# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# School Improvement Plan (SIP)
# Form SIP-1

**2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

# PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

| | |
|---|---|
| School Name:  Witter Elementary | District Name:  Hillsborough |
| Principal:  Susan Persbacker | Superintendent:  MaryEllen Elia |
| SAC Chair:  Debbie Scibilia | Date of School Board Approval: |

## <u>Student Achievement Data:</u>

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

## <u>Highly Qualified Administrators</u>

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

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | Number of Years at Current School | Number of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels,  Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Principal | Susan Persbacker | MaED Educational Leadership Reading, ESOL | 7 | 7 | 11/12: D 10/11:  C 85% AYP 09/10:  C  82% AYP 08/09:  A 82% AYP |
| Assistant Principal | Dina Myers | MaED Educational Leadership Reading, ESOL | 6 | 1 | 11/12: D 10/11:  C 85% AYP 09/10:  C  82% AYP 08/09:  A 82% AYP |

# **Highly Qualified Instructional Coaches**

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

| Subject Area | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | Number of Years at Current School | Number of Years as an Instructional Coach | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels,  Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reading | Deborah Scibilia | MS Ed Lead BA Elem 1 – 6 ESOL | 4 | 4 | 11/12: D<br>10/11:  C 85% AYP<br>09/10:  C  82% AYP<br>08/09: A 82% AYP |
| Reading | Kim Billett | BA Educ | 7 | 7 | 11/12: D<br>10/11:  C 85% AYP<br>09/10:  C  82% AYP<br>08/09: A 82% AYP |
| Reading | Jennifer Penney | BA Educ MS Reading EdS Ed. Leadership ESOL | 2 | 4 | 11/12: D<br>10/11:  D  77% AYP – previous school James Elem.<br>09/10:  C  79% AYP<br>08/09:  B  100% AYP |
| Reading AIS | Cynthia Harnest | BSJ Journalism MS Reading ESOL Certifications: Elementary, Primary, Reading, English, Journalism, and Educational Media Specialist | 5 | 5 | 11/12 ⎤  Peer Evaluator<br>10/11 ⎦   for 2 years<br>09/10:  C  79% AYP<br>08/09:  B  100% AYP |
| Science | Jennifer Livornese-Whalen | MaED Elem. MaED ESE ESOL, ESE, Gifted, Soc. St. Gr 5 - 9 | 5 | 3 | 11/12: D<br>10/11:  C 85% AYP<br>09/10:  C  82% AYP<br>08/09: A 82% AYP |
| Technology | John Volpe | BA ESOL | 7 | 7 | 11/12: D<br>10/11:  C 85% AYP<br>09/10:  C  82% AYP<br>08/09: A 82% AYP |

| Behavior | Tonya Brinkley | MA Elem Ed ESE, ESOL | 6 | 2 | 11/12: D 10/11:  C 85% AYP 09/10:  C  82% AYP 08/09: A 82% AYP |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

## Highly Qualified Teachers

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

| Description of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date | Not Applicable (If not, please explain why) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1.   Teacher Interview Day | General Directors | June 2012 | |
| 2.   Recruitment Fairs | Supervisor of Teacher Recruitment | On-going | |
| 3.   Regular meetings of new teachers with Principal | Principal | On-going | |
| 4.   Partnering new teachers with veteran teachers | Assistant Principal | On-going | |
| 5.   College campus Job Fairs and e-recruiting at Universities | Guidance Counselor | April 2012 | |
| 6.   Monthly meetings | Assistant Principal | Monthly | |
| 7.   Mentor program | Principal | Ongoing | |
| 8.   Performance Pay | General Director of Federal Programs | August 2012 | |

## Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| • Teachers<br>  2 out of field – need ESOL Endorsement | Depending on the needs of the teacher, one or more of the following strategies are implemented.<br>**Administrators**<br>Meet with the teachers four times per year to discuss progress on:<br>• Completing classes need for certification<br>**Subject Area Leader/PLC**<br>• 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 53 | 4% (2) | 17% (9) | 44% (23) | 37% (19) | 54% (28) | 96% (51) | 6% (3) | 8% (4) | 73% (38) |

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Patricia Guglielmi | Lacey Prine, School Psychologist | Guidance Counselor; RtI Leader | Planning, observations/bi-weekly meetings |
| Tonya Brinkley | Erin Saunders, School Social Worker | Behavior Specialist, RtI Leader | |
| | | | |

## Additional Requirements

## Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

| |
|---|
| Title I, Part A |
| Services are provided to ensure students who need additional remediation are provided support through: after school, Saturday, and summer programs, quality teachers through professional development, content resource teachers, focus groups, 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 |
| NA |
| Head Start |
| We currently have three community Head Start Programs servicing approximately 60 students, one of which is a Voluntary Pre-K program. |

| |
|---|
| Adult Education<br>NA |
| Career and Technical Education<br>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. |
| Job Training<br>NA |
| Other<br>NA |

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

| **School-Based MTSS/RtI Team** |
|---|
| Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.<br><br>Susan Persbacker, Principal<br><br>Dina Myers, Assistant Principal<br><br>Lacey Prine, School Psychologist<br><br>Erin Saunders, School Social Worker<br><br>Patricia Guglielmi, Guidance Counselor<br><br>Kimberly Billett, Reading Resource<br><br>Tonya Brinkley, Behavior Specialist<br><br>Jennifer Livornese-Whalen, Science Resource<br><br>Cherilyn Garcia-Soto, English Language Learners (ELL)<br><br>Cindy Harnest, Academic Intervention Specialist<br><br>Jennifer Penney, Reading Coach<br><br>Natalie Reyes, ESE Specialist<br><br>Debbie Scibilia, SAC Chair |
| 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 core Leadership Team is to:
1. Review school-wide assessment data on an ongoing basis in order to identify instructional needs at all grade levels.
2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels.
3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains.
4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams.


Our Core Leadership Team meets bi-weekly and uses the problem solving model/process to:

-Oversee a multi-tiered model of service delivery (Core/Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3)
-Determine scheduling needs, curriculum and intervention resources
-Review/interpret student data (Academic and Behavior)
-Organizes and supports systematic data collection
- Determine the school-wide professional development needs of faculty and staff and arrange trainings aligned with the SIP goals

Our Leadership Team also works to strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction through the:

- implementation and support of PLCs
- use of school-based Reinforcement Calendars, Mini Lessons and Mini Assessments
- use of Common Assessments given every 6-9 weeks
- implementation of research-based, scientifically validated instruction/interventions.
-Support of the planning, implementing, and evaluating the outcomes of supplemental and intensive interventions in conjunction with PLCs and Specialty PSLT.
-Working collaboratively with the PLCs in the implementation of the C-CIM (Core Continuous Improvement Model) on core curriculum material.
-Coordinating/collaborating/integrating with other working committees, such as the Literacy Leadership Team (which is charged with developing a plan for embedding/integrating reading and writing strategies across all other content areas).


Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?
-The Chair of SAC is a member of the Leadership Team/PSLT.
-The administration, leadership team, teachers and SAC are involved in the School Improvement Plan development and monitoring throughout the school year.
-The School Improvement Plan is the working document that guides the work of the Leadership Team and all teacher teams. The large part of the work of

the team is outlined in the Expected Improvements/Problem Solving Process sections (and related professional development plans) for school-wide goals in Reading, Math, Writing, Science, Attendance and Suspension/Behavior.

