Florida Department of Education

Essrig Elementary 2012-13
School Improvement Plan (SIP)

Form SIP-1

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Essrig Elementary	District Name: Hillsborough County
Principal: Teresa Campbell	Superintendent: Mrs. MaryEllen Elia
SAC Chair: Tracey Gillett and Ana Grygo	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	Teresa Campbell	Master of Education and Bachelors of Arts degrees. Educational leadership, elementary education (grades 1-6), English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), school principal (all levels), and gifted certifications.	9	9	08/09: Essrig, A 100% AYP 09/10: Essrig, A 100% AYP 10/11: Essrig, A 85% AYP 11/12: Essrig B
Assistant Principal	Gregory Smith	Master of Education and Bachelors of Science degrees. Educational leadership and elementary education (grades 1-6) certifications.	5	5	08/09: Essrig, A 100% AYP 09/10: Essrig, A 100% AYP 10/11: Essrig, A 85% AYP 11/12: Essrig B

Highly Qualified Instructional Coaches

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

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	Lianna Alexander	BA Early Childhood Education (prek-3) and ESOL endorsed	2	4	08/09: Seminole, A 92% AYP (80% @ 3 and above in reading, 65% of reading students making annual learning gains, 63% of bottom quartile students made annual learning gains, Students with disabilities were subgroup that did not make AYP) 09/10: on leave 10/11: Essrig, A 85% AYP (83% @ 3 and above in reading, 66% of reading student made annual learning gains, 57% of bottom quartile students made learning gains, economically disadvantaged and English language learners were subgroups that did not make AYP) 11/12: Essrig, B

Highly Qualified Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1. Teacher Interview Day	District staff	June	
2. Salary Differential (Renaissance schools)	General of Federal Programs	ongoing	

3.	District Mentor Program	District Mentors	ongoing	
4.	District Peer Program	District Peers	ongoing	
5.	School Based teacher recognition program	Principal	ongoing	
6.	Opportunities for teacher leadership	Principal	ongoing	
7.	Regular time for teacher collaboration	Principal	ongoing	

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
4 teachers out of field	Depending on the needs of the teacher, one or more of the following strategies are implemented. Administrators Meet with the teachers four times per year to discuss progress on: • Preparing and taking the certification exam • Completing classes need for certification • Provide substitute coverage for the teachers to observe other teachers • Discussion of what teachers learned during the observation(s) Reading Coach • The coach co-plans, models, co-teaches, observes and conferences with the teacher on a regular basis Team Leader/PLC • The teachers will attend PLC meetings for on-going adult learning, striving to understand how they as an individual teacher and PLC member can improve learning for all.

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Qualified Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
63	5% (3)	21% (13)	40% (25)	35% (22)	35% (22)	94% (59)	3% (2)	11% (7)	90% (57)

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

Tiffany Behnke	Maria Romano	The district-based mentor is with the EET initiative. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Tiffany Behnke	Julie Hume	The district-based mentor is with the EET initiative. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.

Tiffany Behnke	Matthew Krupa	The district-based mentor is with the EET initiative. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only (N/A)

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.

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.

- Principal

- Assistant Principal

- Guidance Counselor

- School Psychologist

- Social Worker

- Reading Coach

- ESE teacher s

- Representatives from the PLCs for each grade level, K-5

- SAC Chair

- Technology specialist

- ELL resource teacher

- Speech teacher

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

The Leadership team meets regularly (monthly). Specific responsibilities include:

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

•   Create, manage and update the school resource map

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

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

•   Facilitate the implementation of specific programs (e.g., Extended Learning Programs during and after school; Saturday Academies) that provide intervention support to students identified through data sorts/chats conducted by the PLCs.

