

Florida Department of Education



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

School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

School Improvement Plan - Uploading to the Florida DOE Website

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

When you are finished with your SIP (or each time you progress monitor and make updates), follow the steps listed below to upload/re-upload your SIP to the Florida DOE website

Steps

- Go to: <http://flbsi.org/>

Screen #1

- On the left hand side, click on “Submit or View School Improvement Plan”.

Screen #2

- Select Type of Plan – School Improvement Plan.
- Select School District – Find the District in the drop down menu and click on Hillsborough.
- Select School – Find your school in the drop down menu and click on your school.
- Password – Type 29 followed by your four digit site number. Example for Greco Middle – 291781.
- Click on “Click Here to Log In.”

Screen #3

- Click on “Upload my 2011-2012 School Year Plan (Word, PDF)”.

Screen #4

- Find the box at the **top** of the page that says “**2011-2012 SIP Upload**”. In the box:
 - Click on “Browse” to go to your computer’s files. Click on your SIP Word document.
 - Click on “Upload file.”

▪

Repeat the same process each time you make changes to your SIP Word document and re-submit to the FDOE website

2012 – 2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

| | |
|--|--|
| School Name: Collins Elementary School | District Name: Hillsborough |
| Principal: Steven Sims | Superintendent: Mary Ellen Elia |
| SAC Chair: Judith Diaz | Date of School Board Approval: Pending school board approval |

Student Achievement Data:

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.)

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data (Use this data to complete Sections 5A-5D of the reading and mathematics goals and Section 3A-3D of the writing goals.)

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

Highly Qualified Administrators

September 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Hillsborough Revised September 28, 2012

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

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 performance (Percentage data for Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

| 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 (Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AYP information along with the associated school year) |
|---------------------|-------------|--|---|---|---|
| Principal | Steven Sims | EdS. Educational Leadership Physical Education K-12 | 7 | 7 | 11/12 A Grade, Reading Learning Gains: 70% (177), Lowest 25%: 65% (41) Math Learning Gains: 67% (170), Lowest 25%: 62% (39) 10/11 A Grade, Reading Learning Gains: 64% (169), Lowest 25%: 50% (33) Math Learning Gains: 65% (172), Lowest 25%: 53% (35) 09/10 A Grade 08/09 A Grade 100% AYP |
| Assistant Principal | Teri Madill | MEd. Educational Leadership Elementary Education | 7 | 3 | 11/12 A Grade, Reading Learning Gains: 70% (177), Lowest 25%: 65% (41) Math Learning Gains: 67% (170), Lowest 25%: 62% (39) 10/11 A Grade, Reading Learning Gains: 64% (169), Lowest 25%: 50% (33) Math Learning Gains: 65% (172), Lowest 25%: 53% (35) 09/10 A Grade 08/09 A Grade 100% 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 performance (Percentage data for Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

| Subject | Name | Degree(s)/ | Number of Years at | Number of Years as an | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT (Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AYP |
|---------|------|------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|
|---------|------|------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|

September 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Hillsborough Revised September 28, 2012

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

| Area | | Certification(s) | Current School | Instructional Coach | information along with the associated school year) |
|---------|---------------|---------------------------|----------------|---------------------|---|
| Reading | Laura Schulte | B.S. Elementary Education | 5 | 5 | 11/12 A Grade, Reading Learning Gains: 70% (177), Lowest 25%: 65% (41) 10/11 A Grade, Reading Learning Gains: 64% (169), Lowest 25%: 50% (33) 09/10 A Grade 08/09 A Grade 100% AYP |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Highly Qualified Teachers

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

| Description of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date | Not Applicable (If not, please explain why) |
|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| 1. Teacher Interview Day | General Directors | June 2012 | |
| 2. Performance Pay | General Director of Federal Programs | June 2013 | |
| 3. Opportunities for Teacher Leadership | Principal & Assistant Principal | June 2013 | |
| 4. Peer Mentoring | Team Leaders | June 2013 | |
| 5. Regular time for teacher collaboration | Principal & Assistant Principal | ongoing | |
| 6. On-site home-based training | Principal & Assistant Principal | ongoing | |

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

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

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

| Name | Certification | Teaching Assignment | Professional Development/Support to Become Highly Qualified |
|---|--|---------------------|---|
| Jessica Freese *Highly qualified for Elementary *Out of field for ELL | Elementary Education K-6 | Grade 2 | Working on ESOL Endorsement. PLC's will provide support by developing on-going strategies for ELL students. |
| Brianna Hahn *Highly qualified for Elementary *Out of field for ELL | Elementary Education K-6 | Grade 1 | Working on ESOL Endorsement. PLC's will provide support by developing on-going strategies for ELL students. |
| Susan Harrison *Highly qualified for Elementary *Out of field for ELL | Elementary Education K-6 | Grade 4 | Working on ESOL Endorsement. PLC's will provide support by developing on-going strategies for ELL students. |
| Peter Jennings *Highly qualified for Elementary *Out of field for ELL | Pre-Kindergarten/Primary Education (Age 3- Grade 3) Journalism/6-12 | Grade 1 | Working on ESOL Endorsement. PLC's will provide support by developing on-going strategies for ELL students. |
| Jillian Krause *Highly qualified for Elementary *Out of field for ELL | Pre-Kindergarten/Primary Education (Age 3- Grade 3) | Grade K | Working on ESOL Endorsement. PLC's will provide support by developing on-going strategies for ELL students. |
| Regenia Smith *Highly qualified for Elementary *Out of field for ELL | Elementary Education K-6 | Grade 4 | Working on ESOL Endorsement. PLC's will provide support by developing on-going strategies for ELL students. |

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

| | | | |
|--|---|---------|---|
| Carrie Varnadoe *Highly qualified for Elementary *Out of field for ESE | Elementary Education K-6 | ESE | PLC's will provide support by developing on-going strategies for ESE students. |
| Tina Vigh *Highly qualified for Elementary *Out of field for ELL | Elementary Education 1-6 Reading Endorsement | Grade 4 | Working on ESOL Endorsement. PLC's will provide support by developing on-going strategies for ELL students. |
| Karen Wilson *Highly qualified for Elementary *Out of field for ELL | Pre-Kindergarten/Primary Education (Age 3- Grade 3) | Grade 3 | Working on ESOL Endorsement. PLC's will provide support by developing on-going 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 Advanced Degrees | % Highly Qualified Teachers | % Reading Endorsed Teachers | % National Board Certified Teachers | % ESOL Endorsed Teachers |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

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

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| 7 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 | % | % | 0 |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | | | % |
| | (| (| (| (| (| (| (| (| (|
| | 8 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 3 | (|
| |) | 2 | 9 |) | 4 | 8 |) |) | 5 |
| |) |) |) |) |) |) |) |) | 4 |
| |) |) |) |) |) |) |) |) |) |

Teacher Mentoring Program

Please describe the district and 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 |
|--------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| Karen Koslow | Jillian Krause | County Assigned | Guidelines for TIP |
| Karen Koslow | Brianna Hahn | County Assigned | Guidelines for TIP |
| Karen Koslow | Peter Jennings | County Assigned | Guidelines for TIP |
| Karen Koslow | Brittany Fabry | County Assigned | Guidelines for TIP |
| Karen Koslow | Jessica Freese | County Assigned | Guidelines for TIP |
| Karen Koslow | Amy Lofton | County Assigned | Guidelines for TIP |

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

| | | | |
|--------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Karen Koslow | Stephanie Raciti | County Assigned | Guidelines for TIP |
| Karen Koslow | Regenia Smith | County Assigned | Guidelines for TIP |
| Karen Koslow | Carrie Varnadoe | County Assigned | Guidelines for TIP |

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)

School-Based MTSS Team

Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team: Teri Madill, Sue Chapin, Melissa Porfirio, David Kincade, , Katherine Pitts, Marci Rowe, Carrie Varnadoe, Johanna Vega, Marcia Absher, Brad Fuller, and Jennifer Scipione.

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

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

The purpose of the PSLT in our school is to ensure high quality instruction/intervention matched to student needs. By using performance levels and learning rates over time we are able to make data-based decisions to help guide instruction. The PSLT reviews school-wide data to address the progress of low-performing students and determine the enrichment and acceleration needs of high performing students. The team's goal is for all students to achieve adequate yearly progress and improve other long-term outcomes (behavior, attendance, etc.). The team collaborates to problem solve and all decisions are guided by the review and analysis of student data.

The PSLT is considered the main leadership team in our school. The PSLT will meet bi-weekly and use the problem solving process to:

- Oversee the multi-layered model of service delivery (Tier 1/Core, Tier 2/Supplemental and Tier 3/Intensive)
- Based on student data, recommend, coordinate and implement supplemental services (Tiers 2 and 3) that match students' non-mastery of skills through:
 - Designated intervention block
 - Tutoring during the day in small group pull-outs in reading
 - Extended Learning Programs after school
- Determine scheduling needs, curriculum materials and intervention resources based on identified needs derived from data analysis
- Determine the school-wide professional development needs of faculty and staff and arrange trainings aligned with the SIP goals
- Review and interpret student data (academic, behavior and attendance) at the school and grade levels
- Organize and support systematic data collection as needed
- Strengthen instruction through the:
 - Implementation and support of PLCs
 - Use of school-based *Reinforcement Instructional Calendars*, *Mini-Lessons* and *Mini-Assessments*
 - Use of Mini Assessments (data will be collected by PLCs and entered and compiled for analysis by members of the PSLT)
 - Use of *Common Core Assessments* at the end of segments/chapters (data will be collected by PLCs and entered and compiled for analysis by members of the PSLT)
 - Implementation of research-based, scientifically validated instructional strategies and/or interventions (e.g., Differentiated Instruction)

September 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Hillsborough Revised September 28, 2012

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

- Communication with major stakeholders (e.g., parents, business partners, etc.) regarding student outcomes through data summaries and conferences
- At the end of each nine weeks, assist in the evaluation of teacher fidelity data and student achievement data collected during the nine weeks.
- Assist with planning, implementing, and evaluating the outcomes of supplemental and intensive interventions in conjunction with PLCs.
- Work collaboratively with the PLCs in the implementation of the C-CIM (Core Continuous Improvement Model) and F-CIM (Florida Continuous Improvement Model) on specific tested benchmarks and progress monitoring.

