FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Dunbar Elementary Magnet School	District Name: Hillsborough County School District
Principal: Sarah Jacobsen Capps	Superintendent: Mary Ellen Elia
SAC Chair: Dianna Uva	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.
School Grades Trend Data (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)
High School Feedback Report
K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

Highly Qualified Administrators

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Sarah Jacobsen Capps	Bachelor of Arts Varying Exceptionalities (VE) Masters of Science: VE and Educational Leadership ESOL CeMTSSfied Ed Leadership K-12 Certification Administrative Certification	0	7	School Grade: 11-12 : B (Lanier Elementary 10-11: A (Lanier Elementary) 09-10: B (Lanier Elementary) 08-09: B (Lanier Elementary) 07-08: A (Lanier Elementary)
Assistant Principal	Teresa Evans	BS in Urban Planning MA in Elementary Education Ed.D. in Educational Leadership National Board CeMTSSfied Teacher -Middle Childhood	2	5.5	School Grade 11-12: C (Dunbar Elementary Magnet School) 10-11: B (Dunbar Elementary Magnet School) 09-10: A (Rampello Downtown Partnership School) 08-09: A (Rampello Downtown Partnership School)

		Generalist Elementary Education 1-6 ESOL Endorsement Ed Leadership K-12 Certification			

Highly Qualified Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading Coach	Jeanne Williams	BA Early Childhood and Elementary Education	1	8	Dunbar 2011-2012 School Grade C Meeting high standards in reading: 43% Learning gains in reading: 65% Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading: 73% AYP: No DeSoto 2010-2011 School grade A Meeting high standards in reading 83% Learning gains in reading 65% Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading 60% AYP: No Palm River 2009-2010 School grade C High standards in reading 62% Learning gains in reading 59% Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading 52% AYP: No

					Palm River 2008-2009 School grade B High standards in reading 62% Learning gains in reading 66% Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading 73% AYP: No
Math Resource Teacher	Rachel Buchanan	Bachelor's Degree in Elementary Education Master's Degree in Elementary Education Gifted Endorsement CeMTSSfied Elementary Ed K-6	1	1	Dunbar Elementary: 2011-2012 School Grade: C FCAT Proficiency in Math: 42% Learning Gains in Math: 70% Lowest 25% making gains in Math: 68% AYP: No Bellamy Elementary 2010-2011: School Grade: A FCAT Proficiency in Math: 71% Learning Gains in Math: 49% Lowest 25% making gains in Math: 57% AYP: No Bellamy Elementary 2009-2010: School Grade: A FCAT Proficiency in Math: 76% Learning Gains in Math: 61% Lowest 25% making gains in Math: 53% AYP: No Bellamy Elementary 2008-2009 School Grade: A FCAT Proficiency in Math: 81% Learning Gains in Math: 73% Lowest 25% making gains in Math: 69% AYP: No

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. Magnet Screening	Principal/Magnet Office	August 2012	
3. Recruitment Fairs	Supervisor of Teacher Recruitment	Ongoing	
4. District Mentor Program	District Mentors	Ongoing	

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly qualified.	**Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective**
Melissa Blanco- Gifted	Gifted Endorsement Certification (Nature and Needs, Guidance and Counseling for the Gifted, Proceed Curriculum, Theory and Development of Creativity of the Gifted, Educating Special Populations of gifted Students) ESOL Certification (ESOL Essentials for Content Teachers)
Crystal Copechal - Kindergarten	Teacher working on ESOL certification through district courses

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 CeMTSSfied Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
29	17% (5)	38% (11)	24% (7)	21% (6)	34%(10)	93% (27)	3% (1)	3% (1)	59% (17)

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
Audrey Himes	Crystal Copechal; Kindergarten	The mentor is part of the EET initiative for first year teachers. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Audrey Himes	Michelle Harshbargar; First Grade Teacher	The mentor is part of the EET initiative for first year teachers. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Audrey Himes	Maris Mariano; First Grade Teacher	The mentor is part of the EET initiative for first year teachers. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Audrey Himes	Andrea Murray; Second Grade Teacher	The mentor is part of the EET initiative for second year teachers. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Audrey Himes	Jacqueline Harper;Third Grade Teacher	The mentor is part of the EET initiative for second year teachers. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Audrey Himes	Marissa Skirvin; Third Grade Teacher	The mentor is part of the EET initiative for second year teachers. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Audrey Himes	Casey O'Brien Schaefer; Fifth Grade Teacher	The mentor is part of the EET initiative for first year teachers. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.

