

Florida Department of Education



Giunta Middle School

School Improvement Plan (SIP)

Form SIP-1

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Giunta Middle School	District Name: Hillsborough
Principal: Arlene Castelli	Superintendent: Mary Ellen Elia
SAC Chair: Marion Pricher	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

[High School Feedback Report](#)

[K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan](#)

Highly Qualified Administrators

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

Hillsborough 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised July, 2012

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Arlene Castelli	Bachelor of Science in Social Science Education and a Masters in Educational Leadership; Social Science 6-12 Certification	8	15	11-12 : D Learning Gains: 50 Reading, 56 Math 10-11 : C 09-10 : B 08-09 : B 07-08 : B
Assistant Principal of Curriculum	Henrissa Berry	Associate of Arts; Bachelor of Science in Physical Education; Masters Degree in Counseling; Doctorate Degree in Educational Leadership; Physical Education K-12; Health K-12; Guidance and Counseling K-12; Educational Leadership K-12	8	3	11-12 : D Learning Gains: 50 Reading, 56 Math 10-11 : C 09-10 : B
Assistant Principal of Administration	Glenn Bramlett	Bachelor of Science in History; Master of Science in Education Leadership; Doctorate Degree in Educational Leadership; Social Studies 6-12; Educational Leadership K-12	2	8	11-12 : D Learning Gains: 50 Reading, 56 Math

Highly Qualified Instructional Coaches

Hillsborough 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised July, 2012

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

List your school’s highly qualified instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment performance (Percentage data for Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Math	Stephanie O’Neill	Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education; Master of Science in Educational Leadership; Elementary 1-6; Middle Grades Math 5-9; Educational Leadership K-12; ESOL	7	2	11-12 : D Learning Gains: 50 Reading, 56 Math
Reading	Marion Pricher	Bachelors of Science in Psychology; Masters in Teaching in Special Education; Exceptional Student Education K-12; PreK-3; Reading Endorsement; ESOL	2	2	11-12 : D Learning Gains: 50 Reading, 56 Math
Science	Cynthia Britten	Associate of Science in Human Services; Bachelors of Science in Biology/Secondary Science Education; Middle Grades Endorsement; EA Science National Board Certification	1	1	N/A
Writing	Sandra Lefevre	Bachelors of Science in Secondary English Education; Masters in Educational Leadership; English 6-12; Ed. Leadership K-12; ESOL; Gifted endorsement	1	1	N/A

Highly Qualified Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1. Teacher Interview Day	District staff	June	
2. Salary Differential (Renaissance Schools)	General of Federal Programs	ongoing	
3. District Mentor Program	District Mentors	ongoing	
4. District Peer Program	District Peers	ongoing	
5. School-based teacher recognition system	Principal	ongoing	
6. Opportunities for teacher leadership	Principal	ongoing	
7. Regular time for teacher collaboration	Principal	ongoing	

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
---	--

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

7 out of field	<p>Depending on the needs of the teacher, one or more of the following strategies are implemented.</p> <p>Administrators Meet with the teachers four times per year to discuss progress on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparing and taking the certification exam • Completing classes need for certification • Provide substitute coverage for the teachers to observe other teachers • Discussion of what teachers learned during the observation(s) <p>Academic Coach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The coach co-plans, models, co-teaches, observes and conferences with the teacher on a regular basis <p>Subject Area Leader/PLC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teachers will attend PLC meetings for on-going adult learning, striving to understand how they as an individual teacher and PLC member can improve learning for all.
----------------	--

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Qualified Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
82	7% (6)	22% (18)	53% (43)	18% (15)	41% (34)	91% (75)	13% (11)	2% (2)	29% (24)

Teacher Mentoring Program

Please describe the school’s teacher mentoring program by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
-------------	-----------------	-----------------------	------------------------------

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

EET mentor: Debra Keith	Anthony Cothron, Collin Roberts, Jeffery Stover, Jeffery Bostick, Djenane Briette, Jason Elizondo, Dora Friedman, Michelle Gant, Carolyn Klein, Christine McDonald, Pushpanjeli Mishra, Ryan Swilley, Sheila Vakili	The district-based mentor is with the EET initiative. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Stephanie Geyfman	Cindy Britten	Ms. Geyfman is the Sxience SAL and has over 10 years teaching experience.	Bi-weekly co-planning in PLCs.
Robert Gleich	Tony Cothron	Mr. Gleich has been a PE teacher for over 10 years.	Bi-weekly co-planning in PLCs.
Paul White	David Daigle	Mr. White has over 10 years teaching experience.	Bi-weekly co-planning in PLCs.
Cindy Barlette	Carolyn Daly	Ms. Barlette has over 7 years teaching experience.	Bi-weekly co-planning in PLCs.
Stephanie O’Neill	Michelle Gant	Ms. O’Neill has over 11 years teaching experience. She has been the Subject Area Leader for 3 years.	Weekly Subject Area Meetings.
Trinetta Williams	Jason Gibbs	Ms. Williams has over 10 years teaching experience.	Bi-weekly co-planning in PLCs.
Gia DeVore	Dawn Hanich	Ms. DeVore has over 10 years teaching experience.	Bi-weekly co-planning in PLCs.
Henrissa Berry	Dawn Jones	Ms. Berry has been an Administrator for 3 years.	Bi-weekly co-planning in PLCs.
Sarah Weaver	Sandra Lefevre	Ms. Weaver has over 10 years teaching experience.	Bi-weekly co-planning in PLCs.
Trevor Harada	Angali Mishra	Mr. Harada has over 15 years teaching experience and the PLC Facilitator for subject area.	Bi-weekly co-planning in PLCs.
Liz Crozier	Stephanie Montes	Ms. Crozier has over 10 years teaching experience.	Bi-weekly co-planning in PLCs.
Alicia Bennett	Colin Roberts	Mrs. Bennett has over 11 years teaching experience and has served as ESE Specialist for 5 years.	Bi-weekly co-planning in PLCs.
Deneb Farmer	Tamera Simpson	Ms. Farmer has over 15 years teaching experience	Bi-weekly co-planning in PLCs.
David Smith	Jeff Stover	Mr. Smith has over 10 years teaching experience.	Bi-weekly co-planning in PLCs.
Akila Boyd	Rusty Wood	Ms. Boyd has over 8 years of experience in teaching science.	Bi-weekly co-planning in PLCs.