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

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

•   Assist and monitor teacher use of SMART goals per unit of instruction. (data will be collected and analyzed by PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/ PSLT)

•   Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction through the:

o   Implementation and support of PLCs

o   Review of teacher/PLC core curriculum assessments/chapters tests/checks for understanding (data will be collected and analyzed by PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT)

o   Use of Common Core Assessments by teachers teaching the same grade/subject area/course (data will be collected and analyzed by PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT)

o   Implementation of research-based scientifically validated instructional strategies and/or interventions. (as outlined in our SIP)

o   Communication with major stakeholders (e.g., parents, business partners, etc.) regarding student outcomes through data summaries and conferences.

- On a monthly basis, assist in the evaluation of teacher fidelity data and student achievement data collected during the month.

- Support the planning, implementing, and evaluating the outcomes of supplemental and intensive interventions in conjunction with PLCs and Specialty PSLT.

- Work collaboratively with the PLCs in the implementation of the C-CIM (Core Continuous Improvement Model) on core curriculum material.

- Coordinate/collaborate/integrate with other working committees, such as the Literacy Leadership Team (which is charged with developing a plan for embedding/integrating reading and writing strategies across all other content areas).

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

• The Chair of SAC is a member of the Leadership Team/PSLT.

• The administration, leadership team, teachers and SAC are involved in the School Improvement Plan development and monitoring throughout the school year.

• The School Improvement Plan is the working document that guides the work of the Leadership Team and all teacher teams. The large part of the work of the team is outlined in the Expected Improvements/Problem Solving Process sections (and related professional development plans) for school-wide goals in Reading, Math, Writing, Science, Attendance and Suspension/Behavior.

• Given that one of the main tasks is to monitor student data related to instruction and interventions, the Leadership Team/PLST monitors the effectiveness of instruction and intervention by reviewing student data as well as data related to implementation fidelity (teacher walk-through data).

• The Leadership Team/PSLT communicates with and supports the PLCs in implementing the proposed strategies by distributing Leadership Team members across the PLCs to facilitate planning and implementation. Once strategies are put in place, the Leadership Team members who are part of the PLCs regularly report on their efforts and student outcomes to the larger Leadership Team/PSLT.

• The Leadership Team/PSLT and PLCs both use the problem solving process (Problem Identification, Problem Analysis, Intervention Design and Implementation and Evaluation to:

o Use the problem-solving model when analyzing data:

1. What is the problem? (Problem Identification)

2. Why is it occurring? (Problem Analysis and Barrier Identification)

3. What are we going to do about it? (Action Plan Design and Implementation)

4. Is it working? (Monitor Progress and Evaluate Action Plan Effectiveness)

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

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

o Develop and target interventions based on confirmed hypotheses.

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

o   Develop grading period or units of instruction//intervention goals that are ambitious, time-bound, and measureable (e.g., SMART goals).

o   Review progress monitoring data at regular intervals to determine when student(s) need more or less support (e.g., frequency, duration, intensity) to meet established class, grade, and/or school goals (e.g., use of data-based decision-making to fade, maintain, modify or intensify intervention and/or enrichment support).

o   Each PLC develops PLC action plan for SIP strategy implementation and monitoring.

o   Assess the implementation of the strategies on the SIP using the following questions:

1.   Does the data show implementation of strategies are resulting in positive student growth?

2.   To what extent are we making progress toward the school's SIP goals?

3.   If we are making progress, what can we do to sustain what is working?

4.   What barriers to implementation are we facing and how will we address them?

5.   What should we do next? What should be our plan of action?

MTSS Implementation

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

Core Curriculum (Tier 1)

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible
FCAT released tests	School Generated Excel Database	Reading Coach/ AP
Baseline and Midyear District Assessments	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers
District generated assessments from the Office of Assessment and Accountability (End of year and online tests)	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers
Subject-specific assessments generated by District-level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Language Arts, Math, Writing and Science (End of year and online tests)	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall PLC Logs	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers
FAIR	Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network Data Wall	Reading Coach/ PLCs
CELLA	Sagebrush (IPT)	ELL PSLT Representative

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

Teachers' common core curriculum assessments on units of instruction/big ideas. (Reading, Writing, Science and Math will be monitored)	PLC logs	Individual Teachers/ Team Leaders/ PLC Facilitators
DRA-2	School Generated Excel Database	Individual Teacher

