FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

November 2012

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Woodbridge Elementary	District Name: Hillsborough
Principal: Christine Hanjian	Superintendent: MaryEllen Elia
SAC Chair: Milca Lebron	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

High School Feedback Report

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

Highly Qualified Administrators

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Christine Hanjian	M.Ed. Educational Leadership B.S. Physical Education Certification in Elementary Education Certification in Physical Education (K-12) ESOL Endorsement	New principal 2012-2013	5	11/12: C 10/11: B 74% AYP 09/10: A 85% AYP 08/09: A 87% AYP 07/08: B 85% AYP
Assistant Principal	Joshua Hodges	B.S.(1-6) M.A.	6	7.5	11/12: C 10/11: B 74% AYP 09/10: A 85% AYP 08/09: A 87% AYP

					07/08: B 85% 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 Coach	Kathleen Nartker	B.S.(Elementary 1-6)	4	4	11/12: Grade C 10/11: Grade B 74% AYP 09/10: Grade A 85% AYP
Reading Resource	Kimberly Cook	BS (Elementary K-6) MS Elementary Ed. Ed. S- Educational Leadership	5	4	11/12: Grade C 10/11: Grade B 74% AYP 09/10: Grade A 85% AYP
Writing Resource	Joanna Schaal	B.S.(Elementary K-6)	3	3	11/12: Grade C 10/11: Grade B 74% AYP 09/10: USF Patel Grade B

Highly Qualified Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1. Teacher Interview Day	General Directors, Site administrators	June 2013	
2. Performance Pay	General Director of Federal	June 2013	

	Programs		
3. EET	Administrators	ongoing	
4. School orientation	Administrators	August 2012	

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
Bradley Davis, Highly Qualified, Out of Field –ELL	Completed 300 hours of ESOL coursework. Certification Pending
Leah A. Robertson, Out of Field – ELL	Currently taking classes towards ESOL certification. Working on ESOL Endorsement; PLCs will provide support by discussing specific strategies for ELL students.
Erin O'Leary, Out of Field – ELL	Currently taking classes towards ESOL certification. Working on ESOL Endorsement; PLCs will provide support by discussing specific strategies for ELL students.
Ryan Kittle, Highly Qualified, Out of field-ELL	Currently taking classes towards ESOL certification. Working on ESOL Endorsement; PLCs will provide support by discussing specific strategies for ELL students.
Ashley Meneese, Highly Qualified, Out of field-ELL	Currently taking classes towards ESOL certification. Working on ESOL Endorsement; PLCs will provide support by discussing specific strategies for ELL students.
Laura Looze, Highly Qualified, Out of Field-ELL	Currently taking classes towards ESOL certification. Working on ESOL Endorsement; PLCs will provide support by discussing specific strategies for ELL students.

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Qualified Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
57	4% (2)	32% (18)	39% (22)	26% (15)	26% (15)	96% (55)	5% (3)	4% (2)	93% (53)

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
Tammy Steele	Miriam Mahmoud	Assigned by district as part of the EET initiative.	Visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work and data, developing assessments, conferencing, and problem solving.
Tammy Steele	Melissa Tallman	Assigned by district as part of the EET initiative.	Visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work and data, developing assessments, conferencing, and problem solving.
Tammy Steele	Laura Looze	Assigned by district as part of the EET initiative.	Visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work and data, developing assessments, conferencing, 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 Services are provided to ensure students who need additional remediation are provided support through: after school and summer programs, quality teachers through professional development, content resource teachers, and mentors.
Title I, Part C- Migrant The migrant advocate provides services and support to students and parents. The advocate works with teachers and other programs to ensure that the migrant students' needs are being met. *Woodbridge currently does not have any migrant students enrolled.
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. *Woodbridge has a full time certified teacher, who teaches, coordinates and monitors the ELL Program. Two bi-lingual para-professionals assist with the program
Title X- Homeless The district receives funds to provide resources (social workers and tutoring) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school, reading coaches, and extended learning opportunity programs. *Woodbridge has implemented all of these programs as they have provided additional benefits for out students.
Violence Prevention Programs District Policy to address "bullying" issues has been implemented as a part of the school's discipline plan. Conference in-service and faculty-staff training were completed
Nutrition Programs HEART= The school's Health Team has a school-wide plan, which was presented to the faculty-staff in pre-planning that will have activities (deemed necessary from school survey results) implemented throughout the school year.
Housing Programs N/A

Head Start
N/A
Adult Education
N/A
Career and Technical Education
N/A
Job Training
N/A
Other
N/A

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.
    A.   Principal – Christine Hanjian
    B.   Asst. Principal of Elementary Instruction – Joshua Hodges
    C.   School Psychologist – Claire Johnson
    D.   Guidance Counselor – Kristen Riley
    E.   Speech Pathologist- Nikki Long
    F.   PLC Facilitators – Rebecca Loomis, Shelly Garcia, Jill Watson, Nancy Schroeder, Adriana Wilsey, Jordan Solano
    G.   Instructional Coaches – Kathleen Nartker, Kimberly Cook , Joanna Schaal
    H.   ESE Specialist – Teresa Masters
    I.   ELP Coordinator – Josh Hodges
    J.   SAC Chair – Milca Lebron

Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?
The purpose of the RtI team in our school is to provide high quality instruction/intervention matched to student needs and using performance and learning rate over time to make important education decisions to guide instruction. The RtI team functions to address the progress of low performing students help meet AYP and help students stay in regular education settings and improve long term outcomes. The team uses a problem solving model and all decisions are made with data. Our RtI Team will be called the Instructional Leadership Team and will serve as the main leadership team of the school.
 	
The Instructional Leadership Team will meet twice a month to:
    A.   Use the Instructional Leadership Team to:
        1.   Oversee a multi-tiered model of service delivery: (Core/Tier 1, Tier2, and Tier 3)
        2.   Determine scheduling needs, curriculum & intervention resources.
        3.   Review/interpret student data (Academic and Behavior)
        4.   Organize and support systematic data collection.

5. Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction.
   -Through the implementation of PLCs
   -Through the use of school-based Reinforcement Calendars, Mini Lessons and Mini Assessments.
   -Through the use of Common Assessments.
   -Through the implementation of research-based, scientifically validated instruction/interventions. This year the RtI team will focus on Differentiated instruction practices.
6. Plan, implement and oversee the supplemental and intensive interventions for student progression in Tier 2 and Tier 3.
7. Monitor interventions and data assessment in Tier 2 and Tier 3.
B. Work collaboratively with the PLCs in the implementation of the Continuous Improvement Model and progress monitoring.
C. Coordinate/collaborate with other working committee.
D. Assist in the implementation and monitoring of the Differentiated Accountability Model.
E. Identify professional developmental needs and resources.