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

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

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

Use the problem-solving model when analyzing data:

What is the problem? (Problem Identification)

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

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

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

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

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

-Develop and target interventions based on confirmed hypotheses.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

|  |
| --- |
| **MTSS Implementation** |

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

The following table contains a summary of the assessments used to measure student progress in core, supplemental and intensive instruction and their sources and management:

**Core Curriculum (Tier 1)**

| Data Source | Database | Person (s) Responsible |
|---|---|---|
| FCAT released tests | School Generated Excel Database | Reading Coach/ AP |
| Baseline and Midyear District Assessments | Scantron Achievement Series<br>Data Wall | Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers |
| District generated assessments from the Office of Assessment and Accountability<br>*Formatives for Reading and Math*<br>*Beginning and End of Year for Science* | Scantron Achievement Series<br>Data Wall | Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers |
| FAIR | Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network<br>Data Wall | Reading Coach/ Reading Resource Teacher/Reading PLC Facilitator |
| CELLA | Viewpoint (IPT) | ELL PSLT Representative |
| Teachers' common core curriculum assessments on units of instruction/big ideas. | Ed-Line<br>PLC logs | Individual Teachers/ Team Leaders/ PLC Facilitators/AP |
| DRA-2 | School Generated Excel Database | Individual Teacher |
| Reports on Demand/Crystal Reports | District Generated Database | Leadership Team/AP |

**Supplemental/Intensive Instruction (Tiers 2 and 3)**

| Data Source | Database | Person (s) Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|
| Extended Learning Program (ELP)* *(see below)*<br>Ongoing Progress Monitoring (mini-assessments and other assessments from adopted curriculum resource materials)<br>Teacher-created common mini assessments | School Generated Database in Excel | Leadership Team/ ELP Facilitator |
| Differentiated mini assessments based on core curriculum assessments. | Individual teacher data base<br>PLC/Department data base | Individual Teachers/PLCs |
| FAIR OPM | School Generated Database in Excel | Leadership Team/Reading Coach |
| Other Curriculum Based Measurement | easyCBM<br>School Generated Database in Excel | Leadership Team/PLCs/Individual Teachers |
| Research-based Computer-assisted Instructional Programs:<br>Myon<br>Successmaker<br>iStation | Assessments included in computer-based programs | PLCs/Individual Teachers/Technology Resource Teacher |

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

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

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

Describe plan to support MTSS.
Response to Intervention (RtI) has also been described in Florida as a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) for providing high quality instruction and intervention matched to student needs using learning rate over time and level of performance to inform instructional decisions.  In order to support MTSS in our schools, we will:
- Consistently promote the shared vision of one system meeting the needs of ALL students with MTSS as the platform for integrating all school initiatives (i.e., PLC, PSLT, Steering, and SAC meetings, lesson study, school-wide behavior management plans).
- Provide designated school personnel with the requisite knowledge and experience to support coordination and implementation of MTSS.
- Provide continued training and support to all school based personnel in problem solving, responding to student data and the use of a systematic method to increase student achievement.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

| School-Based Literacy Leadership Team |
| --- |
| Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). |
| Susan Persbacker, Principal |
| Dina Myers, Assistant Principal |
| Natalie Reyes, ESE Specialist |
| Debbie Scibilia,  Reading Resource |

Jennifer Penney, Reading Coach

Kimberly Billett, Reading Resource

Cindy Harnest, Academic Intervention Specialist

Roxane Lozano, Media Specialist

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).
The LLT is a subset of the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The team provides leadership for the implementation of the reading strategies on the SIP.

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

The principal also ensures that the LLT monitors reading data, identifies school-wide and individual teachers' reading-focused instructional strengths and weaknesses, and creates 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
- Small group interventions with third, fourth, and fifth grade students
- Higher order critical thinking and written response.

*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.

In Hillsborough County Public schools, all kindergarten children are assessed for Kindergarten Readiness using the FLKRS (Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screener.) This state-selected assessment contains a subset of the Early Childhood Observation System and the first five measures of the Florida Assessments in Reading (FAIR). The instruments used in the screening are based upon the Florida Voluntary Prekindergarten (VPK) Education Standards. Parents are provided with a letter from Dr. Eric. J. Smith, Florida Commissioner of Education, explaining the assessments. Teachers will meet with parents after the assessments have been completed to review student performance.

Data from the FAIR will be used to assist teachers in creating homogeneous groupings for small group reading instruction. Children entering Kindergarten may have benefited from the Hillsborough County Public Schools' Voluntary Prekindergarten Program. This program is offered at elementary schools in the summer and during the school year in selected Head Start classrooms. Students in the VPK program are given a district-created screening that looks at letter names, letter sounds phonemic awareness and number sense. This assessment is administered at the start and end of the VPK program. A copy of these assessments is mailed to the school in which the child will be registered for kindergarten, enabling the child's teacher to have a better understanding of the child's abilities. Parent Involvement events for Transitioning Children into Kindergarten include Kindergarten RoundUp. This event provides parents with an opportunity to meet the teachers and hear about the academic program. Parents are encouraged to complete the school registration procedure at this time to ensure that the child is able to start school on time.

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

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

## *High Schools Only

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

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

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

## Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.
Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the 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<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
| **1. FCAT 2.0:  Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5).**<br><br>Reading Goal #1:<br><br>The percentage of students scoring Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 35% to 55%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>**35%** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>**55%** | 1.1.<br>-Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development.  Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13.<br>-Training all content area teachers | 1.1.<br>**Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas**<br>Reading comprehension improves when **students are engaged in grappling with complex text**.  Teachers need to understand how to **select/identify** complex text, **shift** the amount of informational text used in the content curricula, and **share** complex texts with all students.  **All content area teachers are responsible for implementation.**<br><br>**Action Steps**<br>Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans. | 1.1.<br>Who<br>-Principal<br>-AP<br>-Reading Coach<br>-Reading Resource<br>-PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like subjects<br><br>How<br>-Reading PLC Logs<br>-Language Arts PLC Logs<br>-Social Studies PLC Logs<br>-PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete.<br>-Administration and coach rotate through PLCs looking for complex text discussion.<br>-Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis. | 1.1.<br>Teacher Level<br>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.<br>-Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal.<br>PLC Level<br>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses.<br>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.<br>-For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.<br>Leadership Team Level<br>-PLC facilitator shares SMART Goal data with the Leadership Team.<br>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. | 1.1.<br>3x per year<br>- FAIR<br>-DRA 2<br>-Formative Assessments<br><br>During the Grading Period<br>- Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)<br>-Running Records<br>-Reader's Response Notebooks |
| | | | 1.2. Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs | 1.2 **Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas** | 1.2.<br>Who<br>-Principal<br>-AP | 1.2.<br>Teacher Level<br>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this | 1.2.<br>3x per year<br>- FAIR<br>-DRA 2 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13.<br>-Training all content area teachers | Teachers need to understand how to **design** and **deliver** a **close reading** lesson. Student reading comprehension improves when students are engaged in close reading instruction using complex text. Specific close reading strategies include: 1) multiple readings of a passage 2) asking higher-order, text-dependent questions, 3) writing in response to reading and 4) engaging in text-based class discussion. **All content area teachers are responsible for implementation.**<br><br>**Action Steps**<br>Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans. | -Reading Coach<br>-Reading Resource Leaders<br>-PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like subjects<br><br>How<br>-Reading Logs<br>-Language Arts Logs<br>-Social Studies Logs<br>-PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete.<br>-PLCs receive feedback on their logs. Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis.<br>-Reading Coach observations and walk-throughs<br>-Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency.<br>-Administrator and Reading Coach aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation | knowledge to drive future instruction.<br>-Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system.<br>-Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal.<br>PLC Level<br>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses.<br>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.<br>- For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.<br>Leadership Team Level<br>-PLC facilitator shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.<br>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. | -Formative Assessments<br><br><u>During the Grading Period</u><br>- Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks) |
| 1.3. -Time<br>-Sidebar conservations<br>-Off topic discussions<br>-Teachers are at varying skills with PLC Collaboration. | 1.3.<br>**PLC Collaboration using the Plan-Do-Check-Act Model**<br>Instruction improves when teachers use data driven dialogue to improve student achievement. Teachers need to participate in grade level and/or like course PLCs once a week with well-defined norms, focused | 1.3.<br>Who<br>-Principal<br>-AP<br>-Reading Coach<br>-Reading Resource<br>-PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses<br><br>How<br>-PLCS turn their logs into | 1.3.<br>Teacher Level<br>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.<br>-Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system.<br>-Teachers use the on-line grading system data to | 1.3.<br><u>3x per year</u><br>- FAIR<br>-DRA 2<br>-Formative Assessments<br><br><u>During the Grading Period</u><br>- Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks) |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | agendas, and data. Participants should come prepared and be actively involved in the discussions. **All content area teachers are responsible for implementation.**<br><br>**Action Steps**<br>Action steps for this strategy are outlined on school "Looking Ahead" action plans. | administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis. -Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency. -Administrator aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation -Administrator holds individuals accountable for implementation of strategy. | calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. | |
| | | 1.4 –Time<br>- Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction<br>-Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Behavior Management | 1.4<br>**Acting on the Data through Differentiated Instruction**<br>Instruction improves when teachers use Differentiated Instruction in their classrooms.  Teachers need to participate in grade level and/or like course PLCs once a week with well-defined norms, focused agendas, and data. Participants should come prepared and be actively involved in the discussions. Teachers then instruct using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions. **All content area teachers are responsible for** | 1.4<br>Who<br>-Principal<br>-AP<br>-Reading Coach<br>-Reading Resource<br>-PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like subjects<br><br>How<br>-PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis.<br>-Administrative walk- | 1.4<br>Teacher Level<br>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.<br>-Teachers discuss use of DI in the classroom<br>-Teachers seek assistance from other teachers in order to implement DI in the classroom<br>- PLC Level<br>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.<br>- PLCs assist teachers who need help incorporating DI strategies..<br>Leadership Team Level<br>-PLC facilitator shares data | 1.4<br>3x per year<br>- FAIR<br>-DRA 2<br>-Formative Assessments<br><br>During the Grading Period<br>- Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks) |