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

- The School Improvement Plan is the working document that guides the work of the PSLT. The large part of the work of the team is outlined in the Expected Improvements/ Problem Solving Process sections (and related professional development plans) for school-wide goals in Reading, Math, Writing, Science, Attendance and Suspension/Behavior.
- Given that one of the main tasks is to monitor student data related to instruction and interventions, the PSLT will monitor the effectiveness of the strategies developed in problem solving plans by reviewing student data as well as data related to various levels of fidelity. Using data gathered from PLCs, the team will monitor the data and update the School Improvement Plan at the end of the first, second and third grading period if necessary.
- The PSLT will communicate with and support the PLCs in implementing the proposed strategies by assigning PSLT members as consultants to the PLCs to facilitate planning and implementation. Once strategies are put in place, PLCs will periodically report on their efforts and student outcomes to the larger PSLT team through the grade level PSLT representatives.

MTSS Implementation

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

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

Core Curriculum (Tier 1)

| Data Source | Database | Person (s) Responsible |
|---|--|--|
| FCAT | School Generated Excel Database | Principal/AP, Individual Teachers, Reading Coach |
| Baseline and Mid-year District Assessments | Scantron Achievement Series | PSLT, PLCs, Principal/AP, Individual Teachers |
| FAIR | Progress Monitoring and Reporting Data Wall | PSLT, Principal/AP, Reading Coach, PLCs, Individual Teachers |
| CELLA | Instructional Planning Tool (IPT) | ELL Representative, PSLT |
| Common Assessments* (<i>see below</i>) of chapter/segments tests using adopted curriculum resources | School Generated Database | PLCs, Individual Teachers |
| DRA-2 | School Generated Excel Database | Individual Teacher |
| Mini-Assessments on specific tested Benchmarks | School Generated Excel Database | Individual Teacher |

*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.

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

- Determine which skills need to be taught with alternative strategies.
- Determine which skills need to be re-taught within the core curriculum and which skills need to be moved to the Reinforcement Instructional Calendar.
- Determine which students need Differentiated Instruction within the classroom and which students might need Supplemental Services.

Supplemental/Intensive Instruction (Tiers 2 and 3)

| Data Source | Database | Person (s) Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|
| Extended Learning Program (ELP) * <i>(see below)</i> Ongoing Progress Monitoring (mini-assessments and other assessments from adopted curriculum resource materials) | School Generated Database in Excel | ELP Facilitator, Principal, Assistant Principal |
| FAIR OPM | School Generated Database in Excel | PSLT, Reading Coach, Individual Teacher |
| Other Curriculum Based Measurement** <i>(see below)</i> | School Generated Database in Excel | PSLT, PLCs |
| Computer Enrichment Programs (FCAT Explorer, I-Station, FASTT Math) | School Generated Database in Excel | PSLT, PLCs, Reading Coach, Individual Teacher |
| Easy CBM | Assessments included in computer based programs | PSLT, PLCs, Reading Coach, Individual Teacher |

*Students receiving tutoring through the Extended Learning Program (ELP) after school will receive instruction on the specific skills they have not mastered in the core curriculum areas of reading, writing, and math. As students work on these specific skills, they will be assessed during ELP to ensure mastery of skills. In order to make this process effective, a communication system between classroom teacher and the ELP teacher will be developed by the PSLT and monitored for effectiveness throughout the school year.

** In addition to Core assessments, progress monitoring the outcomes of intensive interventions requires additional Curriculum Based Measures (CBM) that:

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

- assess the same skills over time
- have multiple equivalent forms

Example: FAIR Ongoing Progress Monitoring

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The Teacher Training Modules, as posted under the MTSS Icon, were delivered to faculty members over the course of several faculty meetings during the 2012-2013 school year. PSLT members who attended the district level MTSS trainings served as consultants to the PLCs to guide the process of data review and interpretation. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will continue to work to build consensus with all stakeholders regarding a need for and a focus on school improvement efforts. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will work to align the efforts of other school teams that may be addressing similar identified issues.

As the District's MTSS Committee develops resources and staff development trainings on PDS/MTSS, 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.

To provide additional support with the MTSS process, our school psychologist visits PLC's when needed and offers one-on-one lessons and feedback on specific sections of the MTSS process. (Data tracking, forms needed, interventions, etc.)

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

September 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Hillsborough Revised September 28, 2012

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

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Steven Sims, Teri Madill, Laura Schulte, Rachel Patterson, Jennifer Scipione , Stacy Graves, Katie Jacob, Ashley Joline, and Brad Fuller.

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

LLT will meet bi-monthly to discuss on-going progress monitoring of each grade level and how the implemented strategies are progressing. The LLT is a subset of the PSLT. The team provides leadership for the implementation of the reading strategies of the SIP.

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

- Implementation of SIP goals and action plans
- Ongoing data analysis in PLCs
- Increase bottom quartile by 2% or more on FCAT reading
- Professional Development

NCLB Public School Choice

- **Notification of School in Need of Improvement (SINI) Status**
Upload a copy of the Notification of SINI Status to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.
- **Public School Choice with Transportation (CWT) Notification**
Upload a copy of the CWT Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.
- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**
Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.

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

****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.

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

| READING GOALS | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| 1. Students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3 or above) in reading | | | | |
| <u>Reading Goal #1:</u> | | | | |
| In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 75% to 80%. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | |

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

| | | | | |
|--|--------------|--|---|-----------------|
| | 75% (309) | 80% (385) | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |

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

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| <p>-Not all teachers of the same course give the same common assessment at the end of the instructional cycle.</p> <p>- Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students).</p> | <p>1.1</p> <p><u>Strategy</u></p> <p>This reading strategy crosses all content areas. __</p> <p>Students' comprehension of course content/standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the common assessments to ensure the mastery of essential skills.</p> <p><u>Action Steps</u></p> <p>Plan</p> <p><u>Planning/PLCs Before the Lesson</u></p> <p>-PLCs identify the essential skills and learning targets for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs answer the question, "What do we want students to learn?" (EET Rubric 1e, 4d)</p> <p>-PLCs identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs are answering the question, "How do we know if they have learned it?" Specifically, PLCs reflect on the following questions:</p> <p>--Does the assessment match the intended essential learnings and learning targets?(EET Rubric 1f)</p> <p>--How will we explain to students what they are expected to learn in order to demonstrate mastery on the assessment? How will we explain to students the performance standards by which their learning will be evaluated?</p> <p>--How will we involve the student in self-assessment and monitoring?</p> <p>--How will we collect and track end-of-unit assessment data in order to evaluate student growth? (EET Rubric 1f, 4d).</p> <p>-As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers plan for Differentiated Instruction using data from previous assessments to guide student groupings.</p> | <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>-Steven Sims</p> <p>-Teri Madill</p> <p>-Laura Schulte</p> <p>-Team Leaders</p> <p>-Peer and Mentor Evaluators</p> <p>-Individual Teacher</p> <p>—</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.</p> <p>-Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-through.</p> <p>-EET formal evaluations</p> <p>-EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor)</p> <p>-EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor)</p> <p>-EET informal observation(Admin and Peer/Mentor)</p> <p>-School-based informal walk-through form which includes the school's SIP strategies.</p> | <p><u>Teacher Level</u></p> <p>-Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.</p> <p>-Teachers record their students' individual progress, utilizing rubrics and teacher generated assessments.</p> <p><u>PLC Level</u></p> <p>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs discuss the data across all classes.</p> <p>- For each class, PLCs chart their data on data walls to track progress.</p> <p>-After each assessment, PLCs will ask the following questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How are we using data to inform our instruction? 2. What barriers to implementation are we facing and how will we address them? 3. To what degree are we making progress towards our goal? 4. Are there skills that need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class? 5. Are there skills that need to be re-taught as mini-lessons to the entire class? | <p><u>3x per year</u></p> <p>- FAIR</p> <p><u>During the Grading Period</u></p> <p>- Common assessments</p> <p>-FCAT 2.0 Reading forms: Tracked through achievement series.</p> <p>-Weekly FCAT Reading test: Tracked through ie: Easy Grade Pro, gradebooks, teacher preference.)</p> <p>-Pre/post/mid-section and end of the year tests.</p> |
|---|--|---|---|--|

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

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| | <p>Do/Check</p> <p><u>Teachers in the Classroom</u></p> <p>-PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating effective strategies and Differentiated Instruction activities discussed at their PLC meetings.</p> <p>-At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. (EET Rubric 3d)</p> <p>Check/Act</p> <p><u>Teachers/PLCs after the Common Assessment</u></p> <p>-Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. (EET Rubric 3d, 4d)</p> <p>-Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching. (EET Rubric 4a)</p> <p>-Based on the data, teachers discuss Differentiated Instruction strategies that were effective. (EET Rubric 4a, 4d)</p> <p>-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 for the entire class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students. (EET Rubric 1b and 1c)</p> <p>-PLCs discuss Differentiated Instruction strategies for re-teaching of essential skills.</p> <p>-PLCs discuss how the data will be used to Differentiate Instruction during the initial teaching of the upcoming lesson.</p> <p>-After the assessment, teachers provide timely feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning. (EET Rubric 3d)</p> <p><u>Whole Faculty</u></p> <p>-Throughout the school year, teachers participate in faculty SIP Reviews.</p> | | <p>6. Are there skills that need to be re-taught to targeted students?</p> <p>7. How do we report and share our results with the Leadership Team?</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u></p> <p>-Team Leaders share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.</p> <p>-Data will be used to plan for future supplemental instruction.</p> <p>-All teachers will submit a Running Record or DRA2 list of where each student is reading on an instructional level at the end of each marking period. Kindergarten will begin collecting the same data in December.</p> | |
|--|---|--|---|--|

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

| | | | | |
|------|------|------|------|------|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| 2. Students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 or 5) in reading <u>Reading Goal #2:</u> In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 40% to 45%. | | | | |
| | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | |
| | 40% | 45% | | |
| | (166) | (216) | | |

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

| | | | | |
|---|-----------------|--|---|------------------------|
| <p>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</p> | | | | |
| <p>Anticipated Barrier</p> | <p>Strategy</p> | <p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p> | <p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p> | <p>Evaluation Tool</p> |