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

- The School Advisory Council (SAC) Chair is a member of the Problem Solving Team.
- The Problem Solving Team along with the faculty and SAC were involved in School Improvement Plan development activities that were conducted prior to the end of the 2011-2012 school year and during the preplanning school year of 2012-2013.
- The School Improvement Plan is a document that guides the work of the Problem Solving-Instructional Leadership Team. The large component of the work of the Team is outlined in the Action Steps, Evaluation Process, and Professional Development of the School Improvement Plan.
- Since one of the main tasks of the Problem Solving-Instructional Leadership Team is to monitor student data throughout the school year, a continuous progress plan will be in effect in order to examine the effectiveness and changes, if needed, to the Action steps.

MTSS Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior. The RTI-Instructional Leadership team uses the FCIM model to analyze student data.
Core Curriculum (tier 1)

Data Source	Data Base	Person(s) Responsible
FCAT released test	School Generated excel Database	Reading Coach, APC
Baseline and Midyear District Assessments	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall	PSLT, PLC's individual teachers
Subject- specific assessments generated by District level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Math, Writing, and Science	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall	PSLT, PLC's individual teachers
Program Generated Assessments	Software	Individual teachers
FAIR	Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network Data Wall	Reading coach/Reading PLC Facilitator
CELLA	Sagebrush (IPT)	ELL Representative

Common Assessments*(see below) of Chapter/segments tests using adopted curriculum resources	Subject Area Generated Database	SALs, individual teachers, PSLT
Nine Weeks Exams	Subject Area Generated Excel Database	SALs, individual teachers, PSLT
Semester Exams	Subject Area Generated Excel Database	SALs, individual teachers, PSLT
Mini-Assessments on specific tested Benchmarks	Subject Area Generated Excel Database	Individual teachers

*A Common Assessment covers a "chunk" of instruction within the District adopted curriculum. It covers all of the skills taught within a certain time period. The purpose of the Common Assessment is to assess students" knowledge of the core curriculum. The results of the Common Assessment are used to:
- Determine if the lesson plans and teaching strategies used to teach the core curriculum were effective or need to be modified.
- Determine which skills need to be taught with alternative strategies.
- Determine which skills need to be re-taught within the core curriculum and which skills need to be moved to the Reinforcement Instructional Calendar.
- Determine which students need Differentiated Instruction within the classroom and which students might need Supplemental Services.

Data Source	Database	Person(s) Responsible for Monitoring
Extended Learning Program (ELP)*	School Generated Database in Excel	PSLT/ELP Facilitator
FAIR OMP	School Generated Database in Excel	PSLT/Reading Coach
Ongoing assessments within intensive courses	Database provided by course materials. School Generated Database in Excel	PSLT/PLC/Individual Teachers
Other curriculum based measurements**	School Generated Database in Excel	PSLT/PLC'S

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

** In addition to Core assessments, progress monitoring the outcomes of intensive interventions requires additional curriculum based measure (CBM) that:
- Assess the same skills over time
- Have multiple equivalent forms
- Are sensitive to small amounts of growth over time

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.
- The RtI Power Point presented to Principals during School Improvement Training will be shared with staff.
- As the District's Problem Solving Team develops resources and staff development courses on RtI, these tools and staff development sessions will be conducted with staff when they become available.
- Professional Development sessions will occur once a month on Early Release days designated by PSLT.

Describe plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the Leadership Team (LLT).school-based Literacy The Reading Leadership Team serves as the school's Literacy Professional Learning community. The team is comprised of: Principal: Christine Hanjian Assistant Principal for Curriculum: Joshua Hodges Reading Coach: Kathleen Nartker Reading Resource Teacher: Kimberly Cook Media Specialist: Nicole Rideout AIS: Sondra Turner Some content area teachers
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The LLT is a subset of the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The team provides leadership for the implementation of the reading strategies on the SIP. The principal is the LLT chairperson. The reading coach is a member of the team and provides extensive expertise in data analysis and reading interventions. The reading coach and principal collaborate with the team to ensure that data driven instruction support is provided to all teachers. The principal also ensures that the LLT monitors reading data, identifies school-wide and individual teachers'' reading-focused instructional strengths and weaknesses, and creates and professional development plan to support identified instructional needs in conjunction with the problem solving leadership team's support plan. Additionally the principal ensures that time is provided for the LLT to collaborate and share information with all site stakeholders including other administrators, teachers, staff members, parents and students.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? • Implementation and evaluation of the SIP reading strategies across the content areas • Professional Development • Co-planning, modeling and observation of research-based reading strategies within lessons across the content areas • Data analysis (on-going) • Implement K-12 Reading Plan

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

Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

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

*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.

*High Schools Only

Note: Required for High School-Sec. 1003.413(g)(j) F.S.

How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future?

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?

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.
Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the <u>High School Feedback Report</u>.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5). Reading Goal #1: In grades 3-5, the percentage of All Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2012 FCAT Reading will increase from 51% to 56%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **51%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **56%**	1.1. -Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is to be rolled out in 2012-2013. -Training all content area teachers.	1.1. **Strategy** *Common Core Reading Strategy Across All Content Areas* Questions of all types and levels are necessary to scaffold students' understanding of complex text. Teachers need to understand and use **higher order, text-dependent questions** at the word/phrase, sentence, and paragraph/passage levels (Webb's, Bloom, Costas). Student reading comprehension improves when students are required to provide evidence to support their answers to text-dependent questions. Scaffolding of students grappling with complex text through well-crafted text-dependent questions assist students in discovering and achieving deeper understanding of the author's meaning. **All content area teachers are responsible for implementation.** **Action Steps**	1.1. **Who** Principal AP Reading Coach Reading Resource Peer or Mentor Evaluators **How** -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of this strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walkthroughs. -EET formal evaluations (Administration and Peer/Mentor) -EET Pop-Ins (Administration and Peer/Mentor) -EET informal observations (Administration and Peers) -Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.	1.1. **Teacher Level** -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit using specific evidence of learning and using this knowledge to drive future instruction. **PLC/Department Level** -Using the individual teacher data, PLC's calculate the SMART goal data across all classes. -PLC's reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class, PLC's chart their overall progress towards the SMART goal. **Leadership Team Level** -PLC facilitator shares SMART goal data with the problem Solving Leadership team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. .	1.1. **2-3x Per Year** -FAIR **During Grading Period** -Common Assessments (pre, post, mid, end of unit, intervention checks)

				Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.			