| | | | implementation. | throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency. | with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | **Action Steps** Action steps for this strategy are outlined on school "Looking Ahead" action plans. | -Administrator aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation -Administrator holds individuals accountable for implementation of strategy. | -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.** | | | 2.1. | 2.1. <br><br> See Goal 1 | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| Reading Goal #2: <br><br> The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 15% to 20%. . | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* <br><br> **15%** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <br><br> **20%** | | | | | |
| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |

| 3. **FCAT 2.0:** Points for students making Learning Gains in reading. | | | 3.1. | 3.1.<br><br>See Goals 1 | 3.1. | 3.1. | 3.1. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reading Goal #3:<br><br>Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 61 points to 65 points. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>**61 points** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>**70 points** | | | | | |
| | | | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. |
| | | | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3..3. | 3.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>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.<br><br>Reading Goal #4:<br><br>Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 62 points to 66 points. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>**62 points** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>**70 points** | 4.1.<br>-Scheduling time for the principal/APC to meet with the academic coach on a regular basis.<br>-Teachers willingness to accept support from the coach. | 4.1.<br>**Strategy/Task**<br>Student achievement improves through **teachers' collaboration with the academic coach** in all content areas.<br><br>**Actions/Details**<br>*Academic Coach*<br>-The academic coach and administration conducts one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the teacher's student past and/or present data.<br>-The academic coach rotates through all subjects' PLCs to:<br>--Facilitate lesson planning that embeds rigorous tasks<br>--Facilitate development, writing, selection of higher- | 4.1.<br>Who<br>Administration<br><br>How-<br>-Review of coach's log<br>-Review of coach's log of support to targeted teachers.<br>-Administrative walk-throughs of coaches working with teachers (either in classrooms, PLCs or planning sessions) | 4.1.<br>-Tracking of coach's participation in PLCs.<br>-Tracking of coach's interactions with teachers (planning, co-teaching, modeling, de-debriefing, professional development, and walk throughs)<br>-Administrator-Instructional Coach meetings to review log and discuss action plan for coach for the upcoming two weeks | 4.1.<br>3x per year<br>- FAIR<br>-DRA 2<br>-Formative Assessments<br><br>During the Grading Period<br>- Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit) |

order, text-dependent questions/activities, with an emphasis on Webb's Depth of Knowledge question hierarchy
--Facilitate the identification, selection, development of rigorous core curriculum common assessments
--Facilitate core curriculum assessment data analysis
--Facilitate the planning for interventions and the intentional grouping of the students.
-Using walk-through data, the academic coach and administration identify teachers for support in co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing and debriefing.
-The academic coach trains each subject area PLC on how to facilitate their own PLC using structured protocols.
-Throughout the school year, the academic 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.

*Leadership Team and Coach*
-The academic coach meets with the principal/APC to map out a high-level summary plan of action for

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | the school year.<br>-Every two weeks, the academic coach meets with the principal/APC to:<br>--Review log and work accomplished and<br>--Develop a detailed plan of action for the next two weeks. | | | |
| | | | 4.2.<br>-The Extended Learning Program (ELP) does not always target the specific skill weaknesses of the students or collect data on an ongoing basis.<br>-Not always a direct correlation between what the students is missing in the regular classroom and the instruction received during ELP.<br>-Minimal communication between regular and ELP teachers. | 4.2.<br>Strategy<br>Students' reading comprehension improves through receiving **ELP supplemental instruction on targeted skills** that are not at the mastery level.<br><br>**Action Steps**<br>-Classroom teachers communicate with the ELP teachers regarding specific skills that students have not mastered.<br>-ELP teachers identify lessons for students that target specific skills that are not at the mastery level.<br>-Students attend ELP sessions.<br>-Progress monitoring data collected by the ELP teacher on a weekly or biweekly basis and communicated back to the regular classroom teacher.<br>-When the students have mastered the specific skill, they are exited from the ELP program. | 4.2.<br>Who<br>Administrators<br><br>How Monitored<br>Administrators will review the communication logs and data collection used between teachers and ELP teachers outlining skills that need remediation. | 4.2.<br>Supplemental data shared with leadership and classroom teachers who have students. | 4.2.<br>Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM)<br>*(From District RtI/Problem Solving Facilitators.)* |
| | | | 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<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target | | | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| **5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.**<br><u>Reading Goal #5:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| **5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity** (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**<br><br><u>Reading Goal #5A:</u><br><br>The percentage of White students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 35% to 55%.<br><br>The percentage of Black students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 29% to 43%. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u><br><br>White: 35%<br>Black:29%<br>Hispanic:41%<br>Asian: NA<br>American Indian: NA | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u><br><br>White: 55%<br>Black:43%<br>Hispanic:53%<br>Asian: NA<br>American Indian: NA | 5A.1.<br>White:<br>Black:<br>Hispanic:<br>Asian:<br>American Indian: | 5A.1.<br><br>See Goals 1 & 4 | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | |
| The percentage of Hispanic students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 41% to 53%. | | | 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<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check<br>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.**<br><u>Reading Goal #5B:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | |

| The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 35% to 49%. | **35%** | **49%** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. |
| | | | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **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.**<br><br>Reading Goal #5C:<br><br>The percentage of ELL students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 33% to 47%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>**33%** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>**47%** | 5C.1.<br>Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our student is of high priority.<br>-The majority of the teachers are unfamiliar with this strategy. To address this barrier, the school will schedule professional development delivered by the school's ERT.<br>-Teachers implementation of CALLA is not consistent across core courses.<br>-ELLs at varying levels of English language acquisition and acculturation is not consistent across core courses.<br>-Administrators at varying skill levels regarding use of CALLA/ in order to effectively conduct a CALLA fidelity check | 5C.1<br>ELLs (LYs/LFs) comprehension of course content/standard improves through participation in the **Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA)** strategy across Reading, Language Arts, Math, Social Studies and Science.<br><br>**Action Steps**<br>-ESOL Resource Teacher (ERT) provides professional development to all content area teachers on how to embed CALLA into core content lessons.<br>-ERT models lessons using CALLA.<br>-ERT observes content area teachers using CALLA and provides feedback, coaching and support.<br>-District Resource Teachers (DRTs) provide professional development to all administrators on how to conduct walk-through fidelity checks for use of | 5C.1.<br>Who<br>-School based Administrators<br>-District Resource Teachers<br>-ESOL Resource Teachers<br><br>How<br>-Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the walkthrough form from:<br>The CALLA Handbook, p. 101, Table 5.4 "Checklist for Evaluating CALLA Instruction | 5C.1.<br>Teacher Level<br>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.<br>-Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual ELL SMART Goal.<br>PLC Level<br>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL SMART goal data across all classes/courses.<br>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.<br>-ERTs meet with grade level PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data.<br>- For each class, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the ELL SMART Goal.<br>Leadership Team Level<br>-PLC facilitator shares ELL SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership | 5C.1<br>-FAIR<br>-CELLA<br>-Formative Assessments<br><br>During the Grading Period<br>-Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for ELL performance |