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

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| <p>2.1.</p> <p>- Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques.</p> <p>- PLC meetings need to focus on identifying and writing higher order questions to deliver during the lessons.</p> | <p>2.1</p> <p><u>Strategy</u></p> <p>This reading strategy crosses all content areas.</p> <p>Students' comprehension of course content/standards increases through participation in higher order thinking questioning techniques to promote critical thinking and problem-solving skills. This strategy will be implemented across all content areas. For this strategy, teachers implement a variety or series of questions/prompts to challenge students cognitively, advance high level thinking and discourse, and promote meta-cognition. (EET Rubric 1e, 3b)</p> <p><u>Action Steps</u></p> <p>Plan</p> <p><u>Teacher PD for General Higher Order</u></p> <p>-Teachers attend professional development activities on higher order questioning strategies and apply those strategies in the classroom.</p> <p>—</p> <p><u>Planning/PLCs Before the Lesson</u></p> <p>-PLCs identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs answer the question “How do we know if they have learned it?” (EET Rubric 1f, 4d)</p> <p>-Within PLCs, teachers discuss how to scaffold questions and activities to meet the differentiated needs of students for upcoming lessons.</p> <p>-Teachers design higher order questions to increase rigor in lesson plans and promote student accountable talk.</p> <p>(EET Rubric 1a, 1b, 1e, 1f, 3b, 4a, 4d)</p> <p>-Within PLCs, teachers plan and write for higher order questions in upcoming lessons. (EET Rubric 1a, 1b, 1c, 1e, 3b, 4d)</p> | <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>-Steven Sims</p> <p>-Teri Madill</p> <p>-Laura Schulte</p> <p>-Team Leaders</p> <p>-Peer and Mentor Evaluators</p> <p>—</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.</p> <p>-Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.</p> <p>-EET formal evaluations</p> <p>-EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor)</p> <p>-EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor)</p> <p>-EET informal observation(Admin and Peer/Mentor)</p> <p>-School-based informal walk-through form which includes the school's SIP strategies.</p> | <p><u>Teacher Level</u></p> <p>-Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.</p> <p>-Teachers record their students' individual progress.</p> <p><u>PLC Level</u></p> <p>-Discuss and share data</p> <p>-Identify effective higher order activities in future lessons.</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u></p> <p>-Leadership Team determines and maintains a school-wide data system to track student progress.</p> <p>-Team leaders share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.</p> <p>-PSLT uses data to evaluate the effectiveness of strategy implementation, supplemental instruction for targeted students and future professional development for teachers.</p> <p>—</p> <p>—</p> | <p><u>3x per year</u></p> <p>- FAIR</p> <p><u>During the Grading Period</u></p> <p>-Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p> <p>-Projects that entail Higher Order Thinking</p> |
|--|--|---|--|--|

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

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| | <p>Do/Check</p> <p><u>Teachers in the Classroom</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -During the lesson, teachers frequently ask higher order questions. The teacher responds to students' correct answers by probing for higher-level understanding in an effective manner. (EET Rubric 1b, 3b, 3e) -During the lesson, teachers successfully engage all students in the discussion. (EET Rubric 1b, 3b, 3e) -Students formulate many of the high-level questions and ensure that all voices are heard. (EET Rubric 3b) -Students are provided with opportunities to reflect on classroom discussion and discourse to increase understanding of learning objective. (EET Rubric 1c, 3a, 3b, 3c) -At the end of the unit, teachers administer the common assessment. <p>Check/Act</p> <p><u>PLCs After the Common Assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teachers bring their common assessment data back to the PLCs. -Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching. (EET Rubric 4a) -Using the data, effective higher order strategies and techniques are identified, discussed, and modeled in order to implement techniques in future lessons. (EET 1c, 1f, 4a, 4d, 4e) _ -After the assessment, teachers provide timely feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning. (EET Rubric 3d) | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | |
|------|--|------|------|------|
| | <p><u>Administrators/Leadership Team</u></p> <p>-The higher order strategy is on the Leadership Team's agenda in order to discuss strategy implementation, concentrating on barriers and how they can be overcome.</p> <p><u>Whole Faculty</u></p> <p>-Throughout the school year, teachers participate in faculty SIP Reviews where teachers showcase higher order thinking effective strategies.</p> | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p>3. Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading</p> <p><u>Reading Goal #3:</u></p> | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|--|-----------------|
| In grades 3-5, the percentage of All Curriculum students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 70% to 73%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | |
| | 70% (188) | 73% (222) | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |

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

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| <p>3.1. -Teachers have varying levels of expertise in using checks for understanding techniques.</p> | <p>3.1. <u>Strategy</u> This reading strategy crosses all content areas. The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' comprehension of course content improves by participation in regular Checks for Understanding during and at the close of the lesson. (EET Rubric 3b and 3e) <u>Action Steps</u> Plan <u>Teacher Planning</u> -PLCs identify the essential skills and learning targets for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs answer the question, "What do we want students to learn?" (EET Rubric 1e, 4d) - With PLCs, teachers plan ways to check for understanding throughout the lesson (not just at the end of the lesson). (EET Rubric 1a, 3b, 4d) -With PLCs teachers plan to incorporate into their lessons specific strategies to check for understanding during and at the close of the lesson such as: --Think-Pair-Share --Think and Write --Exit Tickets <i>(Teach Like a Champion)</i> --Check for Understanding <i>(Teach Like a Champion)</i> (EET Rubric 1a, 3b, 4d) -PLCs identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs are answering the question, "How do we know if they have learned it?" Do/Check</p> | <p><u>Who</u> -Steven Sims -Teri Madill -Laura Schulte -Team Leaders -Peer and Mentor Evaluators - <u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -EET formal evaluations -EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET informal observation(Admin and Peer/Mentor) -School-based informal walk-through form which includes the school's SIP strategies.</p> | <p><u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers record their students' individual progress. <u>PLC Level</u> -Data is used to identify effective higher order activities in future lessons. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> --Leadership Team determines and maintains a school-wide data system to track student progress. -Team Leaders share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -PSLT uses data to evaluate the effectiveness of strategy implementation, supplemental instruction for targeted students and future professional development for teachers.</p> | <p><u>3x per year</u> - FAIR <u>During the Grading Period</u> -Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit) -Projects</p> |
|--|---|---|---|---|

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

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| | <p><u>Teachers in the Classroom.</u></p> <p>-During the lesson, teachers consistently implement checks for understanding strategies effectively. (EET Rubric 3b)</p> <p>-Teachers involve enough students in this technique to get an accurate pulse of the students' understanding in order to adjust instruction if needed. (EET Rubric 3b, 3c, 3d, 3e)</p> <p>-Based on the checks for understanding data, teachers persist in seeking effective approaches for students needing help and draw on a broad/extensive repertoire of strategies such as:</p> <p>--When students have difficulty with the lesson, the teacher probes them for additional information so that the lesson adjustment accurately addresses the problem.</p> <p>--Offering an alternative explanation, approach, style of questioning or student activity.</p> <p>--Implementing a collaborative structure activity.</p> <p>--Significantly modifying the activity.</p> <p>--Changing the pace.</p> <p>--Teachers revealing to students the reasons for making a major lesson change and get their feedback about its success.</p> <p>--If needed, teachers identifying likely content and activity challenges in the original lesson and designing a second lesson that avoids those challenges.</p> <p>(EET Rubric 3e)</p> <p>-At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. (EET Rubric 3d)</p> <p>Check/Act</p> <p><u>Teachers/PLCs after the Common Assessment</u></p> | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| | <p>-Teachers bring their common assessment data to their PLCs.</p> <p>-Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching. (EET Rubric 4a)</p> <p>-In PLCs teachers discuss the outcomes of checking for understanding strategies and techniques during their lessons. (EET Rubric 4a, 4d)</p> <p>-Using the data, effective checking for understanding strategies and techniques are identified, discussed, and modeled in order to implement techniques in future lessons. (EET 1c, 1f, 4a, 4d, 4e)</p> <p>-After the assessment, teachers provide timely feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning. (EET Rubric 3d)</p> <p>—</p> <p><u>Administrators/Leadership Team</u></p> <p>-Checking for understanding strategies and techniques are on the Leadership Team’s agenda in order to discuss strategy implementation, concentrating on barriers and how they can be overcome.</p> <p><u>Whole Faculty</u></p> <p>-Throughout the school year, teachers will participate in faculty SIP Reviews where teachers showcase checking for understanding strategies and techniques.</p> | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

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

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| <p>-Teachers are at varying levels of using Differentiated Instruction strategies.</p> <p>-Teachers tend to give all students the same lesson, handouts, etc.</p> | <p>3.2</p> <p>Strategy:</p> <p>This reading strategy crosses all content areas.</p> <p>The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' comprehension of course content improves by participation in consistent, effective and appropriate Differentiated Instruction strategies. Differentiated Instruction is based on: acceleration, enrichment, extensions and remediation.</p> <p>Action Steps</p> <p>Plan</p> <p><u>Teacher Planning</u></p> <p>-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.</p> <p>Do I give my students:</p> <p>--Different ways to take in information</p> <p>--Different amounts of time to complete the work</p> <p>--Different assignments depending on ability, readiness, comprehension level, learning preferences/styles, and interests.</p> <p>--Different types of assessments</p> <p>For all students, do I:</p> <p>--Use data to drive instruction before beginning a unit of study, during the unit of study and at the end of unit of study.</p> | <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>-Steven Sims</p> <p>-Teri Madill</p> <p>-Laura Schulte</p> <p>-Team Leaders</p> <p>-Peer and Mentor Evaluators</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.</p> <p>-Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.</p> <p>-EET formal evaluations</p> <p>-EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor)</p> <p>-EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor)</p> <p>-EET informal observation (Admin and Peer/Mentor)</p> <p>-School-based informal walk-through form which includes the school's SIP strategies.</p> | <p><u>Teacher Level</u></p> <p>-Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.</p> <p>-Teachers record their students' individual progress.</p> <p><u>PLC Level</u></p> <p>-Data is used to identify effective higher order activities in future lessons.</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u></p> <p>--Leadership Team determines and maintains a school-wide data system to track student progress.</p> <p>-Team Leaders share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.</p> <p>-PSLT uses data to evaluate the effectiveness of strategy implementation, supplemental instruction for targeted students and future professional development for teachers.</p> | <p><u>3x per year</u></p> <p>- FAIR</p> <p><u>During the Grading Period</u></p> <p>-Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p> <p>-Projects</p> |
|---|---|---|--|--|