| | | | **1.2**
-Not all teachers know how to effectively implement the 5-day vocabulary plan within their lessons. | **1.2.**
Strategy
5-day Vocabulary Plan

Tier 1 - The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' vocabulary skills will improve through participation in the 5-day vocabulary plan. Teachers will analyze data, plan instruction based on data and include 5-day vocabulary instruction across the curriculum.
(EET Rubric 1e)

Action Steps:

Plan

    1.   The PLC team will identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLC's will answer the question "How do we know if they have learned it?" **(EET Rubric 1f,4d)**
    2.   As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers will review units of study to find Tier 2 and Tier 3 vocabulary words to use with their vocabulary plan. | **1.2.**
Who
Teacher
Principal
AP
Reading Coach
Reading Resource
Peer or Mentor
Evaluators

How
-PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.
 -Evidence of this strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walkthroughs.
-EET formal evaluations (Administration and Peer/Mentor)
-EET Pop-Ins (Administration and Peer/Mentor)
-EET informal observations (Administration and Peers)
 -Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. | **1.2.**
Teacher Level
-Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit using specific evidence of learning and using this knowledge to drive future instruction.

PLC/Department Level

-PLCs – Periodic (weekly or bi-weekly) progress monitoring of assessment scores to determine the number of students demonstrating proficiency toward benchmark attainment.
-PLCs discuss how to report and share the data with the leadership team.
-Data is used to identify effectiveness of the 5-day vocabulary plan in future lessons.

Leadership Team Level

-The Problem Solving Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.

-The PSLT/Reading Leadership team will maintain a school-wide data system to track student progress.

-PSLT/Reading Leadership | **1.2.**
2-3x Per Year
-FAIR
-DRA

During Grading Period

-Classroom based tests
-Data collection form
-Running Records with Comprehension Check
-Independent Reading Conferences
-Anecdotal Records
-Student Work |

				3. Within PLC's, teachers will design lessons for the 5-day vocabulary plan that will be used across the curriculum.**(EET Rubric 1a, 1b, 1c, 1e, 4d)** **Do/Check** 1. Teachers implement the 5-day vocabulary plan within their lessons. 2. During the lesson, teachers successfully engage all students in the discussion. **(EET Rubric 1b, 3e)** 3. Teachers will implement common assessments from the curriculum materials. **Check/Act** 1. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs and reflect on their teaching. **(EET Rubric 4a)** 2. Based on data, PLCs identify and discuss the 5 day vocabulary plan and techniques that were effective and should be implemented in future lessons.		Team will use data to evaluate the effectiveness of the strategy implementation, supplemental instruction for targeted students and future professional development activities for teachers.	

			(EET Rubric 1c, 4a, 4d, 4e) 3. PLCs record their work in logs. 4. Teachers provide timely feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning. **(EET Rubric 3d)**			
		1.3 -Not all teachers fully understand the strategies necessary to teach single gender classes.	**1.3** **Strategy:** Single Gender Classes The purpose of this strategy is to increase student achievement through the use of single gender classes. Research has shown that boys and girls learn differently and that same-gender classes offer academic advantages to the students. **Action Steps:** **Plan** 1. Classes will be set up and organized with single gender best practices in mind. 2. Single gender teachers will meet with their PLC team to determine specific strategies they will use to teach the reading skill, keeping in mind what strategies work better for each gender. For	**1.3** **Who** Teacher Principal AP District Personnel **How** -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence that the teachers are utilizing best practices for single gender students in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walkthroughs. -Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.	**1.3** **Teacher Level** -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit using specific evidence of learning and using this knowledge to drive future instruction.	**1.3** **2-3x Per Year** -FAIR -DRA **During Grading Period** -Classroom based tests -Data collection form -Running Records with Comprehension Check -Independent Reading Conferences -Anecdotal Records

example: boys learn best using diagrams, graphs, and pictures and girls learn best when "talk time" is allowed, technology is utilized, and they are able to collaborate in groups.

3. Within PLC's, teachers will design lessons utilizing best practices for the specific gender students they will be working with. **(EET Rubric 1a, 1b, 1c, 1e, 4d)**

4. Single gender teachers will identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLC's will answer the question "How do we know if they have learned it?" **(EET Rubric 1f,4d)**

Do/Check

1. Teachers implement the strategies that most benefit students in single-gender

			classes within their lessons. 2. During the lesson, teachers successfully engage all students in the discussion. **(EET Rubric 1b, 3e)** 3. Teachers will implement common assessments from the curriculum materials. **Check/Act** 1. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs and reflect on their teaching. **(EET Rubric 4a)** 2. Based on data, PLCs identify and discuss what techniques were effective and should be implemented in future lessons. **(EET Rubric 1c, 4a, 4d, 4e)** 3. PLCs record their work in logs. 4. Teachers provide timely feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning. **(EET Rubric 3d)**			
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**		**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**

2. **FCAT 2.0:** **Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.**			2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1
Reading Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 27% to 30%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **27%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **30%**					
			2.2. See 1.2	2.2. See 1.2	2.2. See 1.2	2.2. See 1.2	2.2. See 1.2
			2.3 See 1.3	2.3 See 1.3	2.3 See 1.3	2.3 See 1.3	2.3 See 1.3
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
3. **FCAT 2.0:** **Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.**			2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1
Reading Goal #3: Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 66 points to 69 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **66 points**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **69 points**					
			2.2. See 1.2	2.2. See 1.2	2.2. See 1.2	2.2. See 1.2	2.2. See 1.2
			2.3 See 1.3	2.3 See 1.3	2.3 See 1.3	2.3 See 1.3	2.3 See 1.3

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
4. FCAT 2.0: **Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.** Reading Goal #4: Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 75 points to 78 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **75 points**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **78 points**	4.1. -The Extended Learning program (ELP) does not always target the specific skill weaknesses of the students or collect data on an ongoing basis. -Not always a direct correlation between what the students is missing in the regular classroom and the instruction received during ELP. -Minimal communication between regular and ELP teachers.	4.1. **Strategy** Students reading comprehension improves through receiving **ELP supplemental instruction on targeted skills** that are not at the mastery level. **Action Steps** -Classroom teachers communicate with the ELP teachers regarding specific skills that students have not mastered. -ELP teachers identify lessons for students that target specific skills that are not at the mastery level. -Students attend ELP sessions, -Progress monitoring data collected by the ELP teacher on a weekly or biweekly basis and communicated back to the regular classroom teacher. -When the students have mastered the specific skill, they are exited from the ELP program.	4.1. **Who** Administrators **How monitored** Administrators will review the communication logs and data collection used between teachers and ELP teachers outlining skills that need remediation.	4.1. Supplemental data shared with leadership and classroom teachers who have students.	4.1. Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM) (From District RtI/Problem Solving Facilitators.)
			4.2. **See 1.1**	4.2. **See 1.1**	4.2. **See 1.1**	4.2. **See 1.1**	4.2. **See 1.1**