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

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | (DRTs) provide professional development to all administrators on how to conduct walk-through fidelity checks for use of A+ Rise strategies for ELLs. | | Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator shares ELL SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. -ERTs meet with RtI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs) | |
| | | 5C.3. -Lack of understanding teachers can provide ELL accommodations beyond FCAT testing. -Bilingual Education Paraprofessionals at varying levels of expertise in providing support. -Allocation of Bilingual Education Paraprofessional dependent on number of ELLs. -Administrators at varying levels of expertise in being familiar with the ELL guidelines and job responsibilities of ERT and Bilingual paraprofessional. | 5C.3. ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/standards improves through participation in the following **day-to-day accommodations on core content and district assessments across** Reading, LA, Math, Science, and Social Studies: 1. Extended time (lesson and assessments) 2. Small group testing 3. Para support (lesson and assessments) 4. Use of heritage language dictionary (lesson and assessments) | 5C.3. Who -School based Administrators -ESOL Resource Teachers How -Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the walk-throughs look for Committee Meeting Recommendations. In addition, tools from the RtI Handbook and ELL RtI Checklist, and ESOL Strategies Checklist can be used as walk-through forms. | 5C.3. Analyze core curriculum and district level assessments for ELL students. Correlate to accommodations to determine the most effective approach for individual students. | 5C.3. During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests |
| | | 5C.4 -Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our school is of high priority. -Teachers need support in drilling down their core assessments to the ELL level. | 5C.4 ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/standards improves in reading, language arts, math, science and social studies through teachers working collaboratively to focus on ELL student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act** | 5C.4 Who -School based Administrators -ESOL Resource Teachers -PLC Facilitators How PLC logs (with specific ELL information) for like | 5C.4 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual ELL | 5C.4 -FAIR -CELLA -Formative Assessments During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for ELL performance |

| | | | **model** to structure their way of work for ELL students.<br><br>Action Steps<br>-Teachers analyze CELLA data to identify ELL students who need assistance in the areas of listening/speaking, reading and writing.<br>-Teachers use time during PLCs to reinforce and strengthen targeted ELL effective teaching strategies (CALLA and A+ Rise) in the areas of listening/speaking, reading and writing.<br>-Teachers use time during PLCs to reinforce and strengthen targeted ELL Differentiated Instruction lessons using the district provided ELL Differentiated Instruction binders (provided by the ELL Department) in Reading, Language Arts, Math, Science and Social Studies.<br>-PLCs generate SMART goals for ELL students for upcoming units of instruction.<br>-PLCs/teachers plan for upcoming lessons/units using targeted CALLA and A+ Rise strategies and Differentiated Instruction strategies based on ELLs needs in the areas of listening/speaking, reading and writing.<br>-PLCs/teachers plan for accommodations for core curriculum content and assessment.<br>-When conducting data | courses/grades. | SMART Goal.<br>PLC Level<br>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL SMART goal data across all classes/courses.<br>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.<br>-ERTs meet with Reading, Language Arts, Social Studies and Science PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data.<br>-For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the ELL SMART Goal.<br>Leadership Team Level<br>-PLC facilitator shares ELL SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.<br>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.<br>-ERTs meet with RtI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs) | |

| | | | | analysis on core curriculum assessments, PLCs aggregate the ELL data. -Based on the data, PLCs/teachers plan interventions for targeted ELL students using the resources from CALLA, A+ Rise, and Differentiated instruction binders. | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.** | | | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. |
| Reading Goal #5D: The percentage of SWD students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from10% to 31%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* **10%** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **31%** | | | | | |
| | | | 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 |

| Differentiated Instruction | K – 5 | -District DRTs -Reading Coach -Reading Resource Teachers | All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs | On-going -Demonstration classrooms | Classroom walk-throughs | Administration Team Reading Coach |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The 3 S's of Complex Text: Selecting /Identifying Complex Text, Shifting to Increased Use of Informational Text, and Sharing of Complex Text with All Students (K-5) | K – 5 | Reading Coach and Reading Resource Teachers | All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs | On-going | Classroom walkthroughs | Administration Team Reading Coach |
| Identifying and Creating Text-Dependent Questions to Deepen Reading Comprehension (K-5) | K – 5 | Reading Coach and Reading Resource Teacher | All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs | On-going | Classroom walkthroughs | Administration Team Reading Coach |
| Designing and Delivering a Close Reading Lesson Using in-Depth Questioning (K-12) | K – 5 | Reading Coach and Reading Resource Teachers | All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs | On-going | Classroom walkthroughs | Administration Team Reading Coach |
| IEP Training | K – 5 | ESE Teachers | ESE Teachers General Ed Teachers PLCs | On-going | Case Manager | ESE Specialist |
| ELL Strategies | K – 5 | ERT | All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs | On-going | Classroom walkthroughs | Administrative Team |

*End of Reading Goals*

## Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

| Elementary School Mathematics Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
| **1. FCAT 2.0:** **Students scoring proficient in mathematics (Level 3-5).**<br><br>Mathematics Goal #1:<br><br>The percentage of students scoring Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 38 % to 50%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>**38%** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>**50%** | 1.1.<br>-Time<br>-Sidebar conservations<br>-Off topic discussions<br>-Teachers are at varying skills with PLC Collaboration. | 1.1.<br>**PLC Collaboration using the Plan-Do-Check-Act Model**<br>Instruction improves when teachers use data driven dialogue to improve student achievement. Teachers need to participate in grade level and/or like course PLCs once a week with well-defined norms, focused agendas, and data. Participants should come prepared and be actively involved in the discussions. **All content area teachers are responsible for implementation.**<br><br>**Action Steps**<br>Action steps for this strategy are outlined on school "Looking Ahead" action plans. | 1.1.<br>Who<br>-Principal<br>-AP<br>-Academic Coaches<br>-PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses<br><br>How<br>-PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete.<br>-PLCs receive feedback on their logs. Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis.<br>-Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency.<br>-Administrator aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation<br>-Administrator holds individuals accountable for implementation of strategy. | 1.1.<br>Teacher Level<br>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.<br>-Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system.<br>-Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal.<br>PLC Level<br>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses.<br>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.<br>- For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.<br>Leadership Team Level<br>-PLC facilitator shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.<br>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. | 1.1.<br>2-3x Per Year<br>District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing<br>Formative Assessments<br><br>During the Nine Weeks<br>-Chapter Tests<br>-Benchmark mini assessments |

| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | –Time<br>- Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction<br>-Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Behavior Management | **Acting on the Data through Differentiated Instruction**<br>Instruction improves when teachers use Differentiated Instruction in their classrooms. Teachers need to participate in grade level and/or like course PLCs once a week with well-defined norms, focused agendas, and data. Participants should come prepared and be actively involved in the discussions. Teachers then instruct using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions. **All content area teachers are responsible for implementation.**<br><br>**Action Steps**<br>1.Action steps for this strategy are outlined on school "Looking Ahead" action plans.<br>2. Problem of the day<br>3.First in Math Program | Who<br>-Principal<br>-AP<br>-Academic Coaches<br>-PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses<br><br>How<br>-PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis.<br>-Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency.<br>-Administrator aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation<br>-Administrator holds individuals accountable for implementation of strategy. | Teacher Level<br>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.<br>-Teachers discuss use of DI in the classroom<br>-Teachers seek assistance from other teachers in order to implement DI in the classroom<br>- PLC Level<br>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.<br>- PLCs assist teachers who need help incorporating DI strategies..<br>Leadership Team Level<br>-PLC facilitator shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.<br>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.<br>-Monthly meeting with district discussing data and strategies | 2-3x Per Year<br>District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing<br>Formative Assessments<br><br><br>During the Nine Weeks<br>-Chapter Tests<br>-Benchmark mini assessments |
| | | 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**<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics.** | | 2.1. | 2.1.<br><br># See Goal 1 | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |

| Mathematics Goal #2:<br><br>The percentage of students scoring Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 15% to 20%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* |
|---|---|---|
| | **15%** | **20%** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
|  |  |  | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **3. FCAT 2.0:  Points for students making learning gains in mathematics.** | | | 3.1. | 3.1. See Goal 1 | 3.1. | 3.1. | 3.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #3:  Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 40 points to 50 points. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* **40** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **50** |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. |
|  |  |  | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3..3. | 3.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **4. FCAT 2.0:  Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.** | | | 4.1. | 4.1. See Goal 1 | 4.1. | 4.1. | 4.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #4:  Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 55 points to 65 points. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* **55** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **65** |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. |

| | | | 4.3 | 4.3. | 4.3. | 4.3. | 4.3. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | |
| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target | | | **2011-2012** | **2012-2013** | **2013-2014** | **2014-2015** | **2015-2016** | **2016-2017** |
| **5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.** Mathematics Goal #5: | | | | | | | | |
| **5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity** (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics** Mathematics Goal #5A: The percentage of White students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Mathematics will increase from 47% to 68%. The percentage of Black students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Mathematics will increase from 36% to 44%. The percentage of Hispanic students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Mathematics will increase from 33% to 49%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* White: 47% Black:36% Hispanic:33% Asian: NA American Indian: NA | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White: 68% Black:44% Hispanic:49% Asian: NA American Indian: NA | 5A.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: | 5A.1. See Goal 1 | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | |
| | | | 5A.2. | 5A.2. | 5A.2. | 5A.2. | 5A.2. | |
| | | | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | |
| 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 | **Student Evaluation Tool** | |