Supplemental/Intensive Instruction (Tiers 2 and 3)

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible for Monitoring
Extended Learning Program (ELP) Ongoing Progress Monitoring (mini-assessments and other assessments from adopted curriculum resource materials) (DRA-2 and other district adopted assessments to monitor student progress through the mainframe)	School Generated Database in Excel	Leadership Team/ ELP Facilitator
Differentiated mini assessments based on core curriculum assessments.	Individual teacher data base PLC/Department data base	Individual Teachers/PLCs
FAIR OPM	School Generated Database in Excel	Leadership Team/Reading Coach
Research-based Computer-assisted Instructional Programs including Successmaker, Istation, Hearbuilder	Assessments included in computer-based programs	Technology Specialist/Individual Teachers

Hillsborough 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised July, 2012
15

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

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

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

Describe plan to support MTSS.

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

•	Consistently promote the shared vision of one system meeting the needs of ALL students with MTSS as the platform for integrating all school initiatives (i.e., PLC, PSLT, Steering, and SAC meetings, lesson study, school-wide behavior management plans).

•	Provide designated school personnel with the requisite knowledge and experience to support coordination and implementation of MTSS.

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

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

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

- Principal

- Assistant Principal

- Reading Coach

- Primary and intermediate teachers

- Media Specialist

- ELL resource teacher

- Guidance counselor

- Technology specialist

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 goals and strategies identified on the SIP.

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

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

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?
•   Implementation and evaluation of the SIP reading goals/strategies across the content areas
•   Professional Development based on data
•   Co-planning, modeling and observation of research-based reading strategies within lessons across the content areas
•   Data analysis (on-going)
•   Implementation of the K-12 Reading Plan

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

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.

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

Reading Goals	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**					

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

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

| 1. **FCAT 2.0:** Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5). | 1.1

-Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13.

-Training all content area teachers | 1.1.

Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas

Reading comprehension improves when students are engaged in grappling with complex text through engagement. Teachers need to understand how to select/identify complex text, shift the amount of informational text used in the content curricula, and share complex texts with all students. All content area teachers are responsible for implementation.

Action Steps

Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level PLC action plans and includes: engagement through Literacy Notebooks/ Response Journals, Reader's Theater, Reading Recognitions, Battle Clubs, Fairytale Bowl, Snuggle Up and Read, Camp Read a Lot, Comprehension and Collaboration Book study, Non-fiction text like National Geographic, | 1.1.

Who

-Principal

-AP

-Instruction Coaches

-Subject Area Leaders

-PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses

How

- PLC Logs

-PLCS turn their logs into administration and/ or coach after a unit of instruction is complete.

-Administration and coach rotate through PLCs looking for complex text discussion.

-Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis. | 1.1

Teacher Level

-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.

-Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal.

PLC Level

-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses.

-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.

-For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.

Leadership Team Level

-PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader shares SMART Goal data with the Leadership Team.

-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. | 1.1.

3x per year

- FAIR

During the Grading Period

- Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks) | | |

		Performance tasks, and Reciprocal Teaching Strategies.				
Reading Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 69% to 72%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	69%	**72%**				
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
2. **FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.**	2.1. See Reading Goal 1	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	

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

Reading Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 41% to 45%.						
	41%	**45%**				
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.	3.1. -Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13. -Training all content area teachers	3.1. Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas Teachers need to understand how to design and deliver a close reading lesson. Student reading comprehension improves when students are engaged in close reading instruction using complex text. Specific close reading strategies include: 1) multiple readings of a passage 2) asking higher-order, text-dependent questions, 3) writing in response to reading and 4) engaging in text-based class discussion. All content area teachers are responsible for implementation. Action Steps Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.	3.1. Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -PLC facilitators How -Reading Logs -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/ or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis. -Reading Coach observations and walk-throughs -Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency. -Administrator and Reading Coach aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation.	3.1. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	3.1. 3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)		

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

Reading Goal #3: Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 68 points to 73 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	68 points	**71 points**				
		3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3..3.	3.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

4. FCAT 2.0: **Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.**	4.1. See Reading Goal 3	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.		
Reading Goal #4: Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 70 points to 73 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	70 points	**73 points**					
		4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	

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

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

White: Enrichment needed for this group- performance is already a high level, so they are often not pushed to their capacity of learning.