		4.3. See 1.3	4.3. See 1.3	4.3. See 1.3	4.3. See 1.3	4.3. See 1.3	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		**Anticipated Barrier**					
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target		**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Reading Goal #5: In 2017, the percentage of All Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT Reading test will increase from 51% to 77%, reducing the achievement gap by 50%.		**51%**	**56%**	**61%**	**66%**	**71% 2015-2016** **77% 2016-2017**	

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

Reading Goal #5A:	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 55% to 60%. The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will	White:55% Black:53% Hispanic:49% Asian:46% American Indian:	White:60% Black:58% Hispanic:54% Asian:51% American Indian:

	5A.2. See 1.2	5A.2 See 1.2	5A.2 See 1.2	5A.2 See 1.2	5A.2 See 1.2

increase from 53% to 58%. The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 49% to 54%. The percentage of Asian students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 46% to 51%.						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5B.1. **See 1.1**	5B.1. **See 1.1**	5B.1. **See 1.1**	5B.1. **See 1.1**	5B.1. **See 1.1**
Reading Goal #5B: The percentage of Economically Disadvantages students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 47% to 52%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **47%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **52%**					
			5B.2. **See 1.2**	5B.2. **See 1.2**	5B.2. **See 1.2**	5B.2. **See 1.2**	5B.2. **See 1.2**
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5C.1. -Lack of understanding that teachers can provide ELL accommodations beyond the FCAT	5C.1. ELLs (LYA, LYB, and LYC) comprehension of course content/standards improves through participation in the	5C.1. **Who** -School based Administrators -ESOL Resource Teachers	5C.1. Analyze core curriculum and district level assessments for ELL students. Correlate to accommodations to determine	5C.1. **During the Grading Period** -Classroom Tests -District Tests
Reading Goal #5C:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 43% to 46%.	**43%**	**46%**	testing. -Allocation of Bilingual Education Paraprofessional dependent of number of ELLs.	following day-to-day accommodations on core content and district assessments across Reading, 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)	**How** -Administrative an d ESOL resource Teacher walk-throughs and review of lesson plans.	the most effective approach for individual students.	
			5C.2. **See 1.2**	5C.2. **See 1.2**	5C.2. **See 1.2**	5C.2. **See 1.2**	5C.2. **See 1.2**

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5D.1. -Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEP's by both the general education and ESE teacher.	5D.1. **Strategy** SWD student achievement improves through the effective and <u>consistent implementation of the students' IEP</u> goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations. -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD will review students' IEP's to be sure that IEP's are implemented with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLC's) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/SWD	5D.1. **Who** Principal, Assistant Principal, and ESE Specialist **How** IEP Progress Reports reviewed by administration and ESE Specialist	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, PLC's calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLC's reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction	5D.1. -FAIR **During the Grading Period** -End of core common unit tests with data aggregated for SWD performance.
Reading Goal #5D: The percentage of Students with Disabilities scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 25% to 33%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **25%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **33%**					

				strategies and modifications into lessons.		-For each class, PLC's chart their overall progress towards the SMART goal. **Leadership Team Level** PLC facilitator shares SMART goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	

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
Professional Study Day Training- Text Complexity	K-5	Reading Coach and Reading Resource Teacher	All Teachers	PSD- August 15, 2012	Classroom Walkthroughs	Administrators
Deepening the Understanding of the Common Core State Standards/ELA K/1	K-1	District Personnel	All teachers who support K-1 students	Summer 2012	Classroom Walkthroughs	Administrators
Applying the Common Core State Standards in a K/1 ELA Classroom	K and 1	District Personnel	All teachers who support K-1 students	Summer 2012	Classroom Walkthroughs/ Teacher Lesson Plans	Administrators
Text Dependent Questions to Deepen Reading Comprehension	K-5	Reading Department	All Teachers	October 2012	Classroom Walkthroughs/ Teacher Lesson Plans	Administrators
Close Reading	K-5	Reading	All Teachers	January 2013	Classroom Walkthroughs/ Teacher	Administrators

		Department			Lesson Plans	
ELL Strategies	K-5	English Language Learner Resource Teacher	All Teachers	On-going	Classroom Walkthroughs	Administrators
IEP Training	K-5	District Personnel	ESE Teachers	September 2012	Case Manager will review IEP's	ESE Specialist
SWD Co-Teaching	K-5	District Personnel	ESE Teachers	2012-2013 School Year	Classroom Walkthroughs	Administrators ESE Specialist

End of Reading Goals

Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in mathematics (Level 3-5).			1.1. Not all teachers know how to identify student needs from assessments administered to students	1.1 **Strategy** Higher Order Thinking Strategies Tier 1 – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through participation in HOT activities. Teachers will analyze data, plan instruction based on data, include HOT questions designed to increase rigor in lesson plans. **Plan** 1. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction). **EET Rubric 4d** 2. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers discuss HOT strategies and how they can be	1.1. PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing lessons designed with problem-solving strategies. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-through. -PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. - Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. - EET formal/informal evaluations (Administration and Peer/Mentor)	1.1. Teacher Level Teachers analyze individual and team data to identify students for enrichment and remediation. Teachers maintain an online grading system. PLC/Department Level PLCs – Periodic (weekly or bi-weekly) progress monitoring of assessment scores to determine the number of students demonstrating proficiency toward benchmark attainment. PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.	1.1. 2-3x Per Year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During Grading Period -Chapter Tests -Benchmark mini assessments -Informal assessment
Mathematics Goal #1: In grades 3-5, the percentage of All Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 47% to 52%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **47%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **52%**					

| | | | | implemented in the upcoming lessons. **EET Rubric 1e and 4d**
3. Teachers implement the targeted higher order questioning strategies in their lessons.
Do/Check
1. Teachers give the common assessments identified from the core materials. EET Rubric 3d
Check/Act
1. Teachers will bring assessment data back to the PLCs to make a reflection on the teaching and the learning. EET Rubric 3d and 4d
2. PLCs study specifically students' responses to the higher order questions to assess students' higher order thinking processes.
3. Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of higher order strategy implementation. EET Rubric 1b and 1c
PLCs record their work in the PLC logs. | | | |
| | | | 1.2.
Not all teachers are aware of how to model for students on how to read a mathematics word problem and apply problem-solving strategies. | 1.2.
Strategy
Tier 1 – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through participation in lessons where teachers model for students on how to read a mathematics word | 1.2.
-PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.
-Classroom walk-throughs observing lessons designed with problem-solving strategies. | 1.2.
Teacher Level
-Teachers analyze individual and team data to identify students for enrichment and remediation.
PLC/Department Level | 1.2.
<u>2-3x Per Year</u>
District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing
<u>During Grading Period</u> |

| | | | problem and apply <u>problem-solving strategies.</u>

<u>Action Steps</u>

Plan
  1. Teachers/Coaches will attend district offered Math and Reading training as well as Problem Solving Training in Mathematics.
  2. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction).
  3. As teachers attend trainings, problem-solving strategies for word problems are discussed in PLCs as a Professional Development strategy and discuss upcoming common assessments. EET Rubric 1d and 1f
Do/Check