| | | | | | effectiveness of strategy? | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.** | | | 5B.1. | 5B.1.<br><br>## See Goal1 | 5B.1. | 5B.1. |
| **Mathematics Goal #5B:**<br>The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Mathematics will increase from 37% to 48%.<br>. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>**37%** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>**48%** | | | | |
| | | | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. |
| | | | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.** | | | 5C.1.<br>-Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our student is of high priority.<br>-The majority of the math teachers are unfamiliar with this strategy.  To address this barrier, the school will schedule professional development delivered by the school's ERT.<br>-Math teachers implementation of CALLA is not consistent<br>-ELLs at varying levels of<br>English language | 5C.1.<br>ELLs (LYs/LFs) comprehension of course content/standard improves through participation in the **Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA)** strategy in math.<br><br>**Action Steps**<br>-ESOL Resource Teacher (ERT) provides professional development to all math area teachers on how to embed CALLA into core content lessons.<br>-ERT models lessons using CALLA.<br>-ERT observes content area teachers using CALLA and | 5C.1.<br>Who<br>-School based Administrators<br>-District Resource Teachers<br>-ESOL Resource Teachers<br><br>How<br>-Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the walkthrough form from:<br>The CALLA Handbook, p. 101, Table 5.4 "Checklist for Evaluating CALLA Instruction | 5C.1.<br>Teacher Level<br>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.<br>-Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual ELL SMART Goal.<br>PLC Level<br>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL SMART goal data across all classes/courses.<br>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.<br>-ERTs meet with Math PLCs | 5C.1.<br>2x per year<br>District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing<br>Formative Assessments (3X)<br><br>During the Grading Period<br>-Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit) |
| **Mathematics Goal #5C:**<br><br>The percentage of ELL students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Mathematics will increase from 38% to 47%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>**38%** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>**47%** | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | acquisition and acculturation is not consistent across core courses.<br>-Administrators at varying skill levels regarding use of CALLA/ in order to effectively conduct a CALLA fidelity check walk-through. | provides feedback, coaching and support.<br>-District Resource Teachers (DRTs) provide professional development to all administrators on how to conduct walk-through fidelity checks for use of CALLA.<br>-Math teachers set SMART goals for ELL students for upcoming core curriculum assessments.<br>-Math teachers administer and analyze ELLs.  In particular, teachers aggregate data to determine the performance of ELLs compared to the whole group.<br>-Based on data math teachers differentiate instruction to remediate/enhance instruction. | | on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data.<br>-For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the ELL SMART Goal.<br>Leadership Team Level<br>-PLC facilitator shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.<br>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.<br>-ERTs meet with RtI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs) | |
| | | | 5C.2.<br>-Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our student is of high priority.<br>-The majority of the math teachers are unfamiliar with this strategy.  To address this barrier, the school will schedule professional development delivered by the school's ERT.<br>-Math teachers implementation of A+ Rise is not consistent.<br>-Administrators at varying skill levels regarding use of A+ Rise in order to effectively conduct an | 5C.2.<br>ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/standards increases in math through the use of the district's on-line program **A+Rise** located on IDEAS under Programs for ELL.<br><br>**Action Steps**<br>-ESOL Resource Teacher (ERT) provides professional development to all math area teachers on how to access and use A+ Rise Strategies for ELLs at http://arises2s.com/s2s/ into math lessons.<br>- ERT models lessons using A+ Rise Strategies for ELLs. | 5C.2.<br>Who<br>-School based Administrators<br>-District Resource Teachers<br>-ESOL Resource Teachers<br><br>How<br>-Administrative and ERT walk-throughs looking for implementation of A+ Rise strategies. | 5C.2.<br>Teacher Level<br>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.<br>-Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual ELL SMART Goal.<br>PLC Level<br>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL SMART goal data across all classes/courses.<br>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.<br>-ERTs meet with Math PLCs on a rotating basis to assist | 5C.2.<br>2x per year<br>District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing<br>Formative Assessments (3X)<br><br>During the Grading Period<br>-Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests  with data aggregated for ELL performance |

| | | A+ Rise fidelity check walk-through. | - ERT observes content area teachers using A+Rise and provides feedback, coaching and support.<br>- District Resource Teachers (DRTs) provide professional development to all administrators on how to conduct walk-through fidelity checks for use of A+ Rise Strategies for ELLs. | | with the analysis of ELLs performance data.<br>-For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the ELL SMART Goal.<br><u>Leadership Team Level</u><br>-PLC facilitator shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.<br>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.<br>-ERTs meet with RtI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs) | |
| | | 5C.3.<br>-Lack of understanding that math teachers can provide ELL accommodations beyond FCAT testing.<br>-Bilingual Education Paraprofessionals at varying levels of expertise in providing heritage language support.<br>-Allocation of Bilingual Education Paraprofessional dependent on membership of ELLs.<br>-Administrators at varying levels of expertise in being familiar with the ELL Program guidelines and job responsibilities of ERT and Bilingual paraprofessional | 5C.3.<br>ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/standards improves through participation in the following **day-to-day accommodations on core content** and district assessments in math:<br>-Extended time (lesson and assessments)<br>-Small group testing<br>-Para support (lesson and assessments)<br>-Use of heritage language dictionary (lesson and assessments) | 5C.3.<br><u>Who</u><br>-School based Administrators<br>-ESOL Resource Teachers<br><br><u>How</u><br>-Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the walk-throughs look for Committee Meeting Recommendations.  In addition, tools from the RtI Handbook and ELL RtI Checklist, and ESOL Strategies Checklist  can be used as walk-through forms | 5C.3.<br>Analyze math core curriculum and district level assessments for ELL students. Correlate to accommodations to determine the most effective approach for individual students. | 5C.3.<br><u>2x per year</u><br>District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing<br>Formative Assessments (3X)<br><br><u>During the Grading Period</u><br>-Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests |
| | | 5C.4 | 5C.4 | 5C.4 | 5C.4 | 5C.4 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | -Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our school is of high priority. -Teachers need support in drilling down their core assessments to the ELL level. | ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/standards improves in math through teachers working collaboratively to focus on ELL student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act model to structure their way of work for ELL students.**<br><br>Action Steps<br>-Teachers use time during PLCs to reinforce and strengthen targeted ELL effective teaching strategies (CALLA and A+ Rise) in order to integrate them into the math lessons.<br>-Teachers use time during PLCs to reinforce and strengthen targeted ELL Differentiated Instruction lessons using the district provided ELL Differentiated Instruction binders (provided by the ELL Department) in math.<br>-PLCs generate SMART goals for ELL students for upcoming units of instruction.<br>-PLCs/teachers plan for upcoming lessons/units using targeted CALLA, A+ Rise strategies and Differentiated Instruction strategies based on ELLs needs.<br>-PLCs math teachers plan for accommodations for core curriculum content and assessment.<br>-When conducting data analysis on core curriculum assessments, PLCs | Who<br>-School based Administrators<br>-ESOL Resource Teachers<br>-PLC Facilitators<br><br>How<br>PLC logs (with specific ELL information) for like courses/grades. | Teacher Level<br>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.<br>-Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual ELL SMART Goal.<br>PLC Level<br>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL SMART goal data across all classes/courses.<br>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.<br>-ERTs meet with Math PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data.<br>- For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the ELL SMART Goal.<br>Leadership Team Level<br>-PLC facilitator shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.<br>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.<br>-ERTs meet with RtI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs) | 2x per year<br>District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing<br>Formative Assessments (3X)<br><br>During the Grading Period<br>-Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for ELL performance |

| | | | | aggregate the ELL data. -Based on the data, PLCs/teachers plan interventions for targeted ELL students using the resources from CALLA, A+ Rise, and Differentiated Instruction binders. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5D. Student with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.** | | | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #5D:<br><br>The percentage of SWD students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Mathematics will increase from 10% to 38%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>**10%** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>**38%** | | | | | |
| | | | 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 |
| **Alg1. Students scoring proficient in Algebra (Levels 3-5).** | | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| Algebra Goal #1: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |

| NA | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 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** |
| **Alg2.   Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in Algebra.** | | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| Algebra Goal #2:<br><br>NA | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |

*End of Algebra EOC Goals*

## Mathematics Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Differentiated Instruction | K - 5 | -Math Contact | Math Departmental  and course-specific PLCs | PLC Meetings every two weeks | Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor DI | Administration Team |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | implementation | | | |
| ELL Strategies | K – 5 | English Language Learner Resource Teacher (ERT) | All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs | On-going | Classroom walkthroughs | Administration Team |
| IEP Training | K – 5 | ESE Teachers | ESE Teachers General Ed Teachers PLCs | On-going | Case Manager | ESE Specialist |