Audrey Himes	Wendy Dulin; Third Grade Teacher	The mentor is part of the EET initiative for first year teachers. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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 tutoring programs, before school tutoring programs, Saturday school tutoring, summer instructional programs, academic intervention specialist, fulltime reading coach, fulltime math resource teacher, quality teachers through professional development, and mentoring programs for students.	Title I, Part A
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 C-
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 I, Part D
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 II
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 III
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.	Title X- Homel
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school, reading coaches, and extended learning opportunity programs	Supplemental A
Violence Prevention Programs N/A	Violence Preve

Nutrition Programs N/A	Nutrition Progr
Housing Programs N/A	Housing Progra
Head Start N/A	Head Start
Adult Education N/A	Adult Educatio
Career and Technical Education N/A	Career and Tec
Job Training N/A	Job Training
Other N/A	Other

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

School-Based MTSS/MTSS Team
Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team. • Principal • Assistant Principal • Guidance Counselor • School Psychologist • Social Worker • Lead Teacher for Curriculum Integration • Reading Coach • Math Resource Teacher • Academic Intervention Specialist • ESE Specialist • AGP
Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts? The purpose of the PSLT in our school is to ensure high quality instruction/intervention matched to student needs and using performance level and learning rate over time to make data-based decisions to guide instruction. The PSLT reviews school-wide data to address the progress of low-performing students and determine the enrichment and acceleration needs of high performing students. The major goal is for all students to achieve adequate yearly progress and improve other long-term outcomes (behavior, attendance, etc.). The team uses the Collaborative Culture Problem Solving Model and ALL decisions are guided by the review and analysis of student data.

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

- Oversee the multi-layered model of service delivery (Tier 1/Core, Tier 2/Supplemental and Tier 3/Intensive)
- Based on student data, recommend, coordinate and implement supplemental services (Tiers 2 and 3) that match students' non-mastery of skills through:
  - Tutoring during the day in small group pull-outs in reading and math
  - Extended Learning Programs before, during, and after school
  - ½ Hour of Remediation/Enrichment built into the daily schedule
  - Mini assessments to determine validity of remediation and assess student growth
- Determine scheduling needs, curriculum materials and intervention resources based on identified needs derived from data analysis
- Determine the school-wide professional development needs of faculty and staff and arrange trainings aligned with the SIP goals
- Review and interpret student data (academic, behavior and attendance) at the school and grade levels
- Organize and support systematic data collection as needed
- Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction through the:
  - Implementation and support of PLCs
  - Use of school-based *Reinforcement Instructional Calendars*, *Mini-Lessons* and *Mini-Assessments*
  - Use of Mini Assessments (data will be collected by PLCs and entered and compiled for analysis by members of the PSLT)
  - Use of *Common Core Assessments* at the end of segments/chapters (data will be collected by PLCs and entered and compiled for analysis by members of the PSLT)
  - Implementation of research-based, scientifically validated instructional strategies and/or interventions (e.g., Differentiated Instruction)
  - Communication with major stakeholders (e.g., parents, business partners, etc.) regarding student outcomes through data summaries and conferences
- At the end of each nine weeks, assist in the evaluation of teacher fidelity data and student achievement data collected during the nine weeks.
- Assist with planning, implementing, and evaluating the outcomes of supplemental and intensive interventions in conjunction with PLCs.
- Work collaboratively with the PLCs in the implementation of the C-CIM (Core Continuous Improvement Model) and F-CIM (Florida Continuous Improvement Model on specific tested benchmarks) and progress monitoring.
- Coordinate/collaborate 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).

Use intervention planning forms to communicate initiatives between the PSLT and PLCs.