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

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

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

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

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

Job Training Job training support is specific to each school site in which funds can be utilized, in a specific program, within Title I regulations
Other NA

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

School-Based MTSS/Rtl Team
Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team. Kim Kelley; School Psychologist, Adam Burke; School Social Worker, Joann Buffington; Guidance Counselor, Arien Wilson; School Intervention Specialist, Alicia Bennett; ESE Specialist, Arlene Castelli; Principal, Henrissa Berry; Assistant Principal for Curriculum, Glenn Bramlett; Assistant Principal for Administration, Marion Pricher; SAC Chair and specific classroom teachers.
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 Rtl team in our school is to provide high quality instruction/intervention matched to student's needs and using performance and learning rate over time to make important education decisions to guide instruction. The Rtl team functions to address the progress of low performing students and help students stay in regular education setting and improve long term outcomes. The team uses a problem solving model and all decisions are made with data. The team will meet twice a month in the Principals Conference Room.
Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the Rtl Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? The purpose of the Rtl team in our school is to provide oversight on student achievement and school-based processes to ensure that each promotes student achievement. The Rtl Leadership team will pay careful attention to data related to the subgroups that did not make AYP. We will implement plans to increase student achievement via reviewed data.
MTSS Implementation
Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior. This information can be found in the check portion of the Florida Continuous Improvement Model section of the School Improvement Plan

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

<p>Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● An Rtl PowerPoint presented to Principals during School Improvement Training will be shared with staff.● As the District's Problem Solving Team develops resources and staff development courses on Rtl, these tools and staff development will be conducted with staff when they become available.● Professional Development sessions will occur during Tuesday faculty meeting times.
<p>Describe plan to support MTSS.</p> <p>In order to support MTSS in our school, we will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Consistently promote the shared vision of one system meeting the needs of all students with MTSS as the platform for integrating all school initiatives (i.e., PLC, PSLT, STEERING, AND SAC MEETINGS, lesson study, school-wide behavior management plans).● Provide designated school personnel with the requisite knowledge and experience to support coordination and implementation of MTSS.● Provide continued training and support to all school based personnel in problem solving, responding to student data and the use of a systematic method to increase student achievement.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
<p><u>Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).</u> Arlene Castelli; Principal, Henrissa Berry; Assistant Principal for Curriculum, Marion Pricher; Reading Coach, Sundi Pierce; Media Specialist; Sarah Weaver, Language Arts Subject Area Leader, Dawn Jones; ART, Pablo Alava; SS Teacher, David Smith; SS Teacher, Stacci Wilson; SS Teacher, Paul White; Science Teacher, Medina Miller; Science Teacher, Jose Berrios; Reading Teacher, Lori Salley; Reading Teacher/Literacy Coach, Deneb Farmer; Math Teacher, Maxine Schragar; LA Teacher, Gia Devore; Culinary Arts Teacher, Stephanie Montes; Orchestra Teacher.</p>

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

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

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

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

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

- Implementation and evaluation of the SIP reading goals/strategies across the content areas
- Professional Development
- Co-planning, modeling and observation of research-based reading strategies within lessons across the content areas
- Data analysis (on-going)
- Implementation of the K-12 Reading Plan

NCLB Public School Choice

- Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

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

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

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

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

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

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

The reading coach is required as a part of his/her job description to provide on-site support of the implementation of the Project CRISS Strategic Lesson Plan model and the

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

design and delivery of close reading lessons through professional development opportunities, as well as, coaching opportunities. A yearly action plan is created by the reading coach that outlines what Project CRISS and close reading model lesson professional development will be offered. A monthly written update allows the reading supervisor to monitor the progress of each coach’s action plan.

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

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

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

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

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

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

***High Schools Only**

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

Hillsborough 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised July, 2012

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

Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#).

--

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

<p>1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5).</p>	<p>1.1. Teachers are at varying levels of identify complex and implementing close reading strategies using core curriculum materials.</p>	<p>1.1. Students' reading comprehension improves when students are engaged in close reading strategies in the Social Studies classrooms. The literacy coach/on-the-ground coach/district staff will provide on-going professional development and support on utilizing close reading strategies. Social Studies teachers will be supported through lesson planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing, and conferencing throughout the school year.</p>	<p>1.1. 1. Walk-throughs 2. PLC logs</p>	<p>1.1. Teachers/PLCs use data gathered from checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments to drive future instruction. Common core curriculum assessment data and teacher walk-through data is shared with the Leadership Team. This data is used to drive problem solving, professional development, teacher support, and supplemental instruction. The data gathered by the Leadership Team is shared every three weeks with the district STAAR team using the problem solving model. Specifically, the data is examined using the following questions: 1) What is the evidence of implementation, 2) What are the concerns, 3) What are the celebrations and 4) What are the next steps?</p>	<p>1.1. Common Core Assessment Data</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #1:</u> In grades 6-8, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 34% to 39%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>34% (328)</p>	<p>39% (376)</p>					
		<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	
		<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	
<p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p>Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	<p>Student Evaluation Tool</p>		

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

<p>2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.</p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1. See goal 1</p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1.</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #2:</u> In grades 6-8, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 12% to 17%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>12% (115)</p>	<p>17% (164)</p>					
		<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	
		<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	
<p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p>Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	<p>Student Evaluation Tool</p>		