Black: N/A

Hispanic: Language barriers since 18 different languages are spoken on our campus.

Asian: N/A

American Indian: N/A | 5A.1.

See reading Goal 1 | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | | |

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

Reading Goal #5A: The percentage of White students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 75% to 78%. The percentage of Hispanic students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 62% to 66%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	White: 75 Black: Y Hispanic: 62 Asian: Y American Indian: N/A	White: 78 Black: Hispanic: 66 Asian: American Indian: N/A				
		5A.2.	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2
		5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5B.1. See Reading Goal 1	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		
Reading Goal #5B: The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 59% to 63%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	59%	**63%**					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
Reading Goal #5C:

N/A (ELL=Y) | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | **Y**

— | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | |
| | | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of

Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5D.1. See Reading Goal 1	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		
Reading Goal #5D: The percentage of Students with Disabilities scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 20% to 28%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	20%	**28%**					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through

Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core (CCSS)	K-5	Classroom teachers and Reading Coach	All elementary instructors	Beginning with Pre-planning and follow up faculty meeting trainings monthly	Classroom observations	Administrative team and reading coach
Close reading	K-5	Reading coach	All elementary instructors	Faculty meeting training dates throughout year	Classroom observations	Administrative team and reading coach
Text complexity	K-5	Reading coach and 2 trainers	All elementary instructors	Faculty meeting training dates throughout year	Classroom observations	Administrative team and reading coach

Elementary 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					

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

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

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

1. FCAT 2.0: **Students scoring proficient in mathematics (Level 3-5).**	1.1. -Technology beginning to age and fail for teacher use. -Teachers at varying understanding of the intent of the CCSS	1.1. Strategy Students' math achievement improves with the use of engagement through technology and hands-on activities to implement the Common Core State Standards. In addition, student practice taking on-line assessments to prepare students for on-line state testing. Action Steps -PLCs use their core curriculum information to learn more about hands-on and technology activities. -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level PLC action plans including engagement through: choice of their own manipulatives, working on problems in pairs including use of the SMART board and wireless headphones as a center, students creating their own problems, itools (online manipulatives), and math songs.	1.1. Who - Principal -Math contacts -Technology Specialist How Monitored -PLCS turn their logs into administration after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.	1.1. PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 75% mastery on units of instruction. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends.	1.1. 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During the Grading Period -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, etc.)	

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

Mathematics Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 64% to 69%.						
	64%	**69%**				
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics.	2.1. See Math Goals 1 and 3	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	

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

Mathematics Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 32% to 40%.						
	32%	**40%**				
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making learning gains in mathematics.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1		
	-Teachers tend to only differentiate after the lesson is taught instead of planning how to differentiate the lesson when new content is presented. -Teachers are at varying levels of using Differentiated Instruction strategies. -Teachers tend to give all students the same lesson, handouts, etc.	Strategy/Task Students' math achievement improves when teachers use on-going student data to differentiate instruction. Actions/Details Within PLCs Before Instruction and During Instruction of New Content -Using data from previous assessments and daily classroom performance/ work, teachers plan Differentiated Instruction groupings and activities for the delivery of new content in upcoming lessons. In the classroom -During the lessons, students are involved in flexible grouping techniques PLCs After Instruction -Teachers reflect and discuss the outcome of their DI lessons. -Use student data to identify successful DI techniques for future	Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators How PLCS turn their logs into administration and/ or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.	Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. - For each class/course, PLCs report their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction	During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)		

		implementation. -Using a problem-solving question protocol, identify students who need re-teaching/interventions and how that instruction will be provided. (Questions are listed in the 2012-2013 Technical Assistance Document under the Differentiation Cross Content strategy).				
Mathematics Goal #3: Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 62 points to 67 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	62 points	**67 points**				
		3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3..3.	3.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

4. FCAT 2.0: **Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.**	4.1. See Math Goals 1 and 3	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.		
Mathematics Goal #4: Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 47 points to 54 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	47 points	**54 points**					
		4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	

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

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

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

White: Y

Black: Lack of mathematics interventions currently available.