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

- The PSLT and SAC were involved in the School Improvement Plan development that was initiated prior to the end of the 2011--12 school year and during preplanning for the 2012-13 school year.
- The School Improvement Plan is the working document that guides the work of the PSLT. The large part of the work of the team is outlined in the Expected Improvements/Problem Solving Process sections (and related professional development plans) for school-wide goals in Reading, Math, Writing, Science, Attendance and Suspension/Behavior.
- Given that one of the main tasks is to monitor student data related to instruction and interventions, the PSLT will monitor the effectiveness of the strategies developed in problem solving plans by reviewing student data as well as data related to various levels of fidelity. Using data gathered from PLCs, the team will monitor the data and make progress statements on the School Improvement Plan at the end of the first, second and third nine weeks. The PSLT will use the following rubric to evaluate Strategy Fidelity of Implementation and Strategy Effectiveness:
- The PSLT will communicate with and support the PLCs in implementing the proposed strategies by assigning PSLT members as consultants to the PLCs to facilitate planning and

implementation. Once strategies are put in place, PLCs will periodically report on their efforts and student outcomes to the larger PSLT team through the subject area PSLT representatives.

- The PSLT and PLCs both use the problem solving process: Problem Identification, Problem Analysis, Intervention Design and Implementation and Evaluation to:
  - review and analyze screening and collateral data
  - develop and test hypotheses about why student/school problems are occurring (changeable barriers)
  - develop and target interventions based on confirmed hypotheses
  - establish methods to track students' progress with appropriate progress monitoring assessments at intervals matched to the intensity of the interventions and/or enrichment
  - develop progress monitoring goals 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 interventions and/or enrichments)

review goal statements to ensure they are ambitious, time-bound and meaningful (e.g., SMART goals)
assess the fidelity of instruction/intervention implementation and other PS/MTSS processes

• The School Advisory Council (SAC) Chair is a member of the Problem Solving Team.
• The Problem Solving Team along with the faculty and SAC were involved in School Improvement Plan development activities that were conducted prior to school being out for 11-12 school year and during preplanning for 12-13 school year.
• The School Improvement Plan is the document that guides the work of the Problem Solving Team. The large part of the work of the Problem Solving Team is outlined in the Action Steps, Evaluation Process, Evaluation Tools, and Professional Development of the School Improvement Plan.
• Since one of the main tasks of the Problem Solving Team is to monitor student data, it will monitor the effectiveness of the Action Steps and suggest modifications if needed.

- The MTSS Leadership Team actively monitors student data to ensure that the goals of the School Improvement Plan are being met.

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 data management system for MTSS is to use teacher data collection notebooks which consist of FCAT released tests, Baseline and Midyear District Assessments, Subject-specific assessments generated by District-level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Math, Writing and Science , Subject-specific assessments generated by District-level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Math, Writing and Science , FAIR, CELLA, Common assessments of chapter/segment tests using adopted curriculum, mini assessments on specific tested benchmarks, DRAs and running records, and student portfolios. Teachers will collect their student data and this data will be analyzed through PLCs and PSLT to determine Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 needs.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.
Staff will receive overview training over the course of several faculty meetings during the school year. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will continue to work to build consensus with all stakeholders regarding a need for and a focus on school improvement efforts. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will work to align the efforts of other school teams that may be addressing similar identified issues.

An overview of the MTSS process will be conducted during October for the 2012-2013 school year. As the District's Problem Solving Team develops resources and staff development trainings on PS/MTSS, these tools and staff development sessions will be conducted with staff when they become available. Professional Development sessions will occur during Tuesday faculty meeting times or Mondays during early release times. Our school will invite our area MTSS Facilitator to visit quarterly to review our progress in implementation of PS/MTSS and provide on-site coaching and support to our PSLT/PLCs. New staff will be directed to paMTSScipate in trainings relevant to PLCs and PS/MTSS as they become available.

Describe plan to support MTSS. Staff will meet weekly as part of the MTSS process through grade level PLCs to analyze student data. Teachers will have ongoing feedback from the MTSS Leadership team throughout the year to ensure adequate support.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). The Reading Leadership Team serves as the school's literacy Professional Learning Community. The team is comprised of: • Principal • Assistant Principal • Reading Coach • Lead Teacher for Curriculum Integration • Media Specialist • Academic Intervention 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 expeMTSSse 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 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) • Specified Reading Blocks for each grade level

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.

N/A

*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?

N/A

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?

N/A

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.