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

<p>3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.</p>	<p>3.1. Need to ensure that students in the reading classes are receiving curriculum with fidelity and progress monitored on a regular basis.</p>	<p>3.1. Students in the lower quartile will show improvement through teachers' collaboration with the reading coach in using the correct curriculum with fidelity. The reading coach's position description defines the level and type of teacher support that is expected.</p> <p>a. Using walk-through data, the reading coach/administration identifies teachers for support in co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing and debriefing.</p> <p>b. Throughout the school year, the reading coach/administration conducts one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the data gathered from walk-through tools. This data is used for future professional development, both individually and as a department.</p> <p>c. Observation Classrooms and demonstration lessons will be offered to help teachers learn how to differentiate instruction to help increase the</p>	<p>3.1. 1. Summary of teacher walk-throughs 2. Development of an action plan 3. Coaching Cycle 4. Co-teaching/modeling</p>	<p>3.1. Teachers/PLCs use data gathered from checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments to drive future instruction. Common core curriculum assessment data and teacher walk-through data is shared with the Leadership Team. This data is used to drive problem solving, professional development, teacher support, and supplemental instruction. The data gathered by the Leadership Team is shared every three weeks with the district STAAR team using the problem solving model. Specifically, the data is examined using the following questions: 1) What is the evidence of implementation, 2) What are the concerns, 3) What are the celebrations and 4) What are the next steps?</p>	<p>3.1. Common Core Assessment Data</p>		
--	---	--	--	---	---	--	--

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

		performance of the bottom quartile.					
<u>Reading Goal #3:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In grades 6-8, the percentage of All Curriculum students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 50% to 55%.							
	50% (483)	55% (531)					
		3.2. Need to structure a regular communication/ accountability system between administration and coaches in order to drive the coaches way of work.	3.2. Student achievement improves when students are engaged in frequent checks for understanding (during the lesson, end of lesson, after the lesson) that provide timely feedback in order to ensure learning prior to the summative assessment (end of unit/big idea assessment). Teachers plan for frequent checks for understanding throughout their lessons that: 1) align with essential learning/ outcomes, 2) allow for differentiation, 3) focus on gap analysis, and 4) lead to precise teaching.	3.2. 1. PLC's 2. PLC Logs	3.2. Teachers/PLCs use data gathered from checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments to drive future instruction. Common core curriculum assessment data and teacher walk-through data is shared with the Leadership Team. This data is used to drive problem solving, professional development, teacher support, and supplemental instruction. The data gathered by the Leadership Team is shared every three weeks with the district STAAR team using the problem solving model. Specifically, the data is examined using the following questions: 1) What is the evidence of implementation, 2) What are the concerns, 3) What are the celebrations and 4) What are the next steps?	3.2. Common Core Assessment Data	

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

		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		
4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4.1.	4.1. See goal 1 and 3	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.		
<u>Reading Goal #4:</u> In grades 6-8, the percentage of All Curriculum students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 55% to 60%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	55% (530)	60% (579)					
		4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	

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

		4.3	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Need to reduce the rate of referrals and suspensions for SWD and minority students. •Teachers are at different levels of CHAMPS implementation. •Need to provide positive feedback for expected/ appropriate behavior. 	<p>Teachers will meet in PLC’s in order to collaborate grade specific data, curriculum planning and literacy strategies.</p> <p>a. Teachers will plan for grade specific common assessments.</p> <p>b. Teachers will use data to drive instruction using PLC logs as evidence.</p> <p>c. Teachers will collaborate on how literacy strategies will be implemented in grade level curriculum.</p> <p>d. Teachers will work collaboratively in order to unpack assessments to understand the skills and knowledge that the students will need to be successful on the assessment.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PLC’s 2. PLC Logs 	<p>Teachers/PLCs use data gathered from checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments to drive future instruction. Common core curriculum assessment data and teacher walk-through data is shared with the Leadership Team. This data is used to drive problem solving, professional development, teacher support, and supplemental instruction. The data gathered by the Leadership Team is shared every three weeks with the district STAAR team using the problem solving model. Specifically, the data is examined using the following questions: 1) What is the evidence of implementation, 2) What are the concerns, 3) What are the celebrations and 4) What are the next steps?</p>	Common Core Assessment Data		

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

<p><u>Reading Goal #5:</u> In grades 6-8, the percentage of students making proficient/satisfactory scores on the 2013 FCAT Reading/FAA will increase from 55% to 60%.</p>							
<p>5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p>	5A.1.	5A.1. See goal 5	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.		
<p><u>Reading Goal #5A:</u> The percentage of White students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 48% to 53%. The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 24%% to 32%. The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 35% to 42%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>White: 48% Black: 24% Hispanic:35% Asian: Y American Indian: N/A</p>	<p>White: 53% Black: 32% Hispanic:42% Asian: American Indian: N/A</p>					

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

		5A.2.	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2	
		5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5B.1.	5B.1. See goal 5	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		
<u>Reading Goal #5B:</u> The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 31% to 38%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	31%	38%					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5C.1. An effective monitoring system needs to be developed to ensure ELL strategy implementation across the core content classes.	5C.1. See goal 5	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
Reading Goal #5C: The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 16% to 24%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	16%	24%					
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5D.1. An effective monitoring system needs to be developed to 1) ensure IEP implementation and 2) ensure the co-teaching model is being delivered with full fidelity.	5D.1. See goal 5	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		
Reading Goal #5D: The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 21% to 29%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	21%	29%					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Identification of common assessments	6-8	-SALS/DHs -Course specific PLC Facilitators	School-wide	PLCs: On-going	Classroom walk-throughs	Administration Team Instructional Coaches SAL/DH
Gradual Release	6-8	-SALS/DHs -Course specific PLC Facilitators -Reading Coach	School-wide	-PLCs: On-going -Demonstration Classrooms	Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations	Administration Team Instructional Coaches
Student Engagement	6-8	-SALS/DHs -Course specific PLC Facilitators -Reading Coach	School-wide	-PLCs: On-going -Demonstration Classrooms	Classroom walk-throughs	Administration Team Instructional Coaches
Higher Order Thinking	6-8		School-wide	-PLCs: On-going -Demonstration Classrooms	Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations	Administration Team Instructional Coaches