Hispanic: Language barriers to comprehension of what is being asked.

Asian: Continual enrichment for this group of students- already at such a high level of performance.

American Indian: N/A | 5A.1. See Math Goal 1 | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | | |

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

Math Goal #5A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
The percentage of Black students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 35% to 42%. The percentage of Hispanic students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 56% to 60%. The percentage of Asian students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 90% to 91%.						
	White: Y Black: 35 Hispanic: 56 Asian: 90 American Indian: N/A	White: Black: 42 Hispanic: 60 Asian: 91 American Indian: N/A				
		5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.
		5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5B.1. See Math Goal 1	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5B: The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 50% to 55%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	50%	**55%**					
		5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.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 subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5C: N/A (ELL= Y)	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Y						

		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5D. Student with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5D.1. See Math Goal 1	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	
Mathematics Goal #5D: The percentage of Students with Disabilities scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 26% to 33%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				

		26%	33%					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
			5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	

Mathematics Professional Development

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Engagement in Mathematics	K-5	Math contact and administration	School-wide	Faculty meeting trainings	Classroom walkthroughs	Administrative team

<u>Elementary School Science Goals</u>

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

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

1. **FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science.**	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
	-PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum conversations and data analysis to deepen their leaning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act "Instructional Unit" log.	Strategy Student achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning using the 5E Instructional Model. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model to structure their way of work to increase engagement. Using the backwards design model for unit of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: 1. What is it we expect them to learn? 2. How will we know if they have learned it? 3. How will we respond if they don't learn? 4. How will we respond if they already know it? Actions/Details	Who -Principal -AP -science contacts -PLC facilitators How -PLC logs turned into administration/coaches provides feedback -Administrators attended targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.	School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, team leaders, and leadership team.	2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)		

		Within PLCs:					
		-PLCs will use a PLC log to monitor the following:					
		--Guide their Plan-Do-Check-Act conversations and way of work.					
		--Monitor the frequency of meetings. All grade level/ subject area PLCs collaborate monthly for curriculum planning, reflection, and data analysis.)					
		-Working with the core curriculum, within grade level PLCs teachers will:					
		--Unpack the benchmark and identify what students need to understand, know, and do.					
		--Plan for checks for understanding during the unit.					
		--Plan for the End-of-Unit Assessment					
		--Plan upcoming lessons/units using the 5E					

		Instructional Model. --Reflect on the outcome of lessons taught --Analyze checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments. --Act on the core curriculum data by planning interventions for the whole class or small group. -PLCs will generate SMART goals for upcoming units of instruction. -PLCs will report SMART goal data through their logs.					
<u>Science Goal #1:</u> The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 51% to 55%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	51%	**55%**					

		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

| 2. **FCAT 2.0:** Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science. | 2.1.

-Not all teachers have received the CCLS for Science overview.

-Not all teachers understand how to integrate close reading with the 5E instructional model.

-Not all PLCs routinely look at curriculum materials beyond those posted on the curriculum guide | 2.1.

Strategy

Students' comprehension of science text improves when students are engaged in close reading techniques using on-grade-level content-based text (textbooks and other supplemental texts). Science teachers engage students in the close reading model (appropriately placed within the 5E instructional model) using their textbooks or other appropriate high-Lexile, complex supplemental texts at least one time per nine weeks.

_

Action Steps

Professional Development

-The Reading Coach will conduct small group trainings to develop teachers' ability to use the close reading model. | 2.1.

Who

Principal

AP

Science Contact

Reading Coach

Reading Leadership Team

How Monitored

Administration, Coach, SAL walk-throughs

-PLC logs turned into administration.