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

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>--Create a variety of activities and tasks that allows students to explore concepts and standards in different ways.</p> <p>--Give students choices in some of their learning activities.</p> <p>For High Performing, Gifted, Honors and Advanced Students, do I:</p> <p>--Make modifications to ensure students are challenged with higher-level thinking activities.</p> <p>--Use curriculum compacting, independent study, and extension activities where appropriate</p> <p>For Lower Ability and Students with Learning Difficulties:</p> <p>--Assess specific skills and knowledge that need remediation and utilize a variety of strategies to help students in these areas.</p> <p>For English Language Learners:</p> <p>--Use gestures, visuals and graphic organizers when explaining concepts</p> <p>--Specifically pinpoint and teach the academic language these students need to learn in order to complete a task.</p> <p>--Recognize cultural/experiential differences, and when feasible includes these in units and examples.</p> <p>(EET Rubric 4d, 4e)</p> <p>--Teachers use student data (formative assessments, common assessments, daily work, etc.), student interests, and student learning styles to plan appropriate Differentiated Instruction lessons that meet the individual needs of all students in the classroom. (EET Rubric 1b)</p> <p>--PLCs identify the essential skills and learning targets for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs answer the question, "What do we want students to learn?" (EET Rubric 1e, 4d)</p> <p>--PLCs identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs are answering the question, "How do we know if they have learned it?"</p> | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| | <p>Do/Check</p> <p><u>Teachers in the Classroom</u></p> <p>-Teachers implement lessons using Differentiated Instruction activities. (EET Rubric 3c)</p> <p>-At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. (EET Rubric 3d)</p> <p>Check/Act</p> <p><u>Teachers/PLCs after the Common Assessment</u></p> <p>-Teachers bring their common assessment data to their PLCs.</p> <p>-Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching. (EET Rubric 4a)</p> <p>-PLCs teachers discuss the outcomes of their DI lessons and share the effectiveness of their lessons.</p> <p>-After the assessment, teachers provide timely feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning. (EET Rubric 3d)</p> <p>-Using the data, effective Differentiated Instruction strategies and techniques are identified, discussed, and modeled in order to implement techniques in future lessons. (EET 1c, 1f, 4a, 4d, 4e) __</p> <p>-Based on the data, teachers plan future Differentiated Instruction lessons (either as a whole lesson or mini lesson) to the whole class or targeted students.</p> <p>—</p> <p><u>Administrators/Leadership Team</u></p> <p>- Differentiated Instruction strategies and techniques are on the Leadership Team’s agenda in order to discuss strategy implementation, concentrating on barriers and how they can be overcome.</p> | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | <u>Whole Faculty</u> -Throughout the school year, teachers will participate in faculty SIP Reviews where teachers showcase gradual release strategies and techniques. | | | |
| | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|-----------------|
| 4. Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading | | | | |
| <u>Reading Goal #4:</u> In grades 3-5, the percentage of All Curriculum students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 65% to 68%. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | |
| | 65% (43) | 68% (51) | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |

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

| | | | | |
|------|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|
| 4.1. | 4.1. See goals 1 and 2 | 4.1. | 4.1. | 4.1. |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. |
| 4.3. | 4.3. | 4.3. | 4.3. | 4.3. |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>5A. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading</p> <p><u>Reading Goal #5A:</u></p> <p>Reading Goal #5A: Ethnicity (White,</p> | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|------------------|
| Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) | | | | |
| In grades 3-5, 86% of the Black and Hispanic All Curriculum student subgroups will score a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 10%. (Safe Harbor Targets: Black-69% and Hispanic-78%) | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | |
| | White: Black:66% (48) Hispanic:75% (93) Asian: American Indian: | White: Black:69% (50) Hispanic:78% (97) Asian: American Indian: | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? Nine Week Check What is the level of strategy implementation? What do you plan to do with the data | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? Nine Week Check What is the level of strategy effectiveness? What do you plan to do with the data? | Evaluation Tools |

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

| | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 5A.2. | 5A.2. | 5A.2. | 5A.2. | 5A.2. |
| 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. |
| 5B. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading <u>Reading Goal #5B:</u> Reading Goal #5B: Economically Disadvantaged | | | | |

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

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|-------------------------|
| <p>In grades 3-5, 86% Economically Disadvantaged All Curriculum students will score a Level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT Math or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 10%. (Safe Harbor Target-69%)</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | |
| | <p style="text-align: center;">65% (107)</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">69% (113)</p> | | |
| <p>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</p> | | | | |
| <p>Anticipated Barrier</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Strategy</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Fidelity Check</p> <p>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Nine Week Check</p> <p>What is the level of strategy implementation? What do you plan to do with the data</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Strategy Data Check</p> <p>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Nine Week Check</p> <p>What is the level of strategy effectiveness? What do you plan to do with the data?</p> | <p>Evaluation Tools</p> |
| <p>5B.1.</p> | <p>5B.1.</p> | <p>5B.1.</p> | <p>5B.1.</p> | <p>5B.1.</p> |

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

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|-------|-------|
| | | | | |
| 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. |
| 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. |
| 5C. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading <u>Reading Goal #5C:</u> Reading Goal #5C: English Language Learners (ELL) | | | | |
| N/A | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | |
| | () | () | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |

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

| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? Nine Week Check What is the level of strategy implementation? What do you plan to do with the data | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? Nine Week Check What is the level of strategy effectiveness? What do you plan to do with the data? | Evaluation Tools |
|--|----------|--|---|------------------|
| 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. |
| 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. |
| 5D. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading <u>Reading Goal #5D:</u> Reading Goal #5D: Students with Disabilities (SWD) | | | | |

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

| | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|--|------------------|
| N/A | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | |
| | () | () | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | <p>Fidelity Check</p> <p>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p> <p>Nine Week Check</p> <p>What is the level of strategy implementation? What do you plan to do with the data</p> | <p>Strategy Data Check</p> <p>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p> <p>Nine Week Check</p> <p>What is the level of strategy effectiveness? What do you plan to do with the data?</p> | Evaluation Tools |
| 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. |
| 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. |

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

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|---|--|------------------------------------|---|
| Student Engagement | K-5 | -PLC | School-wide | | Classroom walk-throughs | Administration Team |
| | | -Reading Coach | | -PLCs: On-going *Each grade level meets bi-weekly. | Optional peer teacher observations | Reading Coach |
| Higher Order Thinking | K-5 | -PLC | School-wide | -PLCs: On-going | Classroom walk-throughs | Administration Team |
| | | -Reading Coach | | *Each grade level meets bi-weekly. | Optional peer teacher observations | Reading Coach |

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|---|-------------|---|---|---|
| Differentiated Instruction | K-5 | -PLC -Reading Coach | School-wide | -PLCs: On-going *Each grade level meets bi-weekly. | Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations | Administration Team Reading Coach |
| Checks for understanding | K-5 | -PLC -Reading Coach | School-wide | -PL*Each grade level meets bi-weekly. Cs: On-going | Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations | Administration Team Reading Coach |
| PLC Training for faculty | K-5 | Administration Team - Shannon Bogle | School-wide | August/2012 | PLC monitoring Team Feedback Form turn ins | Administration Team Team Leaders |
| Progress Monitoring/ CBM Training for faculty | K-5 | Administration Team -Mchenry Lerebours | School-wide | -August/2012 On-going | PLC monitoring MTSS data gathering instruments | Administration Team PSLT Team Leaders |
| Using mini-lessons to re-teach and reinforce essential skills in the core curriculum | K-5 | -PLC -Reading Coach | School-wide | PLCs: On-going *Each grade level meets bi-weekly. | Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations | Administration Team Reading Coach |
| Faculty trainings on strategies to enhance the BL and AL Readers | K-5 | Faculty members | School-wide | September 25 On-going | Classroom walk-throughs | Administration Team Reading Coach |

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |

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

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------|---|--------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| ELP: Extended Learning Program | Highly Qualified Teachers | Hillsborough County Public Schools: Division of Curriculum and Instruction | |
| | Classroom Materials | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: \$ | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: \$ | | | |
| Total: \$ | | | |

End of Reading Goals

—

Mathematics Goals

Goal 1 – Elementary using FCAT Math Data

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1. Students achieving proficiency (Level | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| <p>3 or above) in mathematics</p> <p><u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1:</p> | | | | |
| <p>In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 70% to 75%.</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | |
| | <p style="text-align: center;">70% (289)</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">75% (361)</p> | | |
| <p>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</p> | | | | |
| <p>Anticipated Barrier</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Strategy</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Evaluation Tool</p> |

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

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| <p>- Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students).</p> | <p>1.1 <u>Strategy</u> The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the math core curriculum. Students' comprehension of course content/standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Teachers will provide Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the common assessments to ensure the mastery of essential skills.</p> <p>—</p> <p><u>Action Steps</u></p> <p>Plan</p> <p><u>Planning/PLCs Before the Lesson</u></p> <p>-PLCs identify the essential skills and learning targets for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs answer the question, "What do we want students to learn?" (EET Rubric 1e, 4d)</p> <p>-PLCs identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs are answering the question, "How do we know if they have learned it?" Specifically, PLCs reflect on the following questions:</p> <p>--Does the assessment match the intended essential learnings and learning targets?(EET Rubric 1f)</p> <p>--Are we going to use an assessment from our adopted content materials? Will we use all the questions? Will we drop some of the questions? Do we need to add additional questions?</p> <p>--If using a rubric, have we come to consensus what each level of the rubric looks like?</p> <p>--How will we explain to students what they are expected to learn in order to demonstrate mastery on the assessment? How will we explain to students the performance standards by which their learning will be evaluated?</p> <p>--How will we involve the student in self-assessment and monitoring?</p> <p>--How will we collect and track end-of-unit assessment data in order to evaluate student growth? (EET Rubric 1f, 4d).</p> | <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>-Steven Sims</p> <p>-Teri Madill</p> <p>-Team Leaders</p> <p>—</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.</p> <p>-Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.</p> <p>-EET formal evaluations</p> <p>-EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor)</p> <p>-EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor)</p> <p>-EET informal observation(Admin and Peer/Mentor)</p> <p>-School-based informal walk-through form which includes the school's SIP strategies.</p> | <p><u>Teacher Level</u></p> <p>-Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.</p> <p>-Teachers record their students' individual progress.</p> <p>—</p> <p><u>PLC Level</u></p> <p>-After each assessment, PLCs will ask the following questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How are we using data to inform our instruction? 2. What barriers to implementation are we facing and how will we address them? 3. To what degree are we making progress towards our goal? 4. Are there skills that need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class? 5. Are there skills that need to be re-taught as mini-lessons to the entire class? 6. Are there skills that need to be re-taught to targeted students? 7. How do we report and share our results with the Leadership Team? | <p><u>2x per year</u></p> <p>District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing</p> <p><u>During the Grading Period</u></p> <p>- Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p> |
|--|---|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>-As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers plan for Differentiated Instruction using data from previous assessments to guide student groupings.</p> <p>Do/Check</p> <p><u>Teachers in the Classroom</u></p> <p>-PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating effective strategies and Differentiated Instruction activities discussed at their PLC meetings.</p> <p>-At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. (EET Rubric 3d)</p> <p>Check/Act</p> <p><u>Teachers/PLCs after the Common Assessment</u></p> <p>-Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. (EET Rubric 3d, 4d)</p> <p>-Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching. (EET Rubric 4a)</p> <p>-Based on the data, teachers discuss Differentiated Instruction strategies that were effective. (EET Rubric 4a, 4d)</p> <p>-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 for the entire class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students. (EET Rubric 1b and 1c)</p> <p>-PLCs discuss Differentiated Instruction strategies for re-teaching of essential skills.</p> <p>-PLCs discuss how the data will be used to Differentiate Instruction during the initial teaching of the upcoming lesson.</p> <p>-After the assessment, teachers provide timely feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning. (EET Rubric 3d)</p> | | <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u></p> <p>-Data will be used to plan for future supplemental instruction.</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | <p><u>Whole Faculty</u></p> <p>-Throughout the school year, teachers participate in faculty SIP Reviews.</p> | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Goal 2 – Elementary using FCAT Math Data