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

Differentiated Instruction	6-8	-SALS/DHs -Course specific PLC Facilitators -Reading Coach	School-wide	-PLCs: On-going -Demonstration Classrooms -Book study on <i>Successful Teaching in The Differentiated Classroom</i>	Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations	Administration Team Instructional Coaches
Using mini-lessons to re-teach and reinforcement essential skills in the core curriculum	6-8	-SALS/DHs -Course specific PLC Facilitators -Reading Coach	School-wide	PLCs: On-going	Classroom walk-throughs	Administration Team Instructional Coaches
Common Core Standards	6-8	-SALS/DHs -Reading Coach	School-wide	PLCs: On-going	Classroom walk-throughs	Administration Team Instructional Coaches

End of Reading Goals

Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

<p>1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in mathematics (Level 3-5).</p>	<p>1.1. Need to structure PLCs so they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model. Leadership team needs to work collaboratively to implement and monitor cross content strategies.</p>	<p>1.1. Student achievement will improve through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on common assessments for enrichment and re-teach purposes.</p> <p>Grade level/ Course level PLC's collaborate 4 times per month. At least 3 of those PLC's involve teachers in like grades/courses planning, reflecting on instruction, and performing data analysis.</p> <p>Teachers bring a copy of the assessment they would use to evaluate student understanding for the next unit of instruction to the PLC meeting and create the common assessment to be used to evaluate student progress. Once they've created it teachers will unpack the assessment to determine pre-requisite skills and how they would be</p>	<p>1.1. PLC Logs</p>	<p>1.1. Teachers/PLCs use data gathered from checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments to drive future instruction. Common core curriculum assessment data and teacher walk-through data is shared with the Leadership Team. This data is used to drive problem solving, professional development, teacher support, and supplemental instruction. The data gathered by the Leadership Team is shared every three weeks with the district STAAR team using the problem solving model. Specifically, the data is examined using the following questions: 1) What is the evidence of implementation, 2) What are the concerns, 3) What are the celebrations and 4) What are the next steps?</p>	<p>1.1. Common Core Assessment Data</p>		
--	--	---	----------------------	---	---	--	--

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

		integrated throughout the unit Bring class data to determine and design lessons to maximize student engagement opportunities Bring common assessment results for each class to determine which students needs re-teaching or enrichment					
<u>Mathematics Goal #1:</u> In grades 6-8, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 35% to 40%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	35% (338)	40% (386)					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		

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

<p>2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics.</p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1. See goal 1</p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1.</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #2:</u> In grades 6-8, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or 5 on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 10% to 15%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>10% (97)</p>	<p>15% (145)</p>					
		<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	
		<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	
<p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p>Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	<p>Student Evaluation Tool</p>		

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

<p>3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making learning gains in mathematics.</p>	<p>3.1. Need to increase the level of engagement and understanding of key concepts throughout instruction/lesson delivery. Need to have a universal system/model of delivery within the Math department</p>	<p>3.1. Teachers will use different instructional strategies (Think/Pair/Share, Sage and Scribe, Paraphrasing, ect) to scaffold for students the problem solving process. Evidence of implementation will be collected through Walk-Through form</p>	<p>3.1. Walk Through form and lesson plan</p>	<p>3.1. Teachers/PLCs use data gathered from checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments to drive future instruction. Common core curriculum assessment data and teacher walk-through data is shared with the Leadership Team. This data is used to drive problem solving, professional development, teacher support, and supplemental instruction. The data gathered by the Leadership Team is shared every three weeks with the district STAAR team using the problem solving model. Specifically, the data is examined using the following questions: 1) What is the evidence of implementation, 2) What are the concerns, 3) What are the celebrations and 4) What are the next steps?</p>	<p>3.1. Common Core Assessment Data</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #3:</u> In grades 6-8, the percentage of All Curriculum students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 56% to 61%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>56% (540)</p>	<p>61% (589)</p>					

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

		3.2. Need to structure a regular communication/ accountability system between administration and coaches in order to drive the coaches way of work.	3.2. Teachers will create effective lessons that incorporate best practices (daily objectives, bell work, strategies, higher order thinking, informal assessments throughout the lesson) to ensure each class is academically students centered Teachers will create effective lessons with the coach during PLCs Teachers will schedule date for coach to observe lesson Teacher and coach will debrief	3.2. Walk Through form and lesson plan	3.2. Teachers/PLCs use data gathered from checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments to drive future instruction. Common core curriculum assessment data and teacher walk-through data is shared with the Leadership Team. This data is used to drive problem solving, professional development, teacher support, and supplemental instruction. The data gathered by the Leadership Team is shared every three weeks with the district STAAR team using the problem solving model. Specifically, the data is examined using the following questions: 1) What is the evidence of implementation, 2) What are the concerns, 3) What are the celebrations and 4) What are the next steps?	3.2. Common Core Assessment Data	
		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		

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

<p>4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</p>	4.1.	4.1. See goal 1 and 3	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.		
<p>Mathematics Goal #4: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. In grades 6-8, the percentage of All Curriculum students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 61% to 66%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>61% (589)</p>	<p>66% (637)</p>					
		4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	
		4.3	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
<p>5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Need to increase the level of engagement and understanding of key concepts throughout instruction/lesson delivery. •Need to have a universal system/model of delivery within the Math department. 	<p>Teachers will create effective lessons that incorporate best practices (daily objectives, bell work, strategies, higher order thinking, informal assessments throughout the lesson) to ensure each class is academically students centered</p> <p>Teachers will create effective lessons with the coach during PLCs</p> <p>Teachers will schedule date for coach to observe lesson</p> <p>Teacher and coach will debrief</p>	<p>Teacher Progress Monitoring Tools</p> <p>Walk Trough Form, PLC Logs</p>	<p>Teachers/PLCs use data gathered from checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments to drive future instruction. Common core curriculum assessment data and teacher walk-through data is shared with the Leadership Team. This data is used to drive problem solving, professional development, teacher support, and supplemental instruction. The data gathered by the Leadership Team is shared every three weeks with the district STAAR team using the problem solving model. Specifically, the data is examined using the following questions: 1) What is the evidence of implementation, 2) What are the concerns, 3) What are the celebrations and 4) What are the next steps?</p>	<p>Common Unit Assessments</p>		
<p><u>Math Goal #5:</u> In grades 6-8, the percentage of students making proficient/satisfactory scores on the 2013 FCAT Reading/FAA will increase from 56%% to 61%.</p>							
<p>5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics</p>	5A.1.	5A.1. See goal 5	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.		