-Administration provides feedback. | 2.1.

Science PLC Resource meetings

Reading Leadership Team

PLCs will track achievement on the benchmark attached to the Close Reading passage comparing baseline achievement level to 80% mastery using the proximal evaluation tool. | 2.1.

District level baseline and post assessments

During the Grading Period

-mini-assessments

-unit assessments | | |

		-The Reading Coach attends PLCs to co-plan with teachers, developing lessons using the close reading model. In PLCs -Teachers work in their PLCs to locate, discuss, and disseminate appropriate texts to supplement their textbooks. -PLCs review Close Reading Selections to determine word count and high-Lexile. -PLCs assign appropriate NGSSS benchmark/ CCSS to Close Reading passage -To increase stamina, teachers select high-Lexile, complex and rigorous texts that are shorter and progress throughout the year to longer texts that are high-Lexile, complex and rigorous					

		- Teachers debrief lesson implementation to determine effectiveness and level of student comprehension and retention of the text. Teachers use this information to build future close reading lessons. During the lessons, teachers: -Guide students through text without reading or explaining the meaning of the text using the following: --Introducing critical vocabulary to ensure comprehension of text. --Stating an essential question prior to reading --Using questions to check for understanding. --Using question to engage students in discussion. --Requiring oral and written responses to text.				

		-Ask text-based questions that require close reading of the text and multiple reads of the text. During the lessons, students: -Grapple with complex text. -Re-read for a second purpose and to increase comprehension. -Engage in discussion to answer essential question using textual evidence. -Write in response to essential question using textual evidence. Student engagement will occur through: Long term science investigations, Inquiry Mondays, hands on projects/ investigations/ experiments/ reports, data analysis, STEM Fair, field trips, and acting out vocabulary.					

Science Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*				
The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 18% to 25%.						
	18%	**25%**				
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Close Reading	Grades K-5	Reading Coach	All instructors	Faculty meeting in Oct. and then on-going	Walkthroughs	Administrative team and reading coach

Writing/Language Arts Goals

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1		
	-Not all teachers know how to plan and execute writing lessons with a focus 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.	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. (For example, during the first Grading Period, 50% of the students will score 4.0 or above on the end-of-the Grading Period writing prompt.) Plan: -Professional Development for updated rubric courses -Professional Development for instructional delivery of mode-specific writing -Training to facilitate data-driven PLCs	Who Principal APEI Writing contact District (Writing Team, Supervisors, Writing Resources, Academic Coaches, and DRTs) How Monitored -PLC logs -Classroom walk-throughs Observation Form -Conferencing while writing walk-through	See "Check" & "Act" action steps in the strategies column	-Student monthly demand writes/formative assessments -Student daily drafts -Student revisions -Student portfolios - Teacher conferencing utilizing SMILE and STAR interviewing methods		

		-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 points -Daily/ongoing conferencing Check: Review of daily drafts and scoring monthly demand writes -PLC discussions and analysis of student writing to determine trends and needs Act: -Receive additional professional development in areas of need -Seek additional					

		professional knowledge through book studies/ research -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) -Engagement though Quality literature use, meaningful writing assignments utilizing the student binders with dividers, interviews, persuasive letters, writing across content areas, making writing personal and relevant (student choice).					

Writing/LA Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The percentage of students scoring Level 3.0 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes will increase from 91% to 95%.							
	91%	**95%**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Writing/Language Arts Professional Development

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject and/or	PD Facilitator 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
Moodle Scoring online course		Grade level team leaders	Grade level			
	3rd and 4th grades			Late October- November	Scoring test and grade level alignment	Administration/ Team leaders
Mind mapping/ voice						PLC facilitator/ administration
	4th grade	Team leader	4th grade teachers	October/ November team meeting	Scoring papers of 4th grade students	

Attendance Goal(s)