  1. Teachers implement the lessons, modeling for students on how to read a | -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.
-PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies.
- Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.
- EET formal/informal evaluations (Administration and Peer/Mentor) | PLCs – Periodic (weekly or bi-weekly) progress monitoring of assessment scores to determine the number of students demonstrating proficiency toward benchmark attainment.

PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.

Leadership Team Level

The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. | -Chapter Tests
-Benchmark mini assessments
-Informal assessment |

			mathematics word problem and apply problem-solving strategies. 2. Teachers implement the common assessments. Check/Act 1. Teachers will bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 2. As a Professional Development activity, teachers use the data to discuss the effectiveness of the problem-solving strategies that were implemented. 3. Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of problem-solving strategies in word problems. EET Rubric 4a 4. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs			
		1.3.	1.3 **Tier 1** – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through participation in **Differentiated Instruction** (DI) lessons as well as the	1.3. Who Teacher Principal AP How Monitored How -PLC logs turned into	1.3. Teacher Level -Teachers analyze individual and team data to identify students for enrichment and remediation. PLC/Department Level	1.3. 2-3x Per Year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During Grading Period

			Gradual Release Model for Math. These DI and Gradual Release Models for Math lessons will provide both re-teaching and enrichment where needed. Students will be regrouped for DI lessons based on classroom performance. **Action Steps** **Plan** 1. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction). **EET Rubric 1c and 4d** 2. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers discuss specific DI strategies. **Do/Check** 1. Based on classroom performance and the use of the Evaluation Tools listed in the last column, teachers provide DI and Gradual Release for Math lessons and regroup students for both	administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing lessons designed with problem-solving strategies. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. - Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. - EET formal/informal evaluations (Administration and Peer/Mentor)	PLCs – Periodic (weekly or bi-weekly) progress monitoring of assessment scores to determine the number of students demonstrating proficiency toward benchmark attainment. PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.	-Chapter Tests -Benchmark mini assessments -Informal assessment

			re-teaching and enrichment. 2. Teachers assess the skills taught in the DI and Gradual Release for Math lessons from the core curriculum materials to ensure mastery. **EET Rubric 3d** **Check/Act** 1. As a Professional Development activity, in PLCs teachers discuss the outcomes of their DI and Gradual Release for Math lessons and share the effectiveness of their lessons. **EET Rubric 4a and 4d** 2. Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of DI and Gradual Release for Math lesson planning. 3. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.			
		1.4. **See Reading Goal 1.3**	1.4. **See Reading Goal 1.3**	1.4. **See Reading Goal 1.3**	1.4. **See Reading Goal 1.3**	1.4. **See Reading Goal 1.3**

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics.			2.1. **See 1.1**	2.1. **See 1.1**	2.1. **See 1.1**	2.1. **See 1.1**	2.1. **See 1.1**
Mathematics Goal #2: In grades 3-5, the percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 19% to 22%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **19%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **22%**					
			2.2. **See 1.2**	2.2. **See 1.2**	2.2. **See 1.2**	2.2. **See 1.2**	2.2. **See 1.2**
			2.3. **See Reading Goal 1.3**	2.3. **See Reading Goal 1.3**	2.3. **See Reading Goal 1.3**	2.3. **See Reading Goal 1.3**	2.3. **See Reading Goal 1.3**
			2.4. -Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. -Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments. -Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices. - Need additional training to implement effective PLCs.	2.4. **Tier 1** – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through teachers using the **Core-Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM)** with core curriculum and providing **Differentiated Instruction** as a result of the problem-solving model. **Action Steps** **Plan** 1. PLCs write SMART goals based on each	2.4. -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walkthrough observing lessons designed with problem-solving strategies. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-through. -PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. - Monitoring data will be	2.4. Teacher Level -Teachers analyze individual and team data to identify students for enrichment and remediation. PLC/Department Level PLC unit assessment data will be recorded in a course-specific PLC data base (excel spread sheet). PLCs – Periodic (weekly or bi-weekly) progress monitoring of assessment scores to determine the number of students	2.4. 2-3x Per Year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During Grading Period -Chapter Tests -Benchmark mini assessments -Informal assessment

				nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction). **EET Rubric 4d** 2. As a Professional Development activity, teachers use district textbook adopted materials and resources within their PLCs to plan and deliver lessons. 3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling researched-based best-practice strategies. **Do/Check** 1. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions. 3. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum	reviewed every nine weeks. - EET formal/informal evaluations (Administration and Peer/Mentor)	demonstrating proficiency toward benchmark attainment. PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.	

			material. **EET Rubric 3d** **Check/Act** 1. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. **EET Rubric 3d and 4d** 2. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective. **EET 4a and 4d** 3. Based on the data, teachers a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class c) decide what skills need to be re-taught to targeted students (remediation and enrichment). **EET Rubric 1b and 1c** 4. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.			
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3:		3.2. **See 1.1**	3.2. **See 1.1**	3.2. **See 1.1**	3.2. **See 1.1**	3.2. **See 1.1**

In grades 3-5, points earned for students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math test will increase from 57 points to 60 points.	**57 points**	**60 points**					
			3.3. **See 1.2**	3.3. **See 1.2**	3.3. **See 1.2**	3.3. **See 1.2**	3.3. **See 1.2**
			3.4. **See Reading Goal 1.3**	3.4. **See Reading Goal 1.3**	3.4. **See Reading Goal 1.3**	3.4. **See Reading Goal 1.3**	3.4. **See Reading Goal 1.3**
			3.5. **See 1.3**	3.5. **See 1.3**	3.5. **See 1.3**	3.5. **See 1.3**	3.5. **See 1.3**
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
4. FCAT 2.0: **Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.**			4.1. **See 1.2**	4.1. **See 1.2**	4.1. **See 1.2**	4.1. **See 1.2**	4.1. **See 1.2**
Mathematics Goal #4: In grades 3-5, points earned for students in the lowest 25% making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math test will increase from 58 points to 61 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **58 points**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **61 points**					
			4.2. **See 1.3**	4.2. **See 1.3**	4.2. **See 1.3**	4.2. **See 1.3**	4.2. **See 1.3**