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

<p>Math Goal #5A:</p> <p>The percentage of White students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 51% to 56%.</p> <p>The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 24% to 32%.</p> <p>The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 36% to 42%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>White:51% Black:24% Hispanic:36% Asian: Y American Indian: N/A</p>	<p>White:56% Black:32% Hispanic:42% Asian: American Indian: N/A</p>					
		5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	
		5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	
<p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p>Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	<p>Student Evaluation Tool</p>		
<p>5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p>	5B.1.	5B.1. See goal 5	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		

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

<p>Mathematics Goal #5B: The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 32% to 39%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>32%</p>	<p>39%</p>					
		<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	
		<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	
<p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p>Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	<p>Student Evaluation Tool</p>		
<p>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p>	<p>5C.1.</p>	<p>5C.1. See goal 5</p>	<p>5C.1.</p>	<p>5C.1.</p>	<p>5C.1.</p>		

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

<p>Mathematics Goal #5C: The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 32% to 39%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>32%</p>	<p>39%</p>					
		<p>5C.2.</p>	<p>5C.2.</p>	<p>5C.2.</p>	<p>5C.2.</p>	<p>5C.2.</p>	
		<p>5C.3.</p>	<p>5C.3.</p>	<p>5C.3.</p>	<p>5C.3.</p>	<p>5C.3.</p>	
<p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p>Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	<p>Student Evaluation Tool</p>		
<p>5D. Student with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p>	<p>5D.1.</p>	<p>5D.1. See goal 5</p>	<p>5D.1.</p>	<p>5D.1.</p>	<p>5D.1.</p>		

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

Mathematics Goal #5D: The percentage Students With Disabilities scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 25% to 33%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	25%	33%					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	

End of Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

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

<p>Alg1. Students scoring proficient in Algebra (Levels 3-5).</p>	<p>1.1.</p>	<p>1.1. See goal 1</p>	<p>1.1.</p>	<p>1.1.</p>	<p>1.1.</p>		
<p><u>Algebra Goal #1:</u> In grades 6-8, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 Algebra EOC will increase from 66% to 71%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>66% (134)</p>	<p>71% (144)</p>					
		<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	
		<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	
<p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p>Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	<p>Student Evaluation Tool</p>		

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

Alg2. Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in Algebra.	2.1.	2.1. See goal 1	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Algebra Goal #2: In grades 6-8, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 Algebra EOC will increase from 24% to 29%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	24% (49)	29% (59)					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

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

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

(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
Identification of common assessments	6-8	-Math SAL/DH -Course specific PLC facilitators	Math	PLCs: On-going	Classroom walk-throughs	Administration Team Math Coach Math SAL/DH
Gradual Release	6-8	-Math SAL/DH -Course specific PLC facilitators	Math	-PLCs: On-going -Demonstration Classrooms	Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations	Administration Team Math Coach Math SAL/DH
Student Engagement	6-8	-Math SAL/DH -Course specific PLC facilitators	Math	-PLCs: On-going -Demonstration Classrooms -Book Study on <i>Teach Like A Champion</i>	Classroom walk-throughs	Administration Team Math Coach Math SAL/DH
Higher Order Thinking	6-8	-Math SAL/DH -Course specific PLC facilitators	Math	-PLCs: On-going -Demonstration Classrooms	Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations	Administration Team Math Coach Math SAL/DH
Differentiated Instruction	6-8	-Math SAL/DH -Course specific PLC facilitators	Math	-PLCs: On-going -Demonstration Classrooms -Book study on <i>Successful Teaching in The Differentiated Classroom</i>	Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations	Administration Team Math Coach Math SAL/DH
Checks for understanding	6-8	-Math SAL/DH -Course specific PLC facilitators	Math	PLCs: On-going	Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations	Administration Team Math Coach Math SAL/DH

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

Using mini-lessons to re-teach and reinforcement essential skills in the core curriculum	6-8	-Math SAL/ DH -Course specific PLC facilitators	Math	PLCs: On-going	Classroom walk-throughs	Administration Team Math Coach Math SAL/DH
Technology and hands-on activities	6-8	-Math SAL/ DH -Course specific PLC facilitators	Math	PLCs: On-going	Classroom walk-throughs	Administration Team Math Coach Math SAL/DH
Exploration of math curriculum materials – teacher editions	6-8	-Math SAL/ DH		PLCs: On-going	Classroom walk-throughs	Administration Team Math Coach Math SAL/DH

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

<p>1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science.</p>	<p>1.1. Need to increase the level of engagement and understanding of key concepts throughout instruction/lesson delivery. Need to have a universal Structure for planning lessons within the Science department. Need to increase the level of rigor, specifically as it relates to text selection and use.</p>	<p>1.1. Student achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is it we expect them to learn? 2. How will we know if they have learned it? 3. How will we respond when they don't learn? 4. How will we respond 	<p>1.1. PLC Logs Copies of common assessments (pre/post, mid, section & end of unit) Copies of 5E Lesson Plans Student Data</p>	<p>1.1. Teachers/PLCs use data gathered from checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments to drive future instruction. Common core curriculum assessment data and teacher walk-through data is shared with the Leadership Team. This data is used to drive problem solving, professional development, teacher support, and supplemental instruction. The data gathered by the Leadership Team is shared every three weeks with the district STAAR team using the problem solving model. Specifically, the data is examined using the following questions: 1) What is the evidence of implementation, 2) What are the concerns, 3) What are the celebrations and 4) What are the next steps?</p>	<p>1.1. Common Core Assessment Data</p>		
--	--	---	---	---	---	--	--