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5).			1.1. Lack of understanding of the FCIM and CCIM processes How to implement both the FCIM and CCIM strategies while maintaining a focus on the core curriculum. Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. -Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments. -Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices. Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing	1.1. The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' reading comprehension will improve through teachers using the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM) with core curriculum and providing Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the Problem-Solving Model. Action Steps: 1. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) 2. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling researched-based best-practice strategies. 3. PLC teachers instruct students using the core	1.1. Who -Principal -APEI -Reading Coach -Academic Intervention Specialist -Lead Teacher for Curriculum Integration -Reading Literacy Team How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). The C-CIM and DI strategies will be added to the form. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during	1.1. Teacher Level Classroom teachers will analyze data and determine effectiveness through disaggregation of data. PLC/Department Level PLC unit assessment data will be recorded in a course-specific PLC data base (excel spread sheet). PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. Leadership Team Level PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for	1.1. 2-3x Per Year -FAIR -On-going Progress Monitoring in Comprehension During Grading Period -Florida Achieves CIM mini assessments -FCAT Weekly Assessments - Unit assessments
Reading Goal #1: **In grades 3-5, the percentage of standard curriculum students scoring a level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT reading test will increase from 43% to 72%.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **43% (60/139)**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **72% (103/143)**					

			students). -Lack of understanding the PLC and MTSS Process	curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions. 4. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 6. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective. 7. Based on the data, teachers a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students. 8. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment). 9. PLCs record their work in logs.	administration walk-throughs. -Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	
			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**
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.			2.1. Teachers are at varying skill levels with Webbs Taxonomy (higher	2.1. Strategy: The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students'	2.1. Who -Principal -APEI -Reading Coach	2.1. Teacher Level Teachers will teachers will analyze data from CIM quizzes and FCAT Weekly	2.1. 2-3x Per Year - FAIR
Reading Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 21% to 32%.	**21% (29/139)**	**32% (46/143)**	order questioning techniques). -Teachers at varying skill levels with Differentiated Instruction - PLC meetings do not focus on higher order questioning strategies for upcoming lessons.	reading comprehension will improve through a MTSS in Webbs Level of Questioning/Depth of Knowledge in Reading, Language Arts, Science, Social Studies and Arts classes. As a result, there will be increased use of higher level questions versus lower level questions for both teachers and students. Action Steps. 1. As a professional development activity, PLCs study Webbs Level of Questioning/Depth of Knowledge techniques. 2. Teachers implement lessons using Webbs Level of Questioning/Depth of Knowledge . 3. Teachers assess students by having them identify and create different levels of questions. 4. Teachers bring student work and/or assessments to PLCs. 5. As a professional development activity, PLCs use the data to discuss techniques that were successful.	-Academic Intervention Specialist -Lead Teacher for Curriculum Integration -Reading Literacy Team How -HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool) *(which has HOTS as a strategy listed on the form.)* -Lesson plan checks -PLC log checks *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	Assessments. PLC/Department Level PLCs examine student work and data from the Costas quizzes. With teachers, administration reviews College Board Rigor walk-through form. Data from review of unit assessments and interactive notebooks will be analyzed at PLC meetings. Leadership Team Level PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team/Literacy Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	FCIM Benchmark Exams (All Content Areas) During Grading Period -Student work -Chapter tests -FCAT Weekly Assessments -CIM Mini Assessments

				6. Based on the data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of Webbs Level of Questioning/Depth of Knowledge techniques. 7. PLCs record their work on the PLC logs. 8. Teachers will attend professional development in the areas of higher order thinking questioning strategies and differentiated instruction.			
			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. Reading Goal #3: **In grades 3-5 the points earned for standard curriculum students making Learning Gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading in reading will increase from 65 to 69.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **65 (90/139)**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **69 (99/143)**	3.1. Lack of understanding of the FCIM and CCIM processes How to implement both the FCIM and CCIM strategies while maintaining a focus on the core curriculum. Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. Teachers at varying	3.1. Strategy: The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' reading comprehension will improve through teachers using the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM) with core curriculum and providing Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the Problem-Solving Model.	3.1. Who Principal -APEI -Reading Coach -Academic Intervention Specialist -Lead Teacher for Curriculum Integration -Reading Literacy Team How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration	3.1 Teacher Level Classroom teachers will analyze student data from assessments. PLC/Department Level PLC unit assessment data will be recorded in a course-specific PLC data base (excel spread sheet). PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of	3.1. 2-3x Per Year - FAIR -On-going Progress Monitoring (OPM)in comprehension During Grading Period - Course unit assessments - Florida Achieves CIM Mini Assessment -FCAT Weekly Assessments

			levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students).	Action Steps: 1. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) 2. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling researched-based best-practice strategies. 3. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions. 4. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 6. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective. 7. Based on the data, teachers a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students. 8. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and	provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). The C-CIM and DI strategies will be added to the form. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	instruction. Leadership Team Level PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*.	

				enrichment) based on concepts learned in the Differentiated Instruction Training. 9. PLCs record their work in logs.			
			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 reading.			4.1. Lack of understanding of the FCIM and CCIM processes How to implement both the FCIM and CCIM strategies while maintaining a focus on the core curriculum. Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. - Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students).	4.1. Strategy: The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' reading comprehension will improve through teachers using the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM) with core curriculum and providing Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the Problem-Solving Model. Action Steps: 1. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) 2. As a Professional	4.1. Who Principal -APEI -Reading Coach -Academic Intervention Specialist -Lead Teacher for Curriculum Integration -Reading Literacy Team How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). The C-CIM and DI strategies will be added	4.1. Teacher Level Classroom teachers will analyze student data from assessments. PLC/Department Level PLC unit assessment data will be recorded in a course-specific PLC data base (excel spread sheet). PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. Leadership Team Level PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team will	4.1. 2-3x Per Year - FAIR -On-going Progress Monitoring (OPM)in comprehension During Grading Period - Course unit assessments - Florida Achieves CIM Mini Assessments -FCAT Weekly Assessments
Reading Goal #4: **In grades 3-5 the points earned for standard curriculum students in the Lowest 25% making Learning Gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading in reading will increase from 73 to 80.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **73 (26/35)**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **80 (29/36)**					

				Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling researched-based best-practice strategies. 3. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions. 4. Classroom teachers will provide an additional 30-minutes of small group differentiated instruction for these students at least 3X a week 4. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 6. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective. 7. Based on the data, teachers a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students. 8. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment). 9. PLCs record their work in logs.	to the form. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	

		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%. Reading Goal #5: In six years, Dunbar will reduce the achievement gap by 50%						
5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.** Reading Goal #5A: **In grades 3-5, 72% of the following All Curriculum student subgroups will score a Level 3 or higher on the 2012 FCAT Reading or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 10%. *(Safe Harbor Targets: Black –51 % and Hispanic - 54%)***	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White: Black:38 Hispanic:41 Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White: Black:42 Hispanic:47 Asian: American Indian:	5A.1. White: Black: 38 Hispanic: 41 Asian: American Indian: Lack of understanding of the FCIM and CCIM processes How to implement both the FCIM and CCIM strategies while maintaining a focus on the core curriculum. Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. - Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both	5A.1. Strategy: The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' reading comprehension will improve through teachers using the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM) with core curriculum and providing Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the Problem-Solving Model. Action Steps: 1. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of	5A.1. Who Principal -APEI -Reading Coach -Academic Intervention Specialist -Lead Teacher for Curriculum Integration -Reading Literacy Team How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). The C-CIM and DI	5A.1. Teacher Level Classroom teachers will analyze student data from assessments. PLC/Department Level PLC unit assessment data will be recorded in a course-specific PLC data base (excel spread sheet). PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. Leadership Team Level PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving	5A.1. 2-3x Per Year - FAIR -On-going Progress Monitoring (OPM)in comprehension During Grading Period - Course unit assessments - Florida Achieves CIM Mini Assessments -FCAT Weekly Assessments

			with the low performing and high performing students).	instruction.) 2. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling researched-based best-practice strategies. 3. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions. 4. Classroom teachers will provide an additional 30-minutes of small group differentiated instruction for these students at least 3X a week 4. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 6. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective. 7. Based on the data, teachers a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students. 8. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment). 9. PLCs record their work in logs.	strategies will be added to the form. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	