		4.3. **See Reading Goal 1.3**	4.3. **See Reading Goal 1.3**	4.3. **See Reading Goal 1.3**	4.3 **See Reading Goal 1.3**	4.3. **See Reading Goal 1.3**	
		4.3 **See 2.3**	4.3. **See 2.3**	4.3. **See 2.3**	4.3. **See 2.3**	4.3. **See 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 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%. Mathematics Goal #5: In 2017, the percentage of All Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT Math test will increase from 47% to 71%, reducing the achievement gap by 50%.		**47%**	**52%**	**57%**	**62%**	**In 2016-67% In 2017-71%**	
5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics**		5A.1. **See 1.2**	5A.1. **See 1.2**	5A.1. **See 1.2**	5A.1. **See 1.2**	5A.1. **See 1.2**	
Mathematics Goal #5A: The percentage of White students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 55% to 60%. The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White:55% Black:47% Hispanic:42% Asian:69% American Indian: / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White:60% Black:48% Hispanic:48% Asian:72% American Indian:						
		5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	

2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 47% to 48%.			**See 1.3**	**See 1.3**	**See 1.3**	**See 1.3**	**See 1.3**
The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 42% to 48%.			5A.3. **See 2.3**	5A.3. **See 2.3**	5A.3. **See 2.3**	5A.3. **See 2.3**	5A.3. **See 2.3**
The percentage of Asian students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 69% to 72%.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5B.1. **See 1.2**	5B.1. **See 1.2**	5B.1. **See 1.2**	5B.1. **See 1.2**	5B.1. **See 1.2**
Mathematics Goal #5B: The percentage of Economically Disadvantages students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 44% to 50%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **44%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **50%**					
			5B.2. **See 1.3**	5B.2. **See 1.3**	5B.2. **See 1.3**	5B.2. **See 1.3**	5B.2. **See 1.3**
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.

			See 2.3	See 2.3	See 2.3	See 2.3	See 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 subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
Mathematics Goal #5C: The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 45% to 51%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **45%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **51%**	**See 1.2**	**See 1.2**	**See 1.2**	**See 1.2**	**See 1.2**
			5C.2. **See 1.3**	5C.2. **See 1.3**	5C.2. **See 1.3**	5C.2. **See 1.3**	5C.2. **See 1.3**
			5C.3. **See 2.3**	5C.3. **See 2.3**	5C.3. **See 2.3**	5C.3. **See 2.3**	5C.3. **See 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 subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5D. Student with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
Mathematics Goal #5D: The percentage of Students with Disabilities scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 28% to 35%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **28%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **35%**	**See 1.2**	**See 1.2**	**See 1.2**	**See 1.2**	**See 1.2**

		5D.2. **See 1.3**	5D.2. **See 1.3**	5D.2. **See 1.3**	5D.2. **See 1.3**	5D.2. **See 1.3**
		5D.3 **See 2.3**	5D.3 **See 2.3**	5D.3 **See 2.3**	5D.3 **See 2.3**	5D.3 **See 2.3**

End of Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

Algebra EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
Alg1. Students scoring proficient in Algebra (Levels 3-5). Algebra Goal #1: **Not Applicable**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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
Alg2. Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in Algebra.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Algebra Goal #2: **Not Applicable**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Rigor/NGSSS/ Core Curriculum	K-5	Math Contact & Grade Level PLC Facilitator	Grade-level PLC	Weekly PLC Meetings	Administrators will conduct targeted classroom walkthroughs to monitor rigor implementation	Administration Team
HOTS	K-5	Math Contact & Grade Level PLC Facilitator	Grade-level PLC	Weekly PLC Meetings	Administrators will conduct targeted classroom walkthroughs to monitor HOTS implementation	Administration Team
Meaty Math	K-5	District Personnel	K-5 Math Teachers	October 29, 2012 and February 21, 2013	Administrator Walkthroughs/Lesson Plans	Administration Team

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. FCAT 2.0: **Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science.** Science Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring a level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 38% to 42%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **38%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **42%**	1.1. -Teachers are at varying skill levels in the use of inquiry and the 5E lesson plan model -Lack of common planning time to facilitate and hold PLC's and vertical planning.	1.1. **Strategy** Students' nature of science skills will improve through participation in the explicit district designed **Process Skill Lessons (5 E Instructional Model)**. **Action Steps** Teachers will attend District Science trainings such as Inquiry Mondays and share information at PLCs. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment, identify and discuss the nature of science questions t drive instruction. Based on the data, teachers discuss effectiveness of the 5E lesson plans to drive future instruction.	1.1. **Who** Principal AP **How Monitored** Classroom Walkthrough	1.1. **Teacher Level** Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use information to drive instruction. **PLC Level** PLCs chart overall progress towards SIP goal. PLCs will reflect on lesson outcomes and use data.	1.1. **2x per year** District-level baseline and mid-year tests **During the Grading Period** -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, intervention checks, etc.)
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. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1
Science Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 13% to 16%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	13%	**16%**					

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
STEM Fair Training	K-5	District Personnel	Recommended for K-5 Science Teachers	Offered Now- December	Classroom Walkthroughs/ Teacher Lesson Plans	Administration Team
Inquiry Mondays	K-5	District Personnel	Recommended for K-5 Science Teachers	Offered Now- December	Classroom Walkthroughs/ Teacher Lesson Plans	Administration Team
Long Term Investigations	K-5	District Personnel	Recommended for K-5 Science Teachers	Offered Now- December	Classroom Walkthroughs/ Teacher Lesson Plans	Administration Team
5 E's Instructional Model	K-5	District Personnel	Recommended for K-5 Science Teachers	Offered Now- December	Classroom Walkthroughs/ Teacher Lesson Plans	Administration Team
Calendar of Science	K-5	District Personnel	Recommended for K-5 Science Teachers	Offered Now- December	Classroom Walkthroughs/ Teacher Lesson Plans	Administration Team
Purposeful Planning	K-5	District Personnel	Recommended for K-5 Science Teachers	October 24 and December 13, 2012	Classroom Walkthroughs/ Teacher Lesson Plans	Administration Team