Attendance Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance						
Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Attendance	1.1. -Attendance committee needs to meet on a regular basis throughout the school year. -Need support in building and maintain the student database.	1.1 . The school will establish an attendance committee comprised of Administrators, guidance counselors, teachers and other relevant personnel to review the school's attendance plan and discuss school wide interventions to address needs relevant to current attendance data. The attendance committee will also maintain a database of students with significant attendance problems and implement and monitor interventions to be documented on the attendance intervention form (SB 90710) The attendance committee meets monthly.	1.1. Attendance committee lead by guidance counselor and school social worker will keep a log and notes that will be reviewed by the Principal on a monthly basis and shared with faculty.	1.1. Attendance committee will monitor the attendance data from the targeted group of students.	1.1. Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/Tardy data Ed Connect		

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

Attendance Goal #1:	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
1. The attendance rate will increase from 95.96% in 2011-2012 to 96% in 2012-2013. 2.The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused absences throughout the school year will decrease by 10%. 3.The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused tardies to school throughout the school year will decrease by 10%.							
	95.96 %	**96 %**					

	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)				
	59	**53**				
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)				
	174	**156**				
		1.2. There is no system to reinforce parents for facilitating improvement in attendance.	1.2 Tier 2 Beginning at the 5th unexcused absence, the Attendance Committee collaborates to ensure that a letter is sent home to parents outlining the state statute that requires parents send students to school. If a student's attendance improves (no absences in a 20 day period) a positive letter is sent home to the parent regarding the increase in their child's attendance.	1.2. Social Worker Guidance Counselor PSLT	1.2. The attendance committee (which is a subset of the leadership Team) will disaggregate attendance data for the "Tier 2" group along with the guidance counselor and maintain communication about these children.	1.2. Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/Tardy data
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through
Hillsborough 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised July, 2012

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
IPT Data review	K-5	Guidance counselor	Administrative team	September and then at least monthly	IPT data review and tracking	Guidance counselor

Suspension Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)	**Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension**						
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

| 1. Suspension | 1.1.

Enforce/ reinforce common school-wide expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior throughout school to keep it consistent. | 1.1.

Tier 1

-Positive Behavior Support (Paws) will be implemented to address school-wide expectations and rules, set these through staff survey, discipline data, and provide training to staff in methods for teaching and reinforcing the school-wide rules and expectations.

-Providing teachers with resources for continued teaching and reinforcement of school expectations and rules.

-Where needed, administration conducts individual teacher walk-through data chats | 1.1.

Who

-PSLT Behavior Committee

-Leadership Team

-Administration | 1.1.

- PSLT /Behavior Committee will review data on Office Discipline Referrals and out of school suspensions monthly. | 1.1.

UNTIE , EASI ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data | | |

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

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

	3	**3**					
	2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	8	**7**					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	6	**5**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Suspension Professional Development

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Positive Behavior Support K-5 (paws)		administration	School-wide	Monthly	Administration and guidance walk-throughs	Administration and guidance walk-throughs

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

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

1. **Health and Fitness Goal**	1.1. Time to fit in all of the activities in an already full calendar and not taking time away from core instruction.	1.1. Health and physical activity initiatives developed and implemented by the physical education instructors.	1.1. Physical education teachers.	1.1. Data on the number of students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ)	1.1. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.		
Health and Fitness Goal #1: During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students scoring in the "Healthy Fitness Zone" (HFZ) on the Pacer for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular health will increase from 65% on the Pretest to 75%% on the Posttest.	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	65%	**75%**					

		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		- Lack of physical activities provided to teachers to use. - Weather limitations from rain and cold temps. - Teachers not wanting to give up some instructional time. -Engagement through Running Club, Morning show awareness on nutrition, activity breaks throughout the day, Brain Gym, Conscious Discipline, Walking club, Family Fitness Fest, Field Day.	Five physical education classes per week for a minimum of two per week with a physical education teacher.	Physical Education Teacher and classroom teacher collaboration.	Classroom walk-throughs Class schedules	PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Health and Fitness Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning

Community (PLC)
  or PD Activity

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

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
Brain Gym	all	PE teachers	School wide	December	Walkthoughs	Administration/ PE teachers