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| <p>2. Students achieving above proficiency (Levels 4 or 5) in mathematics</p> <p><u>Mathematics Goal #2:</u></p> | | | | |
| <p>In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 46% to 51%.</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | |

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

| | | | | |
|--|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| | 46% | 51% | | |
| | (123) | (155) | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |

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

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| <p>2.1.</p> <p>- Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques.</p> <p>- PLC meetings need to focus on identifying and writing higher order questions to deliver during the lessons.</p> | <p>2.1</p> <p><u>Strategy</u></p> <p>The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the math core curriculum. Students' comprehension of course content/standards increase through participation in higher order thinking questioning techniques to promote critical thinking and problem-solving skills. This strategy will be implemented across all content areas. For this strategy, teachers implement a variety or series of questions/prompts to challenge students cognitively, advance high level thinking and discourse, and promote meta-cognition. (EET Rubric 1e, 3b)</p> <p><u>Action Steps</u></p> <p>Plan</p> <p><u>Teacher PD for General Higher Order</u></p> <p>-Teachers attend professional development activities on higher order questioning strategies and apply those strategies in the classroom.</p> <p>—</p> <p><u>Planning/PLCs Before the Lesson</u></p> <p>-PLCs identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs answer the question “How do we know if they have learned it?” (EET Rubric 1f, 4d)</p> <p>-Within PLCs, teachers discuss how to scaffold questions and activities to meet the differentiated needs of students for upcoming lessons.</p> <p>-Teachers design higher order questions to increase rigor in lesson plans and promote student accountable talk.</p> <p>(EET Rubric 1a, 1b, 1e, 1f, 3b, 4a, 4d)</p> <p>-Within PLCs, teachers plan and write for higher order questions in upcoming lessons. (EET Rubric 1a, 1b, 1c, 1e, 3b, 4d)</p> <p>Do/Check</p> | <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>-Steven Sims</p> <p>-Teri Madill</p> <p>-Team Leaders</p> <p>-Peer and Mentor Evaluators__</p> <p>—</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.</p> <p>-Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.</p> <p>-EET formal evaluations</p> <p>-EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor)</p> <p>-EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor)</p> <p>-EET informal observation(Admin and Peer/Mentor)</p> <p>-School-based informal walk-through form which includes the school's SIP strategies.</p> | <p><u>Teacher Level</u></p> <p>-Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.</p> <p>-Teachers record their students' individual progress towards mastery.</p> <p><u>PLC Level</u></p> <p>-Data is used to identify effective activities in future lessons.</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u></p> <p>-Leadership Team determines and maintains a school-wide data system to track student progress.</p> <p>-Team Leader shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.</p> <p>-PSLT uses data to evaluate the effectiveness of strategy implementation, supplemental instruction for targeted students and future professional development for teachers.</p> | <p><u>2x per year</u></p> <p>District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing</p> <p><u>During the Grading Period</u></p> <p>- Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p> |
|--|---|---|--|--|

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

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | <p><u>Teachers in the Classroom</u></p> <p>-During the lesson, teachers frequently ask higher order questions. The teacher responds to students' correct answers by probing for higher-level understanding in an effective manner. (EET Rubric 1b, 3b, 3e)</p> <p>-During the lesson, teachers successfully engage all students in the discussion. (EET Rubric 1b, 3b, 3e)</p> <p>-Students formulate many of the high-level questions and ensure that all voices are heard. (EET Rubric 3b)</p> <p>-Students are provided with opportunities to reflect on classroom discussion and discourse to increase understanding of learning objective. (EET Rubric 1c, 3a, 3b, 3c)</p> <p>-At the end of the unit, teachers administer the common assessment.</p> <p>Check/Act</p> <p><u>PLCs After the Common Assessment</u></p> <p>-Teachers bring their common assessment data back to the PLCs.</p> <p>-Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching. (EET Rubric 4a)</p> <p>-Using the data, effective higher order strategies and techniques are identified, discussed, and modeled in order to implement techniques in future lessons. (EET 1c, 1f, 4a, 4d, 4e) __</p> <p>-After the assessment, teachers provide timely feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning. (EET Rubric 3d)</p> <hr/> <p><u>Administrators/Leadership Team</u></p> <p>-Team Leaders address higher order thinking questioning techniques, allowing teachers to share successes and challenges.</p> | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | |
|------|---|------|------|------|
| | <u>Whole Faculty</u> -Throughout the school year, teachers participate in faculty SIP Reviews. | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |

Goal 3 – Elementary using FCAT Math Data

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| 3. Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics | | | | |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #3:</u> | | | | |
| In grades 3-5, the percentage of All Curriculum students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 67% to 70%. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | |

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

| | | | | |
|--|--------------|---|--|-----------------|
| | 67% (180) | 70% (213) | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |

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

| 3.1. | 3.1. | <u>Who</u> | <u>Teacher Level</u> | <u>2x per year</u> |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| <p>-Teachers at varying levels of expertise in using checks for understanding techniques.</p> | <p><u>Strategy</u></p> <p>The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the math core curriculum. Students' comprehension of course content improves by participation in regular Checks for Understanding during and at the close of the lesson. (EET Rubric 3b and 3e)</p> | <p>-Steven Sims -Teri Madill -Team Leaders</p> | <p>-Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.</p> | <p>District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing</p> |
| | <p><u>Action Steps</u></p> | | <p>-Teachers record their students' individual progress towards mastery.</p> | <p><u>During the Grading Period</u></p> |
| | <p>Plan</p> | | | <p>- Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p> |
| | <p><u>Teacher Planning</u></p> | <p><u>How</u></p> | <p><u>PLC Level</u></p> | |
| | <p>-PLCs identify the essential skills and learning targets for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs answer the question, "What do we want students to learn?" (EET Rubric 1e, 4d)</p> | <p>-PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.</p> <p>-Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.</p> | <p>-Data is used to identify effective activities in future lessons.</p> | |
| | <p>- With PLCs, teachers plan ways to check for understanding throughout the lesson (not just at the end of the lesson). (EET Rubric 1a, 3b, 4d)</p> | <p>-EET formal evaluations</p> | <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u></p> | |
| | <p>-With PLCs teachers plan to incorporate into their lessons specific strategies to check for understanding during and at the close of the lesson such as:</p> | <p>-EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor)</p> | <p>-Leadership Team determines and maintains a school-wide data system to track student progress.</p> | |
| | <p>--Think-Pair-Share</p> | <p>-EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor)</p> | <p>-Team Leader shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.</p> | |
| | <p>--Think and Write</p> | <p>-EET informal observation(Admin and Peer/Mentor)</p> | | |
| | <p>--Exit Tickets (<i>Teach Like a Champion</i>)</p> | <p>-School-based informal walk-through form which includes the school's SIP strategies.</p> | <p>-PSLT uses data to evaluate the effectiveness of strategy implementation, supplemental instruction for targeted students and future professional development for teachers.</p> | |
| | <p>--Check for Understanding (<i>Teach Like a Champion</i>)</p> <p>(EET Rubric 1a, 3b, 4d)</p> | | | |
| | <p>-PLCs identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs are answering the question, "How do we know if they have learned it?"</p> | | | |
| | <p>Do/Check</p> | | | |

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

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| | <p><u>Teachers in the Classroom.</u></p> <p>-During the lesson, teachers consistently implement checks for understanding strategies effectively. (EET Rubric 3b)</p> <p>-Teachers involve enough students in this technique to get an accurate pulse of the students' understanding in order to adjust instruction if needed. (EET Rubric 3b, 3c, 3d, 3e)</p> <p>-Based on the checks for understanding data, teachers persist in seeking effective approaches for students needing help and draw on a broad/extensive repertoire of strategies such as:</p> <p>--When students have difficulty with the lesson, the teacher probes them for additional information so that the lesson adjustment accurately addresses the problem.</p> <p>--Offering an alternative explanation, approach, style of questioning or student activity.</p> <p>--Implementing a collaborative structure activity.</p> <p>--Significantly modifying the activity.</p> <p>--Changing the pace.</p> <p>--Teachers revealing to students the reasons for making a major lesson change and get their feedback about its success.</p> <p>--If needed, teachers identifying likely content and activity challenges in the original lesson and designing a second lesson that avoids those challenges.</p> <p>(EET Rubric 3e)</p> <p>-At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. (EET Rubric 3d)</p> <p>Check/Act</p> <p><u>Teachers/PLCs after the Common Assessment</u></p> | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>-Teachers bring their common assessment data to their PLCs.</p> <p>-Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching. (EET Rubric 4a)</p> <p>-In PLCs teachers discuss the outcomes of checking for understanding strategies and techniques during their lessons. (EET Rubric 4a, 4d)</p> <p>-Using the data, effective checking for understanding strategies and techniques are identified, discussed, and modeled in order to implement techniques in future lessons. (EET 1c, 1f, 4a, 4d, 4e)</p> <p>-After the assessment, teachers provide timely feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning. (EET Rubric 3d)</p> <p>—</p> <p><u>Administrators/Leadership Team</u></p> <p>-Checking for understanding strategies and techniques are discussed on the Leadership Team’s agenda in order to improvise strategy implementation, concentrating on barriers and how they can be overcome.</p> <p><u>Whole Faculty</u></p> <p>-Throughout the school year, teachers will participate in faculty SIP Reviews.</p> | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Goal 4 – Elementary using FCAT Math Data

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p>4. Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics</p> <p><u>Mathematics Goal</u></p> | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|-----------------|
| #4: | | | | |
| In grades 3-5, the percentage of All Curriculum students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 62% to 65%. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | |
| | 62% | 65% | | |
| | (41) | (49) | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |

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

Goal 5 – Elementary using FCAT Math Data

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>5A. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics</p> <p><u>Mathematics Goal #5A: Mathematics Goal #5A:</u> Ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian)</p> | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p>In grades 3-5, 86% of the Black and Hispanic All Curriculum student subgroups will score a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 10%. (Growth Model Targets: Hispanic –86%) (Safe Harbor Targets: Black – 73%)</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | |
| | <p>White: Black:70% Hispanic:77% Asian: American Indian:</p> | <p>White: Black:73% Hispanic:86% Asian: American Indian:</p> | | |
| <p>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</p> | | | | |

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

| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| 5A.1. | 5A.1. See goals 1, 2, and 3. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 5A.2. | 5A.2. | 5A.2. | 5A.2. | 5A.2. |
| 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. |
| <p>5B. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics</p> <p><u>Mathematics Goal #5B: Mathematics Goal #5B: Economically Disadvantaged</u></p> | | | | |

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

| <p>In grades 3-5, 86% Economically Disadvantaged All Curriculum students will score a Level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT Math or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 10%. (Safe Harbor Target-70%)</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | |
|--|---|--|--|------------------------|
| | <p>67%</p> <p>(110)</p> | <p>70%</p> <p>(115)</p> | | |
| <p>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</p> | | | | |
| <p>Anticipated Barrier</p> | <p>Strategy</p> | <p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p> | <p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p> | <p>Evaluation Tool</p> |

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

| | | | | |
|-------|------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. |
| | See goals 1, 2, and 3. | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. |
| 5B.3 | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. |

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

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|------------------------|
| <p>5C. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics</p> <p><u>Mathematics Goal #5C: Mathematics Goal #5C: English Language Learners (ELL)</u></p> | | | | |
| <p>N/A</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | |
| | <p>()</p> | <p>()</p> | | |
| <p>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</p> | | | | |
| <p>Anticipated Barrier</p> | <p>Strategy</p> | <p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p> | <p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p> | <p>Evaluation Tool</p> |

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

| | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. |
| 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. |
| <p>5D. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics</p> <p><u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5D: Mathematics Goal #5D: Students with Disabilities (SWD)</p> | | | | |

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

| | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| N/A | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | |
| | () | () | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |

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

| | | | | |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. |
| 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. |

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

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|-------------------------|--|---|--|---|---|
| Student Engagement | K-5 | -PLC | School-wide | -PLCs: On-going | Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations | Administration Team |
| Higher Order Thinking | K-5 | -PLC | School-wide | -PLCs: On-going | Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations | Administration Team |
| Differentiated Instruction | K-5 | -PLC | School-wide | -PLCs: On-going | Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations | Administration Team |
| Checks for understanding | K-5 | -PLC | School-wide | -PLCs: On-going | Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations | Administration Team |

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|-------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---|
| Using mini-lessons to re-teach and reinforcement essential skills in the core curriculum | K-5 | -PLC | School-wide | -PLCs: On-going | Administration Team | Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations |
| Technology and hands-on activities | K-5 | -PLC | School-wide | -PLCs: On-going | Administration Team | Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations |
| Faculty Trainings on New Generation Math | K-5 | Various faculty members | School-wide | September 26/On-going | Administration Team | Classroom walk-throughs |

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| ELP: Extended Learning Program | Highly Qualified Teachers Classroom Materials | Hillsborough County Public Schools: Division of Curriculum and Instruction | *Full budget was listed under reading. ELP at our school consists of reading, writing, and math. |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |

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

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Total: | | | |

End of Mathematics Goals

—

Science Goals

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

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| 1. Students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3 or above) in science | | | | |
| <u>Science Goal #1:</u> | | | | |

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

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|------------------------|
| <p>In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 66% to 68%.</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | |
| | <p>66%</p> <p>(101)</p> | <p>68%</p> <p>(98)</p> | | |
| <p>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</p> | | | | |
| <p>Anticipated Barrier</p> | <p>Strategy</p> | <p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p> | <p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p> | <p>Evaluation Tool</p> |

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

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| <p>-Not all teachers of the same course give the same common assessment at the end of the instructional cycle.</p> <p>- Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students).</p> | <p>I.1</p> <p><u>Strategy</u></p> <p>The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the science core curriculum. Students' comprehension of course content/standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the common assessments to ensure the mastery of essential skills.</p> <p>—</p> <p><u>Action Steps</u></p> <p>Plan</p> <p><u>Planning/PLCs Before the Lesson</u></p> <p>-PLCs identify the essential skills and learning targets for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs answer the question, "What do we want students to learn?" (EET Rubric 1e, 4d)</p> <p>-PLCs identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs are answering the question, "How do we know if they have learned it?" Specifically, PLCs reflect on the following questions:</p> <p>--Does the assessment match the intended essential learnings and learning targets?(EET Rubric 1f)</p> <p>--Are we going to use an assessment from our adopted content materials? Will we use all the questions? Will we drop some of the questions? Do we need to add additional questions?</p> <p>--If using a rubric, have we come to consensus what each level of the rubric looks like?</p> <p>--How will we explain to students what they are expected to learn in order to demonstrate mastery on the assessment? How will we explain to students the performance standards by which their learning will be evaluated?</p> <p>--How will we involve the student in self-assessment and monitoring?</p> <p>--How will we collect and track end-of-unit assessment data in order to evaluate student growth? (EET Rubric 1f, 4d).</p> | <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>-Steven Sims</p> <p>-Teri Madill</p> <p>-Team Leaders</p> <p>-Peer and Mentor Evaluators</p> <p>—</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.</p> <p>-Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.</p> <p>-EET formal evaluations</p> <p>-EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor)</p> <p>-EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor)</p> <p>-EET informal observation(Admin and Peer/Mentor)</p> <p>-School-based informal walk-through form which includes the school's SIP strategies.</p> | <p><u>Teacher Level</u></p> <p>-Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.</p> <p>-Teachers record their students' individual progress towards their goal.</p> <p><u>PLC Level</u></p> <p>- For each class, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the goals.</p> <p>-After each assessment, PLCs will ask the following questions:</p> <p>1. How are we using data to inform our instruction?</p> <p>2. What barriers to implementation are we facing and how will we address them?</p> <p>3. To what degree are we making progress towards our goal?</p> <p>4. Are there skills that need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class?</p> <p>5. Are there skills that need to be re-taught as mini-lessons to the entire class?</p> | <p><u>2x per year</u></p> <p>District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing</p> <p><u>During the Grading Period</u></p> <p>- Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p> |
|---|---|---|---|--|

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

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | <p>-As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers plan for Differentiated Instruction using data from previous assessments to guide student groupings.</p> <p>Do/Check</p> <p><u>Teachers in the Classroom</u></p> <p>-PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating effective strategies and Differentiated Instruction activities discussed at their PLC meetings.</p> <p>-At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. (EET Rubric 3d)</p> <p>Check/Act</p> <p><u>Teachers/PLCs after the Common Assessment</u></p> <p>-Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. (EET Rubric 3d, 4d)</p> <p>-Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching. (EET Rubric 4a)</p> <p>-Based on the data, teachers discuss Differentiated Instruction strategies that were effective. (EET Rubric 4a, 4d)</p> <p>-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 for the entire class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students. (EET Rubric 1b and 1c)</p> <p>-PLCs discuss Differentiated Instruction strategies for re-teaching of essential skills.</p> <p>-PLCs discuss how the data will be used to Differentiate Instruction during the initial teaching of the upcoming lesson.</p> <p>-After the assessment, teachers provide timely feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning. (EET Rubric 3d)</p> | | <p>6. Are there skills that need to re-taught to targeted students?</p> <p>7. How do we report and share our results with the Leadership Team?</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u></p> <p>-Team Leaders share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.</p> <p>-Data will be used to plan for future supplemental instruction.</p> | |
|--|--|--|---|--|

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

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|------|------|
| | <p><u>Whole Faculty</u></p> <p>-Throughout the school year, teachers participate in faculty SIP Reviews.</p> | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| <p>2. Students achieving above proficiency</p> <p>(FCAT Levels 4 or 5) in science</p> <p><u>Science Goal #2:</u></p> | | | | |
| <p>In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 23% to 25%.</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | |

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

| | | | | |
|--|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| | 23% | 25% | | |
| | (35) | (36) | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |

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

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| <p>2.1.</p> <p>- Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques.</p> <p>- PLC meetings need to focus on identifying and writing higher order questions to deliver during the lessons.</p> | <p>2.1</p> <p><u>Strategy</u></p> <p>The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the math core curriculum. Students' comprehension of course content/standards increases through participation in higher order thinking questioning techniques to promote critical thinking and problem-solving skills. This strategy will be implemented across all content areas. For this strategy, teachers implement a variety of questions/prompts to challenge students cognitively, advance high level thinking and discourse, and promote meta-cognition. (EET Rubric 1e, 3b)</p> <p><u>Action Steps</u></p> <p>Plan</p> <p><u>Teacher PD for General Higher Order</u></p> <p>-Teachers attend school-based professional development activities on higher order questioning strategies and apply those strategies in the classroom.</p> <p><u>Planning/PLCs Before the Lesson</u></p> <p>-PLCs identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs answer the question "How do we know if they have learned it?" (EET Rubric 1f, 4d)</p> <p>-Within PLCs, teachers discuss how to scaffold questions and activities to meet the differentiated needs of students for upcoming lessons.</p> <p>-Teachers design higher order questions to increase rigor in lesson plans and promote student accountable talk.</p> <p>(EET Rubric 1a, 1b, 1e, 1f, 3b, 4a, 4d)</p> <p>-Within PLCs, teachers plan and write for higher order questions in upcoming lessons. (EET Rubric 1a, 1b, 1c, 1e, 3b, 4d)</p> <p>Do/Check</p> | <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>-Steven Sims</p> <p>-Teri Madill</p> <p>-Team Leaders</p> <p>-Peer and Mentor Evaluators</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.</p> <p>-Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.</p> <p>-EET formal evaluations</p> <p>-EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor)</p> <p>-EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor)</p> <p>-EET informal observation(Admin and Peer/Mentor)</p> <p>-School-based informal walk-through form which includes the school's SIP strategies.</p> | <p><u>Teacher Level</u></p> <p>-Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.</p> <p>-Teachers record their students' individual progress towards mastery.</p> <p><u>PLC Level</u></p> <p>-Data is used to identify effective activities in future lessons.</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u></p> <p>-Team Leaders determine what specific data will be reported to the Leadership Team.</p> <p>-Leadership Team determines and maintains a school-wide data system to track student progress.</p> | <p><u>2x per year</u></p> <p>District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing</p> <p><u>During the Grading Period</u></p> <p>- Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p> |
|--|---|--|---|--|