End of Science Goals

Writing/Language Arts Goals

Writing/Language Arts Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing. Writing/LA Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring Level 3.0 or higher on the FCAT Writers will increase from 77% to 80%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **77%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **80%**	1.1. -Not all teachers know how to plan and execute writing lessons focused on mode-based writing. -Not all teachers know how to review student writing to determine trends and needs in order to drive instruction. -All teachers need training to score student writing accurately during the 2012-2013 school year using information provided by the state.	1.1. **Strategy** Students' use of mode-specific writing will improve through use of Writers' Workshop/daily instruction with a focus on mode-specific writing. **Action Steps** -Based on baseline data, PLCs write SMART goals for each grading Period. ***Plan:*** -Professional Development for updated rubric courses -Professional Development for instructional delivery of mode-specific writing -Training to facilitate data-driven PLCs -Using data to identify trends and drive instruction -Lesson planning based on the needs of students ***Do:*** Daily/ongoing models and application of appropriate mode-specific writing based on teaching point -Daily/ongoing conferencing ***Check:*** -Review of daily drafts and scoring monthly demand	1.1. Principal APEI Writing Resource District (Writing Team, Supervisors, Writing Resource, DRTs) Writing reviews How Monitored -PLC logs -Classroom walk-throughs Observation Form -Conferencing tool (Star and Smile Interviews)	1.1. See "Check" and "Act" action steps in the strategies column	1.1 -Student monthly demand writes/formative assessments -Students daily drafts -Student revisions -Student portfolios

				writes -PLC discussion and analysis of student writing to determine trends and needs *Act:* -Review additional professional development in areas of need -Spread the use of effective practices across the school based on evidence shown in the best practice of others -Use what is learned to begin the cycle again, revise as needed, increase scale if possible, etc. -Plan ongoing monitoring of the solution (s)			

Writing/Language Arts Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
District Writing Holistic Scoring Training	3-5	Writing Department	All teachers 3-5	On-going	-Inservice points turned into administration	Principal APEI Writing Resource Teacher
Mode-based Writing Lessons	K-5	Writing Resource	All writing teachers K-5	On-going	-Administration or Writing Resource walkthroughs -PLC logs turned into administration	Principal APEI Writing Resource Teacher PLC Facilitators

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1: The attendance rate will increase from 94% in 2011-2012 to 97% in 2012-2013 -The number of students who have 10 or more **unexcused** absences throughout the school year will decrease from 82 in 2011-2012 to 79 in 2012-2013. -The number of students who have 10 or more **unexcused** tardies throughout the school year will decrease from 161 in 2011-2012 to 156 in 2012-2013.	2012 Current Attendance Rate:* **94%** 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) **82** 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) **161**	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* **97%** 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) **79** 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) **156**	1.1. Most students with significant unexcused absences (10 or more) have serious personal or family issues that are impacting attendance. -Lack of time to focus on attendance -Data base will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of attendance interventions and to identify students in need of support beyond school wide attendance initiatives.	1.1. The Administration Team along with other appropriate staff will meet every Monday at PSLT meeting to review the school's Attendance Plan to 1) ensure that all steps are being implemented with fidelity and 2) discuss targeted students. 3) PSLT members will be monitoring targeted students that have a pattern of poor attendance or numerous tardies. A data base will be maintained for students with excessive unexcused absences and tardies.	1.1 Social Worker Guidance Counselor PSLT	1.1. Administration Team and subset of PSLT will examine data monthly	1.1. Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/Tardy Reports Attendance Plan
			1.2. Most students with significant unexcused absences (10 or more) have serious personal or family issues that are impacting attendance. -Lack of time to focus on attendance -Data base will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of attendance interventions and to identify students in need of support beyond school wide attendance	**1.2** When a student reaches 15 days of unexcused absences and/or unexcused tardies to school, parents and guardians are notified via mail. Future absences must have a doctor note or other reason outlined in the Student Handbook to receive an excused absence and must be approved through an administrator. A parent-administrator-student conference is scheduled and held regarding these procedures. The goal of the	1.2 Social Worker Guidance Counselor PSLT	1.2 Administration Team and subset of PSLT will examine data monthly	1.2 Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/Tardy data

		initiatives.	conference is to create a plan for assisting the students to improve his/her attendance/tardies.			

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
E-Reports –Mainframe	K-5	AP	As needed	September	Random check of E Reports-postings	AP-SW
Attendance Monitoring	K-5	Principal Social Worker	K-5 Teachers-Staff	On-going	Attendance Reports	DP Teachers

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)		**Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension**				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:		**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1: The total number of In-School Suspensions will decrease from 2 in 2011-2012 to 0 in 2012-2013. The total number of In-School Suspensions will	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions **2** 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School **2** 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions **1** 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School **1** 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	1.1. Teachers need to have common school-wide expectations and rules and provide explicit instruction to students on the expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior.	1.1. PSLT will be developing school-wide expectations and rules, set these through staff discussion. Additional training to staff in methods for teaching and reinforcing the school-wide rules and expectations as indicated.	1.1. PSLT Team/Grade Leaders	1.1. PSLT	1.1. Disciplinary Action Summary Report

decrease from 5 in 2011-2012 to 3 in 2012-2013.	**5** 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School **5**	**3** 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School **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
School-wide and Classroom Discipline Plans	K-5	PLC Leader	School Wide	Early Release Dates/PLC Tuesdays	Monthly Data Review with support from PLC. PSLT will review the attendance and behavior data on a weekly basis, providing mentoring to students, and establishing ongoing contact with parents.	Principal and Assistant Principal

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Note: Required for High School- F.S., Sec. 1003.53

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**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. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.* **Not Applicable** 2012 Current Dropout Rate:* / 2013 Expected Dropout Rate:* 2012 Current Graduation Rate:* / 2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Health and Fitness Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. Health and Fitness Goal Health and Fitness Goal #1: During the 2011-2012 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 50 %on the Pretest to 60% on the Posttest. .	2012 Current Level :* **50%**	2013 Expected Level :* **60%**	1.1.	1.1. Elementary students will engage in 150 minutes of physical education per week in grades kindergarten through 5.	1.1. Principal	1.1. Classroom walkthroughs Class schedules	1.1. Classroom teachers document in their lesson plans the ninety (90) minutes of "Teacher Directed" physical education that students have per week. This is also reflected in the Master Schedule. Physical Education teachers' schedules reflect the remaining sixty (60) minutes of the mandated 150 Minutes of Elementary Phys. Ed.