*End of Mathematics Goals*

## Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

| Science Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
| **1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science.**<br><br>Science Goal #1:<br><br>The percentage of students scoring Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 35% to 55%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>**35%** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>**55%** | 1.1.<br>-Sidebar conservations<br>-Off topic discussions<br>-Teachers are at varying skills with PLC Collaboration. | 1.1.<br>**PLC Collaboration using the Plan-Do-Check-Act Model** Instruction improves when teachers use data driven dialogue to improve student achievement. Teachers need to participate in grade level and/or like course PLCs once a week with well-defined norms, focused agendas, and data. Participants should come prepared and be actively involved in the discussions.<br>**All content area teachers are responsible for implementation.**<br><br>**Action Steps**<br>Action steps for this strategy are outlined on school "Looking Ahead" action plans. | 1.1.<br>Who<br>-Principal<br>-AP<br>-Instruction Coaches<br>-Subject Area Leaders<br>-PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses<br><br>How<br>-PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete.<br>-PLCs receive feedback on their logs. Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis.<br>-Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency.<br>-Administrator aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation<br>-Administrator holds individuals accountable for | 1.1.<br>Teacher Level<br>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.<br>-Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system.<br>-Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal.<br>PLC Level<br>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses.<br>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.<br>- For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.<br>Leadership Team Level<br>-PLC facilitator shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.<br>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. | 1.1.<br>3x per year<br>Formative Assessments<br><br>During the Grading Period<br>- Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks) |

| | | | | implementation of strategy. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | 1.2.<br>–Time<br>- Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction<br>-Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Behavior Management | 1.2.<br>**Acting on the Data through Differentiated Instruction**<br>Instruction improves when teachers use Differentiated Instruction in their classrooms. Teachers need to participate in grade level and/or like course PLCs once a week with well-defined norms, focused agendas, and data. Participants should come prepared and be actively involved in the discussions. Teachers then instruct using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions.<br>**All content area teachers are responsible for implementation.**<br><br>**Action Steps**<br>Action steps for this strategy are outlined on school "Looking Ahead" action plans. | 1.2.<br>Who<br>-Principal<br>-AP<br>-Instruction Coaches<br>-Subject Area Leaders<br>-PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses<br><br>How<br>-PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis.<br>-Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency.<br>-Administrator aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation<br>-Administrator holds individuals accountable for implementation of strategy. | 1.2.<br>Teacher Level<br>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.<br>-Teachers discuss use of DI in the classroom<br>-Teachers seek assistance from other teachers in order to implement DI in the classroom<br>- PLC Level<br>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.<br>- PLCs assist teachers who need help incorporating DI strategies..<br>Leadership Team Level<br>-PLC facilitator shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.<br>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.<br>- PLC's will review evaluation data.<br>-PLC's will review unit assessments and chart the increase on the data walls in their classrooms<br>-Create focus groups to meet individual needs of our students | 1.2.<br>3x per year<br>Formative Assessments<br><br>During the Grading Period<br>- Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1.3.<br>5th grade assessments and feedback to students | 1.3.<br>Strategy<br>Tier 1-The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen core curriculum in Science. Science teachers will | 1.3.<br>Who<br>Principal<br>Assistant Principal<br>Science Teachers<br>Science Resource | 1.3.<br>-The Science Resource teacher will review assessments and chart the increase of the number of students reaching on the Formative District Assessment. | 1.3.<br>2-3x Per Year<br>2x per year-Pre-test (District baseline) and mid-year exam<br>Formative Assessments |

| | | | increase the number of inquiry based instruction (student engagement, explore time, accountable talk, and higher order questioning) in the classroom.<br><br>Action Steps<br>1. Teachers will attend more District Science trainings and share training information with the school faculty. Site based Inquiry Monday trainings will also occur in August 2012.<br>2. Teachers will conference with their students regarding data and set student driven goals for student achievement.<br>3. Each team will dedicate time in PLC's to share information about Science with one another on integrating Science with Reading, Writing, and Math.<br>4. Based on data, the PLC teams will problem solve to determine the next steps to planning and implementing inquiry based science instruction. | Teacher<br><br>How<br>-PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.<br>-Administrative walkthroughs<br>-Resource teacher to conference with students<br>-Science learning and Inquiry based learning are evident by strategies and processes evident as indicated by walkthrough. Administrative walkthroughs indicate 75% of teachers working on Long Term Investigations. | -3rd/4th/5th grades will meet vertically to disaggregate/discuss assessment data to drive instruction.<br>-Science assessment data K-5 will be reviewed monthly by the Principal and AP. | During Nine Weeks<br>-Unit assessments<br>-mini-assessments<br>-performance tasks<br>-Science notebooks<br>-Active Thinking<br>-Notebooks (Grade 5)<br>-Extended response questions |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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**<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>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.**<br><br>Science Goal #2:<br><br>The percentage of students scoring Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>**4%** | 2013Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>**15%** | 2.1.<br><br>-Teachers are at varying levels with how to apply and use higher order thinking skills with the Science curriculum.<br>-PLC's focus on remediating the bottom quartile rather on maintaining or increasing | 2.1.<br><br>Strategy<br>Tier 1-The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum with an emphasis on increasing higher ordered thinking questions in Science.<br><br>Action Steps. | 2.1.<br>Who<br>Principal<br>Assistant Principal<br>Science Teachers<br>Science Resource<br><br>How<br>PLC logs turned into administration. Administration | 2.1.<br>PLC's will reflect and analyze on student work, and assessments to monitor for higher ordered thinking skills. | 2.1.<br>2-3x Per Year<br>2x per year-Pre-test (District baseline) and mid-year exam<br>Formative Assessments |

| increase from 4% to 15%. | | | the number of higher achieving students. | 1. Teachers will attend H.O.T. trainings provided by the District. 2. Teachers, in PLC's, should discuss and share HOT questions and how they implement them in their 5E lesson plans. | provides feedback. -Administrative walkthroughs -Resource teacher to conference with students -Science learning and Inquiry based learning are evident by strategies and processes evident as indicated by walkthrough. | | During Nine Weeks -Unit assessments -mini-assessments -performance task -Science notebooks -Active Thinking -Notebooks (Grade 5) -Extended response questions |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |

## Science Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| 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 |
| Inquiry Based Mondays | Grades K – 5/STEM | Science Coach | School-wide | August, 2012 | DRTs and Administrators conduct targeted walk-throughs. | Administration Team DRT |
| Vertical PLCs Grades 3-5 | Grades K – 5/Science | Science Coach | Teachers in grades 3-5 | Every other Tuesday | Follow up with Team Leaders on a regular basis as a check in. Keep log of meetings and progress. | Administration Team Science Coach |

*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<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
| **1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing.**<br><br>Writing/LA Goal #1:<br><br>The percentage of students scoring proficient (3.5 or higher) on the 2013 FCAT Writing will increase from 92% to 95%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>**92%** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>**95%** | 1.1.<br>-Sidebar conservations<br>-Off topic discussions<br>-Teachers are at varying skills with PLC Collaboration. | 1.1.<br>**PLC Collaboration using the Plan-Do-Check-Act Model**<br>Instruction improves when teachers use data driven dialogue to improve student achievement. Teachers need to participate in grade level and/or like course PLCs once a week with well-defined norms, focused agendas, and data. Participants should come prepared and be actively involved in the discussions.<br>**All content area teachers are responsible for implementation.**<br><br>**Action Steps**<br>Action steps for this strategy are outlined on school "Looking Ahead" action plans. | 1.1.<br>Who<br>-Principal<br>-AP<br>-PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses<br><br>How<br>-PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete.<br>-PLCs receive feedback on their logs. Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis.<br>-Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency.<br>-Administrator aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation<br>-Administrator holds individuals accountable for implementation of strategy. | 1.1.<br>Teacher Level<br>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.<br>-Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system.<br>-Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal.<br>PLC Level<br>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses.<br>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.<br>- For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.<br>Leadership Team Level<br>-PLC facilitator shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.<br>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. | 1.1.<br>3x per year<br><br>During the Grading Period<br>Student monthly demand writes/formative assessments<br>-Student daily drafts<br>-Student revisions<br>-Student portfolios |