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

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| | <p><u>Teachers in the Classroom</u></p> <p>-During the lesson, teachers frequently ask higher order questions. The teacher responds to students' correct answers by probing for higher-level understanding in an effective manner. (EET Rubric 1b, 3b, 3e)</p> <p>-During the lesson, teachers successfully engage all students in the discussion. (EET Rubric 1b, 3b, 3e)</p> <p>-Students formulate many of the high-level questions and ensure that all voices are heard. (EET Rubric 3b)</p> <p>-Students are provided with opportunities to reflect on classroom discussion and discourse to increase understanding of learning objective. (EET Rubric 1c, 3a, 3b, 3c)</p> <p>-At the end of the unit, teachers administer the common assessment.</p> <p>Check/Act</p> <p><u>PLCs After the Common Assessment</u></p> <p>-Teachers bring their common assessment data back to the PLCs.</p> <p>-Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching. (EET Rubric 4a)</p> <p>-Using the data, effective higher order strategies and techniques are identified, discussed, and modeled in order to implement techniques in future lessons. (EET 1c, 1f, 4a, 4d, 4e) __</p> <p>-After the assessment, teachers provide timely feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning. (EET Rubric 3d)</p> <p>—</p> <p><u>Administrators/Leadership Team</u></p> <p>-Team Leaders put higher order thinking questioning techniques questions on every agenda, allowing teachers to share successes and challenges.</p> | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | |
|------|---|------|------|------|
| | -The higher order strategy is on the Leadership Team’s agenda in order to discuss strategy implementation, concentrating on barriers and how they can be overcome. <u>Whole Faculty</u> -Throughout the school year, teachers participate in faculty SIP Reviews. | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |

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

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

Hillsborough version 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 |
|---|-------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|
| Identification of common assessments | K-5 | PLC | School-wide | PLCs: On-going | Classroom walk-throughs | Administration Team |
| Student Engagement | K-5 | PLC | School-wide | PLCs: On-going | Optional peer teacher observations Classroom walk-throughs | Administration Team |
| Higher Order Thinking | K-5 | PLC | School-wide | PLCs: On-going | Optional peer teacher observations Classroom walk-throughs | Administration Team |
| Differentiated Instruction | K-5 | PLC | School-wide | PLCs: On-going | Optional peer teacher observations Classroom walk-throughs | Administration Team |
| Lab, technology and hands-on activities | K-5 | PLC | School-wide | PLCs: On-going | Optional peer teacher observations Classroom walk-throughs | Administration Team |
| Faculty Training on What A Successful Science Classroom Should Look Like | K-5 | Various faculty members | School-wide | August 2012 | Optional peer teacher observations Classroom walk-throughs | Administration Team |

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |

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

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Total: | | | |

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| 1. Students achieving AYP Proficiency (FCAT Level 3.0 or higher) in writing <u>Writing Goal #1:</u> Not required if school scores 90% or higher 3.0 | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|---|------------------|
| Not required | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | |
| | 91% (113) | 94% (151) | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? Nine Week Check What is the level of strategy implementation? What do you plan to do with the data | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? Nine Week Check What is the level of strategy effectiveness? What do you plan to do with the data? | Evaluation Tools |
| I.1. | I.1. | I.1. | I.1. | I.1. |

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

| | | | | |
|------|------|------|------|------|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| <p>2. Students achieving Adequate Yearly Progress (FCAT Level 4.0 or higher) in writing <u>Writing Goal #2:</u></p> | | | | |
| <p>Not Required</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | |
| | <p>45% (63)</p> | <p>50% (80)</p> | | |

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

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|--|----------|--|---|------------------|
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | <p style="text-align: center;">Fidelity Check</p> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? <p style="text-align: center;">Nine Week Check</p> What is the level of strategy implementation? What do you plan to do with the data | <p style="text-align: center;">Strategy Data Check</p> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? <p style="text-align: center;">Nine Week Check</p> What is the level of strategy effectiveness? What do you plan to do with the data? | Evaluation Tools |
| 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| 3A. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|-------------------------|
| <p><u>Writing Goal #3A:</u> Writing Goal #3A: Ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian)</p> | | | | |
| <p>Not Required</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | |
| | <p>()</p> | <p>()</p> | | |
| <p>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</p> | | | | |
| <p>Anticipated Barrier</p> | <p>Strategy</p> | <p>Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? Nine Week Check What is the level of strategy implementation? What do you plan to do with the data</p> | <p>Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? Nine Week Check What is the level of strategy effectiveness? What do you plan to do with the data?</p> | <p>Evaluation Tools</p> |

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

| | | | | |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 3A.1. | 3A.1. | 3A.1. | 3A.1. | 3A.1. |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 3A.2. | 3A.2. | 3A.2. | 3A.2. | 3A.2. |
| 3A.3. | 3A.3. | 3A.3. | 3A.3. | 3A.3. |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| 3B. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing <u>Writing Goal #3B:</u> Writing Goal #3B: Economically Disadvantaged | | | | |
| | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | |
| Not Required | | | | |
| | () | () | | |

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

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|--|----------|--|---|------------------|
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | <p align="center">Fidelity Check</p> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? <p align="center">Nine Week Check</p> What is the level of strategy implementation? What do you plan to do with the data | <p align="center">Strategy Data Check</p> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? <p align="center">Nine Week Check</p> What is the level of strategy effectiveness? What do you plan to do with the data? | Evaluation Tools |
| 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. |
| 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. |

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

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| <p>3C. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing</p> <p><u>Writing Goal #3C:</u> Writing Goal #3C: English Language Learners (ELL)</p> | | | | |
| <p>Not Required</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | |
| | <p>()</p> | <p>()</p> | | |
| <p>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</p> | | | | |

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

| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? Nine Week Check What is the level of strategy implementation? What do you plan to do with the data | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? Nine Week Check What is the level of strategy effectiveness? What do you plan to do with the data? | Evaluation Tools |
|---------------------|----------|--|---|------------------|
| 3C.1. | 3C.1. | 3C.1. | 3C.1. | 3C.1. |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 3C.2. | 3C.2. | 3C.2. | 3C.2. | 3C.2. |
| 3C.3. | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | 3C.3. |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| 3D. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|-------------------------|
| <p>Writing Goal #3D: Writing Goal #3D: Students with Disabilities (SWD)</p> | | | | |
| <p>Not Required</p> | <p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p> | <p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p> | | |
| | <p>()</p> | <p>()</p> | | |
| <p>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</p> | | | | |
| <p>Anticipated Barrier</p> | <p>Strategy</p> | <p>Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? Nine Week Check What is the level of strategy implementation? What do you plan to do with the data</p> | <p>Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? Nine Week Check What is the level of strategy effectiveness? What do you plan to do with the data?</p> | <p>Evaluation Tools</p> |
| <p>3D.1.</p> | <p>3D.1.</p> | <p>3D.1.</p> | <p>3D.1.</p> | <p>3D.1.</p> |

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

| | | | | |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. |
| 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|---|--|---|---|
| Writing Strategies | K-5 | PLC District Trainers | School-wide Language Arts Teachers | PLCs: On-going | Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations | Administration Team |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----|--------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Rubric Training for Embedded Assessments | K-5 | District Trainers | School-wide Language Arts Teachers | PLCs: On-going | Classroom walk-throughs | Administration Team |
| | | | | | Optional peer teacher observations | |
| Holistic Scoring Training | K-5 | District Trainers | School-wide Language Arts Teachers | PLCs: On-going | Classroom walk-throughs | Administration Team |
| | | | | | Optional peer teacher observations | |
| Differentiated Instruction | K-5 | PLC District Trainers | School-wide Language Arts Teachers | PLCs: On-going | Classroom walk-throughs | Administration Team |
| | | | | | Optional peer teacher observations | |
| Faculty Training on Writing the Collins Way | K-5 | Various faculty members | School-wide | PLCs: On-going | Classroom walk-throughs | Administration Team |

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |

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

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|--------|--|--|
| ELP: Extended Learning Program | Highly Qualified Teachers Classroom Materials | Hillsborough County Public Schools: Division of Curriculum and Instruction | *Full budget was listed under reading . ELP at our school consists of reading, writing, and math. | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | | | | |
| Technology | | | | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | | Funding Source | Amount | | |
| Subtotal: | | | | | | |
| Professional Development | | | | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | | Funding Source | Amount | | |
| Subtotal: | | | | | | |
| Other | | | | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | | Funding Source | Amount | | |
| Subtotal: | | | | | | |
| Total: | | | | | | |

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

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

| 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? | Evaluation Tools | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| <p>I. Attendance</p> | <p>I.1.</p> | <p>I.1.</p> | <p>I.1</p> | <p>I.1.</p> | <p>I.1</p> | | |
| <p><u>Attendance Goal #1:</u></p> | <p>Most students with significant unexcused absences (10 or more) have serious personal or family issues that are impacting attendance.</p> | <p>When a student reaches 5 days of unexcused absences, guidance counselors or other identified staff contacts the parents via the phone and records documentation on the Attendance Intervention form (SB90717).</p> | <p>Judy Vargas- DP Clerk David Kincade- Social Worker Sue Chapin- Guidance Counselor Melissa Porfirio- Psychologist *Monitored through Education Connect</p> | <p>Reports from EASI sign in system will be analyzed to determine if the problem is improving and which students should be targeted.</p> | <p>Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/ Tardy data</p> | | |
| | | <p>An attendance referral is generated. The social worker and other relevant personnel (e.g., guidance counselor, school psychologist, SRO) communicates with the family</p> | | | | | |

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

| | | to create an Attendance Improvement Plan. | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | <u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u> | | | | | |
| 1. The attendance rate will increase from 95.7% in 2011-2012 to 96% in 2012-2013. | | | | | | | |
| 2. The number of students who have 10 or more <u>unexcused</u> absences throughout the school year will decrease by 10% (91 in 2012 to 82 in 2013) | | | | | | | |
| 3. The number of students who have 10 or more <u>unexcused</u> tardies to school throughout the school year will decrease by 10%. (119 in 2012 to 107 in 2013) | | | | | | | |
| | 95.7% | 96% | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|------|------|------|------|--|
| | <u>2012 Current</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Students with</u> <u>Excessive</u> <u>Unexcused</u> <u>Absences</u> (10 or more) | <u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Students with</u> <u>Excessive</u> <u>Unexcused</u> <u>Absences</u> (10 or more) | | | | | |
| | <i>91</i> | <i>82</i> | | | | | |
| | <u>2012 Current</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Students with</u> <u>Excessive</u> <u>Unexcused</u> <u>Tardies to</u> <u>School (10 or</u> <u>more)</u> | <u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Students with</u> <u>Excessive</u> <u>Unexcused</u> <u>Tardies to</u> <u>School</u> (10 or more) | | | | | |
| | <i>119</i> | <i>107</i> | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