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

		<p>when they already know it?</p> <p>Action Effective PLC's</p> <p>Teachers will meet a minimum of once per week</p> <p>Teachers will co-plan and implement 5E Lessons through Backwards Design</p> <p>Teachers will collaborate to create and implement common assessments</p>					
<p><u>Science Goal #1:</u></p> <p>In grade 8 the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 34% to 39%</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>34% (142)</p>	<p>39% (154)</p>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science.	2.1.	2.1. See goal 1	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
<u>Science Goal #2:</u> In grade 8 the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 Science FCAT will increase from 5% to 10%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	5% (21)	10% (42)					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	

Science Professional Development

Professional Development						
---------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

<p>(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.</p>						
<p>PD Content / Topic and/or PLC Focus</p>	<p>Grade Level/ Subject</p>	<p>PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader</p>	<p>PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)</p>	<p>Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)</p>	<p>Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>
<p>Identification of common assessments</p>	<p>6-8</p>	<p>-Science SAL -Course specific PLC facilitators</p>	<p>Science</p>	<p>PLCs: On-going</p>	<p>Classroom walk-throughs</p>	<p>Administration Team Science Coach Science SAL/DH</p>
<p>Higher Order Thinking</p>	<p>6-8</p>	<p>-Science SAL/ DH -Course specific PLC facilitators</p>	<p>Science</p>	<p>-PLCs: On-going -Demonstration Classrooms</p>	<p>Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations</p>	<p>Administration Team Science Coach Science SAL/DH</p>
<p>Differentiated Instruction</p>	<p>6-8</p>	<p>-Science SAL/ DH -Course specific PLC facilitators</p>	<p>Science</p>	<p>-PLCs: On-going -Demonstration Classrooms -Book study on <i>Successful Teaching in The Differentiated Classroom</i></p>	<p>Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations</p>	<p>Administration Team Science Coach Science SAL/DH</p>
<p>Lab, technology and hands-on activities</p>	<p>6-8</p>	<p>-Science SAL/ DH -Course specific PLC facilitators</p>	<p>Science</p>	<p>PLCs: On-going</p>	<p>Classroom walk-throughs</p>	<p>Administration Team Science Coach Science SAL/DH</p>

End of Science Goals

Writing/Language Arts Goals

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

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

<p>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing.</p>	<p>I.1. Both reading intensive classes and Language Arts classes need to improve the delivery of core curriculum with fidelity.</p>	<p>I.1. Students' understanding of, interpretation of, and response to instruction will increase due to participation in engaging academic lessons and rigor through the district's curriculum/framework.</p> <p>Action 1: Information will be gathered during PLCs, walkthroughs, and site-based literacy coaches meetings regarding teachers' skill levels in delivering engaging, rigorous instruction through the district's curriculum/framework.</p> <p>Action 2: In district trainings and within PLCs, teachers and coaches will attend ongoing trainings/professional development to build teachers' skill levels in delivering engaging, rigorous instruction.</p> <p>Action 3: Teachers in the classroom will implement new knowledge of delivering engaging, rigorous instruction through the district's</p>	<p>I.1. Walkthrough Data PLC Logs</p>	<p>I.1. Teachers/PLCs use data gathered from checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments to drive future instruction. Common core curriculum assessment data and teacher walk-through data is shared with the Leadership Team. This data is used to drive problem solving, professional development, teacher support, and supplemental instruction. The data gathered by the Leadership Team is shared every three weeks with the district STAAR team using the problem solving model. Specifically, the data is examined using the following questions: 1) What is the evidence of implementation, 2) What are the concerns, 3) What are the celebrations and 4) What are the next steps?</p>	<p>I.1. Common Core Assessment Data</p>		
--	---	--	---	---	---	--	--

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

		<p>curriculum/ framework as evident by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Walkthroughs looking for pacing and fidelity of implementation •Coach/teacher conversations •Student samples and PLC logs <p>Action 4: At the end of the unit of instruction, teachers give a curriculum/ framework common assessment and bring results to the PLC meeting. In PLCs, teachers/ coaches analyze the assessment results.</p> <p>Action 5: In PLCs, teacher/coaches develop a plan to act on the data. The plan will address the needs of struggling learners and the needs of students who have already mastered the standards taught.</p>					
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

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

<p>Writing/LA Goal #1: In grades 6-8, the percentage of All Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writing 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>70% (292)</p>	<p>75% (313)</p>					
		<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	
		<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	

Writing/Language Arts Professional Development

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

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

Writing Strategies	6-8	LA SAL PLC Facilitators	Language Arts Teachers	PLCs: On-going -Demonstration Classrooms	Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations	Administration Team LA SAL
Rubric Training for Embedded Assessments	6-8	LA SAL PLC Facilitators	Language Arts Teachers	4 Department meetings across September and October, 2011	Shared scoring among PLC	Administration Team LA SAL
Holistic Scoring Training	6-8	District Trainers LA SAL PLC Facilitators	Language Arts Teachers	4 Department meetings across September and October, 2011	Shared scoring among PLC	Administration Team LA SAL
Metacognitive Reflection	6-8	LA SAL/PLC Facilitators	Language Arts Teachers	October, 2010 On-going reflection at PLCs	Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations	Administration Team LA SAL
Student Engagement	6-8	LA SAL PLC Facilitators	Language Arts Teachers	-PLCs: On-going -Demonstration Classrooms -Book Study on <i>Teach Like A Champion</i>	Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations	Administration Team LA SAL
Higher Order Thinking	6-8	LA SAL PLC Facilitators	Language Arts Teachers	-PLCs: On-going -Demonstration Classrooms	Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations	Administration Team LA SAL
Differentiated Instruction	6-8		Language Arts Teachers	-PLCs: On-going -Demonstration Classrooms -Book study on <i>Successful Teaching in The Differentiated Classroom</i>	Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations	Administration Team LA SAL
Writing Strategies	6-8	LA SAL PLC Facilitators	Language Arts Teachers	PLCs: On-going -Demonstration Classrooms	Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations	Administration Team LA SAL