Health and Fitness Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Health and Fitness / Increase the number of students scoring in the "Healthy Fitness Zone" by 25% on the Pacer Test for assessing aerobic capacity and heart cardiovascular health.	1-5	PE Teacher	School wide	April 2012	Staff Survey	Assistant Principal

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

Continuous Improvement Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. Continuous Improvement Goal <u>Continuous Improvement Goal #1:</u> The percentage of teachers who strongly agree with the indicator that "teachers meet on a regular basis to discuss their student's learning, share best practices, problem solve and develop lessons/assessments that improve student performance (under Teaching and Learning)" will increase from 62% in 2012 to 75% in 2013.	2012 Current Level :* **62%**	2013 Expected Level :* **75%**	1.1. - Not all staff is trained in PLCs. - PLC Facilitators/Subject Area Leaders/Department Heads are not all trained to lead PLCs. - Difficulty making the transition for keeping meetings curriculum and student focused.	1.1 Key staff will provide training on PLCs to the Problem-Solving Leadership Team. PSLT members will implement skills learned within the grade level/subject area/Department PLCs.	1.1 <u>Who</u> Principal and trained staff members <u>How</u> - Administration will review PLCs logs and provide feedback.	1.1 PLST will examine the feedback from all PLCs and determine next steps in the PLC process.	1.1 PLC Facilitators will provide feedback to PLST team on progress of their PLC.
			1.2 - Difficult for administration to support all PLCs. - Difficult for support personnel to attend all PLC meetings.	1.2 All PLCs will meet on Tuesday after school. This will enable administration and support personnel to attend a greater number of PLC meetings.	1.2 <u>Who</u> Administration <u>How</u> Administration attends PLC meetings.	1.2 PLST will examine the feedback from all PLCs and determine next steps in the PLC process.	1.2 PLC Facilitators will provide feedback to PLST team on progress of their PLC.

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	PK-5	PLC Facilitator	School wide	PLC Tuesdays	PLC logs	Administrators will visit PLCs and monitor feedback logs.

End of Additional Goal(s)

Hillsborough 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised July, 2012

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

NEW Reading Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

A. **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Students scoring proficient in reading (Levels 4-9).			A.1.	A.1.	A.1.	A.1.	A.1.
Reading Goal A: **Not Applicable-Not Enough Students**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
B. **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.			B.1.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.
Reading Goal B: **Not Applicable-Not Enough Students**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

NEW Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking.		1.1. **See Reading**	1.1. **See Reading**	1.1. **See Reading**	1.1. **See Reading**	1.1. **See Reading**
CELLA Goal #C:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					

The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from 51% to 54%.	**51%**	**Goal 5c.1**	**Goal 5c.1**	**Goal 5c.1**	**Goal 5c.1**	**Goal 5c.1**
		1.2. **See Reading Goal 5c.2**	1.2. **See Reading Goal 5c.2**	1.2. **See Reading Goal 5c.2**	1.2. **See Reading Goal 5c.2**	1.2. **See Reading Goal 5c.2**
Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
D. Students scoring proficient in Reading.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :	2.1. **See Reading Goal 5c.1**	2.1. **See Reading Goal 5c.1**	2.1 **See Reading Goal 5c.1**	2.1. **See Reading Goal 5c.1**	2.1. **See Reading Goal 5c.1**
CELLA Goal #D: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase from 31% to 34%.	**31%**					
		2.2. **See Reading Goal 5c.2**	2.2. **See Reading Goal 5c.2**	2.2. **See Reading Goal 5c.2**	2.2. **See Reading Goal 5c.2**	2.2. **See Reading Goal 5c.2**
Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the	**Student Evaluation Tool**

					effectiveness of strategy?	
E. Students scoring proficient in Writing.		2.1. **See Writing Goal 1.1**	2.1. **See Writing Goal 1.1**	2.1. **See Writing Goal 1.1**	2.1. **See Writing Goal 1.1**	2.1. **See Writing Goal 1.1**
CELLA Goal #E: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA will increase from 22% to 25%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : **22%**					

NEW Math Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
F. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at in mathematics (Levels 4-9).			F.1.	F.1.	F.1.	F.1.	F.1.
Mathematics Goal F: **Not Applicable- Not Enough Students**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
G. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.			G.1.	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.

Mathematics Goal G: **Not Applicable-Not Enough Students**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				

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

Geometry EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** 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**
H. Students scoring in the middle or upper third (proficient) in Geometry.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Geometry Goal H: **Not Applicable**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
I. Students scoring in the upper third on Geometry.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Geometry Goal I:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

Not Applicable							

End of Geometry EOC Goals

NEW Science Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

Elementary, Middle and High Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
J. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at proficient in science (Levels 4-9).			J.1.	J.1.	J.1.	J.1.	J.1.
Science Goal J: **Not Applicable- Not Enough Students**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					

NEW Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Biology EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
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**
K. Students scoring in the middle or upper third (proficient) in Biology.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.

Biology Goal K: **Not Applicable**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
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**
L. Students scoring in upper third in Biology.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Biology Goal L: **Not Applicable**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

NEW Writing Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

Writing Goals			**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
M. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing (Levels 4-9).			M.1.	M.1.	M.1.	M.1.	M.1.
Writing Goal M: **Not Applicable- Not Enough Students**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: Implement/expand project/problem-based learning in math, science and CTE/STEM projects	1.1. Time to plan for STEM projects.	1.1. Explicit direction for STEM at PLCs Documentation of planning of units and outcomes in student logs Increase effectiveness of lessons through lesson study and district metrics, etc.	1.1. Administration and PLC lead-Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plan checks	1.1. Administration/ walkthroughs	1.1. Project feedback, share data with teachers

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
Purposeful Planning	K-5	Mona Clark	K-5 Science Teachers	October 24, December13	Administrator walkthroughs, Sharing sessions at PLCs and faculty meetings	Administration
Meaty Math	K-5	District personnel	K-5 Math Teachers	October 29, February 21	Administrator walkthroughs, Sharing sessions at PLCs and faculty meetings	Administration
TIP Science	K-5	District personnel	K-5 New Science Teachers	October 13 and 20	Administrator walkthroughs, Sharing sessions at PLCs and faculty meetings	Administration

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
CTE Goal #1: Great American Teach -In	1.1. -Not being able to get enough guest speakers in for the Great American Teach-In	1.1. Increase student knowledge in relationship to careers	1.1. Administration	1.1. Administration Walkthroughs	1.1. Great American Teach In logs and sign ins

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
PLC and Faculty meeting discussion	K-5	Administration	K-5 instructors	November15	Discuss at PLCs and faculty meeting	Administration

End of CTE Goal(s)

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
☐Priority	☐Focus	X 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
	SAC Members will vote on how money should be spent in order to best improve student achievement.		$1544.40
Final Amount Spent			