**Professional
Development
(PD) aligned with**

September 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Hillsborough Revised September 28, 2012

Hillsborough version 2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
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 |
|---|-------------------------|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|---|
|---|-------------------------|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|---|

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|--------|--|
| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. | | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount | |
| | | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | | |
| Technology | | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount | |
| | | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | | |
| Professional Development | | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount | |
| | | | | |

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

| | | | |
|------------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Total: | | | |

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

Data Source - Access info through Education Portal

1. 2011-2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions
 - a. Use the **Duplicated** Student Suspension data
2. 2011-2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School
 - a. Use the **Unduplicated** Student Suspension data
3. 2011-2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
 - a. Use the **Duplicated** Student Suspension data
 - b. Add up the OSS and ATOSS figures to come up with a final total
4. 2011-2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
 - a. Use the **Unduplicated** Student Suspension data
 - b. Add up the OSS and ATOSS figures to come up with a final total

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| SUSPENSION GOAL(S) | Problem-solving Process to Decr | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| | ease 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? | Evaluation Tools | | |
| 1. Suspension <u>Suspension Goal #1:</u> | 1.1. Teachers need to have common school-wide expectations and provide explicit instruction to students on the expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior. | 1.1. Positive Behavior Support (PBS) will be implemented to address school-wide expectations and rules, set these through staff survey and discussion, and provide training to staff in methods for teaching and reinforcing the school-wide rules and expectations | 1.1. Steven Sims Teri Madill | 1.1. Administration will review data on Office Discipline Referrals ODRs and out of school suspensions monthly. | 1.1. Suspension Data | | |

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

| <u>Goals</u> | <u>2012 Total</u> | <u>2013 Expected</u> | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | <u>Number of</u> | <u>Number of</u> | | | | | |
| | <u>In-School</u> | <u>In-School</u> | | | | | |
| | <u>Suspensions</u> | <u>Suspensions</u> | | | | | |
| 1. The total number of In-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%. (2 in 2012 to 1 in 2013) | | | | | | | |
| 2. The total number of students receiving In-School Suspension throughout the school year will decrease by 10%. (2 in 2012 to 1 in 2013) | | | | | | | |
| 3. The total number of Out-of-Suspensions will decrease by 10%. (7 in 2012 to 6 in 2013) | | | | | | | |
| 4. The total number of students receiving Out-of-School Suspension throughout the school year will decrease by 10%. (7 in 2012 to 6 in 2013) | | | | | | | |
| | 2 | 1 | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|------|------|------|------|--|
| | <u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended</u> | | | | | |
| | <u>In-School</u> | <u>In -School</u> | | | | | |
| | 2 | 1 | | | | | |
| | <u>2012 Number of Out- of-School Suspensions</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u> | | | | | |
| | 7 | 6 | | | | | |
| | <u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended</u> | | | | | |
| | <u>Out- of- School</u> | <u>Out- of-School</u> | | | | | |
| | 7 | 6 | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

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

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

Hillsborough version 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 District/ USF Trainer | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|--|-------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|
| Positive Behavior Support (PBS) CHAMPS | K-5 | CHAMPS Trainer | School Wide | Faculty meetings and early release dates | PLC Classroom walkthroughs looking for implementation of the strategies | Principal and Assistant Principal |
| | | | | | Classroom walkthroughs looking for implementation of the strategies | |

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| | | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |

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

| | | | |
|------------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Total: | | | |

End of Suspension Goals

Additional Goal(s)

Health and Fitness

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|----------|--|---|------------------|--|--|
| Health and Fitness Goal | 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? | Evaluation Toola | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| <p>1. Health and Fitness Goal</p> | <p>1.1.</p> | <p>1.1.</p> | <p>1.1.</p> | <p>1.1.</p> | <p>1.1.</p> | | |
| <p><u>Health and Fitness Goal #1:</u></p> | <p>-Schedule does not allow time for students to receive the designated minutes of physical activity per week.</p> | <p>-Each student will receive two physical education classes and 90 minutes of teacher directed PE per week.</p> | <p>-Physical Education Teacher -Administration</p> | <p>-Schedules -Walk-throughs</p> | <p>-Schedules -Physical Education Assessments</p> | | |

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

| | <u>2012 Current Level :*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level :*</u> | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>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 73% in 2012 to 80% in 2013.</p> | <p>73% (101)</p> | <p>80% (115)</p> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

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 Goal Budget

| | |
|--|--|
| Include, school allocation from District, Internal funds, Title I, PTSA funds, Grants, ELL funds, Technology funds, etc, additional units/dollars from District. | |
|--|--|

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

| | |
|--|-------|
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | |
| Strategy | Descr |
| | |
| Subtotal: | |
| Technology | |
| Strategy | Descr |
| | |
| Subtotal: | |
| Professional Development | |
| Strategy | Descr |
| | |
| Subtotal: | |
| Other | |
| Strategy | Descr |
| | |
| Grand Total: | |

Continuous Improvement

Note: If you wrote Parent Involvement goals above and they are also appropriate for Continuous Improvement, you may do a “copy and paste.”

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

| | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Continuous Improvement Goal | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| | 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? | Evaluation Tools | | |
| 1. Continuous Improvement Goal <u>Continuous Improvement Goal #1:</u> | 1.1 - Not enough time to meet | 1.1 -PLCs will meet on a bi-weekly basis on Mondays of early release or on Tuesdays after staff meetings. | 1.1 - <u>Who</u> -Administration <u>How</u> - Administration will review PLCs logs and provide feedback. | 1.1 - Administration will review PLCs logs and provide feedback | 1.1 -PLC logs | | |

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

| | 2012 Current Level :* | 2013 Expected Level :* | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| <p>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 61% in 2012 to 65% in 2013.</p> | <p>61% (38)</p> | <p>65% (50)</p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>1.2 - Difficulty making the transition for keeping meetings curriculum and student focused.</p> | <p>1.2 -Team Leaders will use agendas and use the Action Steps of the SIP Goals as a guide for PLC discussion and PLC work.</p> | <p>1.2 <u>Who</u> -Administration <u>How</u> - Administration will review PLCs logs and provide feedback.</p> | <p>1.2 - Administration will review PLCs logs and provide feedback. -Review assessment data</p> | <p>1.2. -PLC logs -Assessment data</p> | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|--|
| | | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3. | |
|--|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|--|

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader Leadership Team/PLC Facilitators | 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 |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|
| Plan- Do-Check-Act Model | Leadership Team/All teachers | | School-wide | PLC meets bi-weekly | Administrators and leadership team walk throughs. Administrator and leadership attendance at PLC meetings PLC survey data | Leadership Team |

Continuous Improvement Goal Budget

September 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Hillsborough Revised September 28, 2012

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

| | | |
|--|---------------------|-------|
| Include, school allocation from District, Internal funds, Title I, PTSA funds, Grants, ELL funds, Technology funds, etc, additional units/dollars from District. | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | |
| Strategy | | Descr |
| | | |
| | Subtotal: | |
| Technology | | |
| Strategy | | Descr |
| | | |
| | Subtotal: | |
| Professional Development | | |
| Strategy | | Descr |
| | | |
| | Subtotal: | |
| Other | | |
| Strategy | | Descr |
| | | |
| | Grand Total: | |

End of Additional Goal(s)

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| CELLA Goals | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition | | | | | |
|--------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| 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 | |
|---|----------------------------|-----------------|--|---|--------------------------------|--|

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|--|
| <p>C. Students scoring proficient/satisfactory performance in Listening/Speaking.</p> | <p>5C.1 -Improving the proficiency of ELL students is a high priority. -The majority of the teachers are unfamiliar with this strategy. To address this barrier, the school will schedule professional development delivered by the school's ERT. -ELLs at varying levels of English language acquisition and acculturation is not consistent across core courses.</p> | <p>5C.1 ELLs (LYs/LFs) comprehension of course content/ standard improves through participation in the <u>Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA)</u> strategy across Reading, Language Arts, Math, Social Studies and Science. <u>Action Steps</u> -ESOL Resource Teacher (ERT) provides professional development to all content area teachers on how to embed CALLA into core content lessons. -Core content teachers administer and analyze ELLs performance on assessments. -Teachers aggregate data to determine the performance of ELLs compared to the whole group. -Based on data core content teachers will differentiate</p> | <p>5C.1 <u>Who</u> -School based Administrators -District Resource Teachers -ESOL Resource Teachers <u>How</u> -Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the walkthrough form from: <u>The CALLA Handbook</u>, p. 101, Table 5.4 *Checklist for Evaluating CALLA Instruction.</p> | <p>5C.1 <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. <u>PLC Level</u> -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -ERTs meet with Reading, Language Arts, Social Studies and Science PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. -ERTs meet with RtI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs).</p> | <p>5C.1 -FAIR -CELLA <u>During the Grading Period</u> -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for ELL performance</p> | |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|--|

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|--------------------------------|------|
| | | instruction to remediate/enhance instruction. | | | | |
| <u>CELLA Goal #C:</u> | <u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</u> | | | | | |
| The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from 59% to 62%. | | | | | | |
| | 59% (40) | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|--|
| <p>D. Students scoring proficient/satisfactory performance in Reading.</p> | <p>2.1.</p> | <p>2.1.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">See Above</p> | <p>2.1.</p> | <p>2.1.</p> | <p>2.1.</p> | |
| <p><u>CELLA Goal #D:</u></p> <p>The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase from 22% to 25%.</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :</u></p> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|------|
| | 22% (15) | | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | |
| E. Students scoring proficient/satisfactory performance in Writing. | 2.1. | 2.1. See Above | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|------|------|------|------|------|
| <p><u>CELLA Goal #E:</u></p> <p>The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA will increase from 23% to 26%.</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing:</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>23%</p> <p>(16)</p> | | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |

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.

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

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

| Describe the use of SAC funds. | | | |
|--|--|------------------|--------------|
| Name and Number of Strategy from the School Improvement Plan | Description of Resources that improves student achievement or student engagement | Projected Amount | Final Amount |
| Reading Goal 3.1 | Purchase Common Core Resource materials to aid instruction | \$2,500 | |
| | | | |