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

Attendance Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance						
Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		
1. Attendance	1.1. •Need to develop a system for monitoring and intervening with student attendance concerns. •Need to get parents involved with attendance concerns early and provide resources/support to assist with the needs of students.	1.1. The teacher will communicate any pertinent information regarding student attendance to AP responsible for attendance and other appropriate personnel. Documentation will be maintained in the homeroom teachers attendance file.	1.1. AP will run Attendance/Tardy meetings every 20 days with appropriate reports -AP will maintain data base -Social Worker -Guidance Counselors	1.1. •Student Attendance Reports •District Attendance Reports •Parent Link Reports •Attendance Action Plans	1.1. •Homeroom Teacher Attendance Logs		

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

<p>Attendance Goal #1: -The attendance rate will increase from 92% in 2011-2012 to 95% in 2012-2013. -The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused absences throughout the school year will decrease from 182 in 2011-2012 to 164 in 2012-2013. -The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused tardies to school throughout the school year will decrease from 6 in 2011-2012 to 3 in 2012-2013.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u></p>					
	92%	95%					
	<p><u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u></p>					
	182	164					
	<p><u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u></p>					

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

	6	3					
		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
Attendance Plan	Administrators	AP	At Administrator staff meeting	August/September	Review plan and student data every 20 days	AP
EdLine	6-8	AP	As needed	On-going	Random check of EdLine postings	AP

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension						
---------------------------	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		
1. Suspension	i.1. There needs to be common school-wide expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior.	i.1 Tier 1: CHAMPS will be implemented to address the school-wide rules and expectations and classroom management. Training provided to staff in methods for teaching and reinforcing the school-wide rules and expectations..	i.1. Administration - PSLT team.	i.1. Administration along with PSLT team will review data on Office Discipline Referrals ODRs and out of school suspensions monthly.	i.1. Suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data		

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

<p>Suspension Goal #1:</p> <p>-The total number of In-School Suspensions will decrease from 619 in 2011-2012 to 557 in 2012- 2013.</p> <p>-The total number of students receiving In-School Suspension will decrease from 279 in 2011-2012 to 252 in 2011-2012.</p> <p>-The total number of Out-of-Suspensions (including ATOSS) will decrease from 549 in 2011-2012 to 494 in 2012-2013.</p> <p>-The total number of students receiving Out-of-School Suspension will decrease from 262 in 2011-2012 to 236 in 2012- 2013.</p>	<p><u>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u></p>					
	<p>619</p>	<p>557</p>					
	<p><u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u></p>					

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

	279	252					
	<u>2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>					
	549	494					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>					
	262	236					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
CHAMPS	6-8	CHAMPS Trainer	School Wide	Staff Development	Classroom walkthroughs looking for implementation of the strategies	Principal and Assistant Principal

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		
1. Dropout Prevention <u>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</u> <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
N/A	<u>2012 Current Dropout Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*</u>					
	<u>2012 Current Graduation Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*</u>					

		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Title I Schools – Please see the Parent Information Notebook (PIN) to view a copy of the Title I PIP.

Parent Involvement Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement						
-----------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		
1. Parent Involvement <u>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</u>	1.1.	1.1. See school PIP	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
	<u>2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*</u>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Parent Involvement Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		
2. Parent Involvement <u>Parent Involvement Goal #2:</u>	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		

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

N/A	<u>2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*</u>					
		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	
		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	

Parent Involvement Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity <small>Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.</small>						
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
To implement effective parent involvement strategies in compliance with NCLB	Title I Parent Involvement Requirements	Title I District Staff	School-wide	October	Parent Involvement Attestation Letter	Principal

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Health and Fitness Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		
1. Health and Fitness Goal	1.1.	1. Middle School students will engage in the equivalent of one class period per day of physical education for one semester of each year in grades 6 through 8	1.APC Guidance	1.Checking student schedules	1.		

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

<p>Health and Fitness Goal #1:</p> <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 <u> 27 </u>% on the Pretest to <u> 30 </u>% on the Posttest.</p> <p>Schools will enter the data after the Pretest and Posttest. Make sure there is at least a 10% between the Pretest and Posttest.</p>	<p>2012 Current Level :*</p>						
	<p>27%</p>						
			<p>2. Principal’s designee.</p>	<p>2. Data on the number of students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ)</p>	<p>2. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	
			<p>3. Physical Education Teacher</p>	<p>3. Classroom walk-throughs Class schedules</p>	<p>3. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	

Health and Fitness Goals Professional Development

<p>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</p>						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

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

Continuous Improvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

<p>1. Continuous Improvement Goal</p>	<p>1.1. Having teachers meet in PLC groups and co-plan with student achievement in mind.</p>	<p>1.1. Use PLC's to encourage meeting and discussions on student performance.</p>	<p>1.1. PLC logs</p>	<p>1.1. Administration reviews PLC Logs at the end of each nine weeks</p>	<p>1.1. SCIP</p>		
<p><u>Continuous Improvement Goal #1:</u> Based on the 2011-2012 School Climate and Perception survey for Instructional Staff, the percentage of teachers who strongly agree with the indicator "The teachers at this school focus on improving student achievement" (under commitment to continuous improvement) was 21%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level :*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level :*</u></p>					
	<p>21%</p>	<p>45%</p>					
		<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	
		<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	

Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development

<p>Professional Development (PD) aligned with</p>						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

NEW Reading Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

<p>A. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring proficient in reading (Levels 4-9).</p>	<p>A.1.</p>	<p>A.1. See Reading Goal 5d</p>	<p>A.1.</p>	<p>A.1.</p>	<p>A.1.</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal A:</u> The percentage of students scoring level 4 - 9 on the 2013 Reading Florida Alternative Assessment will increase from 77% to 82%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>77%</p>	<p>82%</p>					
		<p>A.2.</p>	<p>A.2.</p>	<p>A.2.</p>	<p>A.2.</p>	<p>A.2.</p>	
		<p>A.3.</p>	<p>A.3.</p>	<p>A.3.</p>	<p>A.3.</p>	<p>A.3.</p>	