Continuous Improvement Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

1. Continuous Improvement Goal	1.	1.1. Include regular newsletter articles about SAC and their roles monthly to inform our parents and continue to speak about progress at parent meetings.	1.1. Administration/ team leaders	1.1. Percentage of increase in parent Climate and Perception survey results based on monthly newsletter articles.	1.1. Climate and Perception Survey for parents		
	Parents do not read the newsletter that is sent out monthly on a consistent basis, nor do they attend PTA meetings to hear about our progress.						
Continuous Improvement Goal #1: The percentage of parents who strongly agree with the indicator that "I am aware of the School Advisory Council (SAC) and its role" (under Volunteering and Relationship Building)" will increase from 39% in 2012 to 50% in 2013.	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	39%	**50%**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with

Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity							
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. 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	
Data walk book and DVD	all	Principal	Grade level PLC facilitators	Monthly during steering meetings	Steering notes	Administration	

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: N/A(No FAA students)	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	
	A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	
B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.**	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.	

Reading Goal B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
N/A						
	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	
	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	

NEW Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

CELLA Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition					
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/ Speaking.	1.1. *See Reading ELL Goals 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4*	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	
CELLA Goal #C: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/ Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from 49% to 53%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					
	49%					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

D. Students scoring proficient in Reading.	2.1. *See Reading ELL Goals 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4*	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	
CELLA Goal #D: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase from 44% to 48%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :					
	44%					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

E. Students scoring proficient in Writing.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	
	See Reading ELL Goals 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4					
CELLA Goal #E: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA will increase from 35% to 39%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
	35%					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

Math Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

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

F. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at in mathematics (Levels 4-9).**	F.1.	F.1.	F.1.	F.1.	F.1.	
Mathematics Goal F: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
		F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	
		F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	

G. **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.		
Mathematics Goal G: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	
		G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	

Science Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

Elementary Science Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
J. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at proficient in science (Levels 4-9).	J.1.	J.1.	J.1.	J.1.	J.1.		

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

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

M. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing (Levels 4-9).**	M.1.	M.1.	M.1.	M.1.	M.1.		
Writing Goal M: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	
		M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	

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

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

	Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: Implement/expand project/problem-based learning in math and science.	1.1. Need common planning time for math, science, ELA and other STEM teachers	1.1. -Explicit direction for STEM professional learning communities to be established. -Documentation of planning of units and outcomes of units in logs. -Increase effectiveness of lessons through lesson study and district metrics, etc.	1.1. PLC/ grade level Leaders	1.1. Administrative walk-throughs	1.1. Participation in STEM fair and math bowl/ Tivitz competitions.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject and/or PLC Leader	PD Facilitator	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Inquiry Mondays	All	Science contact	School Wide	October faculty meeting	Walkthroughs	Administration
Long Term Investigations	All	Science contact	School Wide	November faculty meeting	Walkthroughs	Administration

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

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

CTE Goal #1:	1.	There has been a decrease this year in the number of volunteers that have been assisting at the school.	1.1. Advertise on the marquee and in the newsletter that we are looking for volunteers to share their career talents.	1.1. GATI chairs	1.1. Count of careers shared	1.1. GATI evaluation form from district
Increase the number of careers that students are exposed to during the Great Florida Teach In from 65 to 75.						
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning

Community (PLC)
or PD Activity

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

Differentiated Accountability N/A

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
Priority	Focus	☐Prevent

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

X Yes   No

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

Describe the use of SAC funds.			
Name and Number of Strategy from the School Improvement Plan	Description of Resources that improves student achievement or student engagement	Projected Amount	Final Amount
Mathematics- 1.1 strategy	Wireless SMART headsets (set of 4 in each set and 4 total sets)	$538.04	$538.04
	National Geographic magazine class subscriptions	$1,320	$1, 320
Writing- 1.1 strategy	Writing dividers for binders	$83.26	$83.22

Final Amount Spent	$1, 941.26		