| | | 1.2<br>–Time<br>- Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction<br>-Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Behavior Management<br>. | 1.2.<br>**Acting on the Data through Differentiated Instruction**<br>Instruction improves when teachers use Differentiated Instruction in their classrooms. Teachers need to participate in grade level and/or like course PLCs once a week with well-defined norms, focused agendas, and data. Participants should come prepared and be actively involved in the discussions. Teachers then instruct using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions.<br>**All content area teachers are responsible for implementation.**<br><br>**Action Steps**<br>Action steps for this strategy are outlined on school "Looking Ahead" action plans. | 1.2.<br>Who<br>-Principal<br>-AP<br>-PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses<br><br>How<br>-PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis.<br>-Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency.<br>-Administrator aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation<br>-Administrator holds individuals accountable for implementation of strategy. | 1.2.<br>Teacher Level<br>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.<br>-Teachers discuss use of DI in the classroom<br>-Teachers seek assistance from other teachers in order to implement DI in the classroom<br>- PLC Level<br>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.<br>- PLCs assist teachers who need help incorporating DI strategies..<br>Leadership Team Level<br>-PLC facilitator shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.<br>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. | 1.2.<br>3x per year<br><br><br>During the Grading Period<br>Student monthly demand writes/formative assessments<br>-Student daily drafts<br>-Student revisions<br>-Student portfolios |
| | | 1.3.<br>-All teachers need training to score student writing accurately during the 2012-2013 school year using information provided by the state.<br>- Teachers lack skill and understanding regarding the new FCAT 2.0 Writing<br>- Not all teachers have | 1.3.<br>**Strategy**<br>Students' use of mode-specific writing will improve through use of Writers' Workshop/daily instruction with a focus on mode-specific writing.<br><br>**Action Steps**<br>-Based on baseline data, | 1.3.<br>Who<br>Principal<br>AP<br>Writing Contact<br>LA PLCs<br>Writing Teachers<br><br>District (Writing Team, Supervisors, Writing Resources, | 1.3.<br>PLCs will identify trends (deficiencies and growth) in student writing performance and collaborate to modify the instructional calendar to provide differentiated instruction as appropriate.<br><br>PLCs - Review of monthly formative writing assessments | 1.3.<br>Student monthly demand writes/formative assessments<br>-Student daily drafts<br>-Student revisions<br>-Student portfolios |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | confidence using holistic scoring methods<br>- Some teachers lack sufficient time to score student papers<br>-Time Block (Allowable Time) | PLCs write SMART goals for each Grading Period.<br>- As a Professional Development activity, teachers participate in assessment and rubric refresher courses and practice scoring within PLCs<br>-. Utilizing a data wall to track progress of students' monthly using demand writes.<br>- Based on student writing reviews and PLC discussions regarding trends and needs, teachers create daily/weekly writing menus for craft, elaboration, and genres as a list of essential teaching points for the month ahead.<br>6. Teachers implement the ideas based on specific student needs.<br><br>*Plan:*<br>-Professional Development for updated rubric courses<br>-Training to facilitate data-driven PLCs<br>-Using data to identify trends and drive instruction<br>-Lesson planning based on the needs of students<br><br>*Do:*<br>-Daily/ongoing models and application of appropriate mode-specific writing based on teaching points<br>-Daily/ongoing conferencing<br><br><br>*Check:*<br>Review of daily drafts and scoring monthly demand writes<br>-PLC discussions and | Academic Coaches, and DRTs)<br><br>How Monitored<br>-PLC logs<br>-Classroom walk-throughs<br>Observation Form<br>-Conferencing while writing walk-through tool (for coaches) | to determine number and percent of students scoring above proficiency as determined by the assignment rubric.  PLCs will chart the increase in the number of students reaching 4.0 or above on the monthly writing prompt.<br><br>PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.  The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends.<br><br>PLCs will participate in rubric Norming sessions to identify teacher barriers impeding effective holistic scoring<br><br><br><br>. | |

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

## Writing/Language Arts Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Writing Holistic Scoring Training | K – 5 | Writing Contact PLC facilitators Academic Coach | Language Arts Teachers PLC-grade level and vertical teams | On-going | PLC logs turned into administration | Principal APC PLC Facilitators |
| Mode-based Writing Training | K - 5 | Writing Contact PLC facilitators Academic Coach | Language Arts Teachers PLC-grade level and vertical teams | On-going | -Administration or Coach walk-throughs<br>-PLC logs turned into administration | Principal APC PLC Facilitators |
| | | | | | | |

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

*End of Writing Goals*

## Attendance Goal(s)

| Attendance Goal(s) | | | Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
| **1. Attendance**<br><br>Attendance Goal #1:<br><br>Attendance will increase from 94% to 96% in the 2012-2013 school year. | 2012 Current Attendance Rate:*<br>**94%**<br>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)<br>**191**<br>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)<br>**136** | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*<br>**96%**<br>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)<br>**150**<br>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)<br>**120** | 1.1.<br>Students often have to get themselves up and ready for school.<br>Students are sometimes kept home to watch younger siblings or do household chores. | 1.1.<br><br>After review of weekly attendance by individual classes and school wide, incentives will be provided to the classes with the high attendance rate. | 1.1.<br><br>Weekly/ monthly follow up of attendance referrals and attendance reports<br><br>School Social Worker<br>Guidance Counselor<br>Principal | 1.1.<br><br>Monthly monitoring of attendance. Weekly meeting between school social worker and students with attendance referrals. | 1.1.<br><br>Monthly attendance reports. |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Attending RtI Process | All grade levels | Erin Saunders, School Social Worker | School-wide | Faculty Meetings | Follow up with teachers who attend RtI meeting | Lacey Prine, School Psychologist |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

*End of Attendance Goals*

## Suspension Goal(s)

| Suspension Goal(s) | | | Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
| **1. Suspension**<br><br>Suspension Goal #1:<br>1. The total number of In-School Suspensions will increase because we will work toward less out of school suspensions.<br><br>2. The total number of students receiving In-School Suspension throughout the school year will decrease by 10%.<br><br>3. The total number of Out-of-School Suspensions will decrease by 57%.<br><br>4. The total number of students receiving Out-of-School Suspensions throughout the school year will decrease by 44%. | 2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions<br>**9**<br><br>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School<br>**6**<br><br>2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions<br>**44**<br><br>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School<br>**36** | 2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions<br>**15**<br><br>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School<br>**5**<br><br>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions<br>**25**<br><br>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School<br>**20** | 1.1.<br>Adequate teaching modeling and consistent follow-through of the implementation of procedures and expectations. | 1.1.<br>**Tier 1**: Positive Behavior Support (PBS) and CHAMPS will be utilized to address school-wide expectations and rules, set these through staff survey and discussion, and provide training to staff in methods for teaching and reinforcing the school-wide rules and expectations. | 1.1.<br>PSLT "behavior" subgroup | 1.1.<br>PSLT "behavior" subgroup with review data on Office Discipline Referrals ODRs and out of school suspensions monthly, teacher/student surveys and program evaluations. | 1.1.<br>Crystal Report ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data, and teacher-made evaluations. |
| | | | 1.2.<br>Data indicates that there is a common behavior(s) being demonstrated by students based upon the number of ODRs generated across classrooms. | 1.2.<br>PSLT/Behavior Committee subgroup will review data and make recommendations to the PSLT for additional training in classroom management for teachers in need (e.g., CHAMPS training, Basic Behavior | 1.2.<br>" PSLT/Behavior Committee " subgroup | 1.2.<br>" PSLT/Behavior Committee " subgroup with review data on Office Incident Referrals (OIRs) , out of school suspensions, behavior tracking forms, and EASI online discipline report monthly to target classrooms in need | 1.2.<br>ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data |

| | | Management, Tough Kids) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1.3.<br>Inconsistency exists among teachers for students to connect and establish mentoring relationships with adults at school.<br>Teachers are limited on interventions/strategies used to redirect prox. control behavior (behavior contract, etc.) | 1.3.<br>**Tier 2**:"A variety of discipline tools and strategies will be implemented to support students who accrue more than 5 in school or out of school suspension days in one grading period | 1.3.<br>Guidance<br>School Psychologist<br>Behavior Specialist | 1.3.<br>A subgroup of the Problem Solving Leadership Team will review suspension data and determine the percent of data for students who accrue more than 5 in school or out of school suspension days in one grading period and report progress to PSLT monthly | 1.3.<br>Monthly Suspension Data<br><br>EASI |

## 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 |
| Establishing Expectations and Procedures | Pre-K-5th | Behavior Specialist | Pre-K- 5th -PLC | Preplanning (August)<br>PLCs (monthly) | Guidance<br>School Psychologist<br>Behavior Specialist<br>Social Worker<br>Observations<br>Surveys Completed by staff | Behavior Specialist |
| Implementing school-wide/ classroom incentives | Pre-K-5th | Behavior Specialist | Pre-K- 5th –PLC | September (ongoing) | Guidance<br>School Psychologist<br>Behavior Specialist<br>Social Worker<br>Observations<br>Surveys Completed by staff<br>Surveys completed by students | Behavior Specialist |
| Full Implementation of CHAMPS | Pre-K-5th | Behavior Specialist Guidance Counselor | Pre-K- 5th –PLC | September (ongoing) | Guidance<br>School Psychologist<br>Behavior Specialist<br>Social Worker<br>Observations<br>Surveys Completed by staff<br>Surveys by students | Behavior Specialist |