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

<p>B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.</p>	<p>B.1.</p>	<p>B.1. See Reading Goal 5d</p>	<p>B.1.</p>	<p>B.1.</p>	<p>B.1.</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal B:</u> The percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 Reading Florida Alternative Assessment will increase from 17% to 22%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>17%</p>	<p>22%</p>					
		<p>B.2.</p>	<p>B.2.</p>	<p>B.2.</p>	<p>B.2.</p>	<p>B.2.</p>	
		<p>B.3.</p>	<p>B.3.</p>	<p>B.3.</p>	<p>B.3.</p>	<p>B.3.</p>	

NEW Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

<p>CELLA Goals</p>	<p>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition</p>					
---------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

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	
C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/ Speaking.	1.1.	1.1. See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	
CELLA Goal #C: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 CELLA Listening/Speaking will increase from 57% to 62%	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</u>					
	57%					
		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	

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

<p>D. Students scoring proficient in Reading.</p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1. See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4</p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1.</p>	
<p><u>CELLA Goal #D:</u> The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 CELLA Reading will increase from 23% to 28%</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :</u></p>					
	<p>23%</p>					
		<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>
		<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>
<p>Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p>Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	<p>Student Evaluation Tool</p>	

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

E. Students scoring proficient in Writing.	2.1.	2.1. See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	
CELLA Goal #E: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 CELLA Writing will increase from 21% to 26%	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u>					
	21%					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

NEW Math Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

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

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

<p>F. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at in mathematics (Levels 4-9).</p>	<p>F.1.</p>	<p>F.1. See Math Goal 5d</p>	<p>F.1.</p>	<p>F.1.</p>	<p>F.1.</p>		
<p>Mathematics Goal F: The percentage of students scoring level 4 - 9 on the 2013 Math Florida Alternative Assessment will increase from 80% to 85%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>80%</p>	<p>85%</p>					
		<p>F.2.</p>	<p>F.2.</p>	<p>F.2.</p>	<p>F.2.</p>	<p>F.2.</p>	
		<p>F.3.</p>	<p>F.3.</p>	<p>F.3.</p>	<p>F.3.</p>	<p>F.3.</p>	

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

<p>G. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.</p>	G.1.	<p>G.1. See Math Goal 5d</p>	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.		
<p>Mathematics Goal G: The percentage of students scoring learning gains on the 2013 Math Florida Alternative Assessment will increase from 16% to 21%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>16%</p>	<p>21%</p>					
		G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	
		G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	

NEW Science Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

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

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

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

<p>J. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at proficient in science (Levels 4-9).</p>	<p>J.1. -Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs To address this barrier, the APC will put a system in place for this school year.</p>	<p>J.1.Strategy SWD student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations. -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons</p>	<p>J.1. Who Principal, Site Administrator, Assistance Principal How IEP Progress Reports reviewed by APC</p>	<p>J.1.Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/ courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction</p>	<p>J.1.</p>		
<p>Science Goal J: The percentage of students scoring level 4 - 9 on the 2013Science Florida Alternative Assessment will increase from 73% to 78%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>73%</p>	<p>78%</p>					

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

		J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	
		J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	

NEW Writing Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

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

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

<p>M. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing (Levels 4-9).</p>	<p>M.1. -Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs To address this barrier, the APC will put a system in place for this school year.</p>	<p>M.1. Strategy SWD student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations. -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/ SWD strategies and modifications into lessons.</p>	<p>M.1. Who Principal, Site Administrator, Assistance Principal How IEP Progress Reports reviewed by APC</p>	<p>M.1. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/ courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>M.1. On-going writing prompts and assessments</p>		
<p><u>Writing Goal M:</u> The percentage of students scoring level 4 - 9 on the 2013 Writing Florida Alternative Assessment will increase from 64% to 69%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>64%</p>	<p>69%</p>					
		<p>M.2.</p>	<p>M.2.</p>	<p>M.2.</p>	<p>M.2.</p>	<p>M.2.</p>	

		M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	
--	--	------	------	------	------	------	--

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

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

STEM Professional Development

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

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

Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Project-based learning	6-8	SALs	Science, math, ELA and technology teachers PLCs	On-going	Administrator walk-throughs	Administration

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

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

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

<p><u>CTE Goal #1:</u></p> <p>Increase the number of Career Technical Student Organization chapters in 2012-2013. (FBLA and FCCLA)</p> <p>Increase the student membership in 2012-2013.</p>	1.1.	1.1. Increase student participation in CTSO competitions/events.	1.1. CTE Teachers	1.1. Aggregate and analyze the data every quarter to develop next steps	1.1. Log of number of CTSO events Log of number of students who attend CTSO events
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

<p>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</p> <p>Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.</p>						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Establishing or growing a CTSO.	6-8	District	CTE Teachers	October, 2012	Log of events and attendance	CTE Contact Teacher

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

Yes No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.
The school will continue to work to balance employee and non-school board representation.

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
Parent Involvement	Gift Cards for drawings during Parent Involvement Day	275.00	275.00
Parent Involvement	Food for Parent Involvement Day	350.00	336.23
Parent Involvement	Food for Parent Breakfast	120.00	109.17
Parent Involvement	Gift cards for moms and dads	160.00	160.00
Parent Involvement	Books from Barnes and Noble	100.00	81.39
Parent Involvement	Food and gifts for parent mornings	300.00	294.55

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

Reading Goal #3 Mathematics Goal #3 Science Goal #1 Writing Goal #2	Trophies for students meeting academic goals. Clarifying details: Vendors include Rainbow Engraving.	1200.00	1183.50
Student Incentive	Giunta Store	500.00	444.25
Final Amount Spent	2884.09		