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

*End of Suspension Goals*

## **Dropout Prevention Goal(s)**

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

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

| **Dropout Prevention Goal(s)** | | | **Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **1. Dropout Prevention** Dropout Prevention Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.* NA | 2012 Current Dropout Rate:* 2012 Current Graduation Rate:* | 2013 Expected Dropout Rate:* 2013 Expected Graduation Rate:* | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

**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 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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** Parent Involvement Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | 2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:* | 2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:* | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| 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** Parent Involvement Goal #2: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | 2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:* | 2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:* | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| | | | 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 | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 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**<br><br>Health and Fitness Goal #1:<br><br>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   42% on the Pretest to 52% on the Posttest. | 2012 Current Level :*<br><br>**42%** | 2013 Expected Level :*<br><br>**52%** | 1.1.<br>-Only two physical education classes per week for grades 1 – 5 with a certified physical education teacher<br>-Parents do not always understand the importance of a healthy lifestyle.<br>-Students do not get enough exercise in their daily lives | 1.1.<br>Students will engage in the equivalent of two class periods per week of physical education for the 2012-2013 school year | 1.1.<br>Administration | 1.1.<br>Checking of class and master schedules | 1.1.<br>Class schedules<br>Master schedule |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

## Health and Fitness Goals Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Teacher PE Activities | All grade levels | Coach Correia | School-wide | October, 2012 | Walkthroughs | Administrative Team P.E. Coach |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

# Continuous Improvement Goal(s)

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

| Additional Goal(s) | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
| **1. Continuous Improvement Goal**<br><br>Continuous Improvement Goal #1:<br><br>The percentage of parents who strongly agree with the indicators under **Volunteering and Relationship Building** on the *School Climate and Perception Survey for Parents* will increase from 49% in 2012 to 55% in 2013. | 2012 Current Level :*<br><br>**49%** | 2013 Expected Level :*<br><br>**55%** | 1.1.<br>- Not all parents attend the various events held at the school | 1.1.<br>-In order to best accommodate our parents, events will be held in the afternoon and in the evening. | 1.1.<br>Who<br>Administration<br>How<br>- Administration will review parent feedback following school events. | 1.1.<br>Parent comments will be reviewed by administration and the Parent Involvement Team in order to determine the needs of our families. | 1.1.<br>Feedback will be provided to all staff members in order to improve future event turnout. |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

## Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development

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

**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 |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

*End of Additional Goal(s)*

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

## NEW Reading Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

| A. **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Students scoring proficient in reading (Levels 4-9). | | | A.1. | A.1. | A.1. | A.1. | A.1. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reading Goal A: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. **NA** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | A.2. | A.2. | A.2. | A.2. | A.2. |
| | | | A.3. | A.3. | A.3. | A.3. | A.3. |
| B. **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. | | | B.1. | B.1. | B.1. | B.1. | B.1. |
| Reading Goal B: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. **NA** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | B.2. | B.2. | B.2. | B.2. | B.2. |
| | | | B.3. | B.3. | B.3. | B.3. | B.3. |

## NEW Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

| CELLA Goals | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **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.** CELLA Goal #C: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 CELLLA Listening/Speaking will increase from 43% to 48%. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: **43%** | 1.1. | 1.1. **See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4** | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **D.  Students scoring proficient in Reading.** CELLA Goal #D: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 CELLA Reading will increase from 25% to 30%. . | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading : **25%** | 2.1. | 2.1. **See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4** | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **E. Students scoring proficient 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:<br><br>The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 CELLA Writing will increase from 17% to 22%. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :<br><br>**17%** | | | | | |
| | | 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** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **F. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at in mathematics (Levels 4-9).** | | | F.1. | F.1. | F.1. | F.1. | F.1. |
| Mathematics Goal F:<br><br>**NA** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |

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

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

| Geometry EOC Goals | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **H.   Students scoring in the middle or upper third (proficient) in Geometry.** | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| Geometry Goal H: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |

| NA | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 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** |
| **I. Students scoring in the upper third on Geometry.** | | | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| NA | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |

*End of Geometry EOC Goals*

## NEW Science Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

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

| J. **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Students scoring at proficient in science (Levels 4-9). | | | J.1. | J.1. | J.1. | J.1. | J.1. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Science Goal J:<br><br>**NA** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | J.2. | J.2. | J.2. | J.2. | J.2. |
| | | | J.3. | J.3. | J.3. | J.3. | J.3. |

## NEW Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

| **Biology EOC Goals** | | | **Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **K. Students scoring in the middle or upper third (proficient) in Biology.** | | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| Biology Goal K:<br><br>**NA** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **L. Students scoring in upper third in Biology.** | | | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| Biology Goal L: **NA** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |

## NEW Writing Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

| Writing Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
| **M. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing (Levels 4-9).** | | | M.1. | M.1. | M.1. | M.1. | M.1. |
| Writing Goal M: **NA** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | M.2. | M.2. | M.2. | M.2. | M.2. |
| | | | M.3. | M.3. | M.3. | M.3. | M.3. |

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

| STEM Goal(s) | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
| STEM Goal #1:<br><br>Implement problem-based learning in math, science and STEM Design Challenges. | 1.1.<br>-Teachers understanding how to implement engineering concepts in core science curriculum<br>-common planning time to properly prepare Design Challenges | 1.1.<br>-School-wide Inquiry Monday Training with focus on STEM Design Challenges<br>-District support through model/co-teach lessons for Design Challenges support | 1.1.<br>-vertical team meetings K-2 and 3-5<br>-District provided Design Challenges are evident in the classrooms on Monday walkthroughs | 1.1.<br>DRT walkthroughs | 1.1.<br>-Design Challenge logs<br>-science notebooks<br>-Design Challenge models<br>-STEM Fair school wide project Design Challenge Extravaganza accomplished |
| | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

**STEM Professional Development**

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| Inquiry Monday | K-5 | Science DRT Title I | School-wide | August 2012 | DRT | Science Coach |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

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

| CTE Goal(s) | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| CTE Goal #1:<br><br>Provide speakers for each classroom during American Education Week to enhance student knowledge of and interest in various career tracks. | 1.1.<br>All staff members must agree to assist in obtaining speakers.<br>Local community business must be approached to take part. | 1.1.<br>Gain assistance from grade level teams to invite a wide variety of speakers. | 1.1.<br>Great American Teach In check sheet:  How many speakers came and how many classrooms they visited | 1.1.<br>Speaker questionnaire reviewed by awards committee | 1.1.<br>General student survey on interest in careers discussed |
| | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

## CTE Professional Development

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

**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 |
| Getting Speakers | All grade levels | Mrs. Guglielmi, Guidance Counselor | School-wide | October, 2012 Faculty Meeting | -Monitor teachers turning in forms<br>-Coordinate speakers for American Education Week as well as any time during school year | Mrs. Guglielmi, Guidance Counselor |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

*End of CTE Goal(s)*

# Differentiated Accountability

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

| School Differentiated Accountability Status | | |
|---|---|---|
| ☐ Priority | ☒ Focus | ☐ Prevent |

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

## School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

☒ Yes        ☐ No

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

| Describe the use of SAC funds. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Name and Number of Strategy from the School Improvement Plan | Description of Resources that improves student achievement or student engagement | Projected Amount | Final Amount |
| **Reading Goal 1.4   Acting on the Data through Differentiated Instruction** | Teachers were given the opportunity to apply for mini grants to purchase materials to assist when planning for Differentiated Instruction within their classrooms  Items ordered included technology, independent learning activities, skill building activities, | $600.00 | $530.07 |
| **Reading Goal 1.4   Acting on the Data through Differentiated Instruction** | Student Incentives | $125 | $125.99 |
| **Reading Goal 1.4   Acting on the Data through Differentiated Instruction** | 5th grade Science Lanyards supplies | $100 | $98.25 |
| **Reading Goal 1.4   Acting on the Data through Differentiated Instruction** | Differentiated online books; vocabulary building books, Common Core related books | $300 | $245.97 |
| **Reading Goal 1.4   Acting on the Data through Differentiated Instruction** | Headphones, USB flash drives | $250 | 244.38 |
| Final Amount Spent | | | $1244.66 |