			5A.2.	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2
			5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5B.1. Lack of understanding of the FCIM and CCIM processes How to implement both the FCIM and CCIM strategies while maintaining a focus on the core curriculum. Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. - Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students).	5B.1. Strategy: The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' reading comprehension will improve through teachers using the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM) with core curriculum and providing Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the Problem-Solving Model. Action Steps: 1. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) 2. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching,	5B.1. Who Principal -APEI -Reading Coach -Academic Intervention Specialist -Lead Teacher for Curriculum Integration -Reading Literacy Team How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). The C-CIM and DI strategies will be added to the form. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson	5B.1. Teacher Level Classroom teachers will analyze student data from assessments. PLC/Department Level PLC unit assessment data will be recorded in a course-specific PLC data base (excel spread sheet). PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. Leadership Team Level PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine	5B.1. 2-3x Per Year - FAIR -On-going Progress Monitoring (OPM)in comprehension During Grading Period - Course unit assessments - Florida Achieves CIM Mini Assessments -FCAT Weekly Assessments
Reading Goal #5B: **In grades 3-5, 47% Economically Disadvantaged All Curriculum students will score a Level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT Reading or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 10%. *(Safe Harbor Target-59 %)*** .	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **41%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **47%**					

				teaching, and modeling researched-based best-practice strategies. 3. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions. 4. Classroom teachers will provide an additional 30-minutes of small group differentiated instruction for these students at least 3X a week 4. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 6. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective. 7. Based on the data, teachers a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students. 8. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment). 9. PLCs record their work in logs.	plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	
			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.			5B.1. Lack of understanding of skills and strategies related to ELL students Lack of understanding of the FCIM and CCIM processes How to implement both the FCIM and CCIM strategies while maintaining a focus on the core curriculum. Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. - Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students).	5B.1. Strategy: The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' reading comprehension will improve through teachers using the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM) with core curriculum and providing Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the Problem-Solving Model. Action Steps: 1. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) 2. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling researched-based best-practice strategies. 3. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions. 4. Classroom teachers will	5B.1. Who Principal -APEI -Reading Coach -Academic Intervention Specialist -Lead Teacher for Curriculum Integration -Reading Literacy Team How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). The C-CIM and DI strategies will be added to the form. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check*	5B.1. Teacher Level Classroom teachers will analyze student data from assessments. PLC/Department Level PLC unit assessment data will be recorded in a course-specific PLC data base (excel spread sheet). PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. Leadership Team Level PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check*	5B.1. 2-3x Per Year - FAIR -On-going Progress Monitoring (OPM)in comprehension During Grading Period - Course unit assessments - Florida Achieves CIM Mini Assessments -FCAT Weekly Assessments
Reading Goal #5C: **In grades 3-5, 34% of English Language Learners making satisfactory progress in reading for All Curriculum students will score a Level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT Reading or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 10%. *(Safe Harbor Target-59 %)*** .	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **27%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **34%**					

				provide an additional 30-minutes of small group differentiated instruction for these students at least 3X a week 4. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 6. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective. 7. Based on the data, teachers a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students. 8. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment). 9. PLCs record their work in logs.	*2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	*3rd Grading Period Check*	
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**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: N/A.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
			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 PaMTSScipants (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
Social Studies and Reading Integration Training	Grades K-5	Jeanne Williams and Melissa Blanco	All teachers school wide	August 2012	Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor use of strategies	Administration
Text Dependent Questions Training	Grades K-5	Reading Coach	All reading teachers	After School Training	Administrators and Reading Coach conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor proper implementation	Administration/Reading Coach
Easy CBM Training	Grades K-5	Reading Coach	All reading teachers	After School Training	Administrators and Reading Coach conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor proper implementation	Administration/Reading Coach
Diagnostic Reading Assessment 2Training	Grades K-5	Reading Coach	All reading teachers	After School Training	Administrators and Reading Coach conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor proper implementation	Administration/Reading Coach
Comprehension Toolkit Training	Grades K-5	Reading Coach	All reading teachers	After School Training	Administrators and Reading Coach conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor proper implementation	Administration/Reading Coach

Phonics and Word Work Training	Grades K-5	Reading Coach	All reading teachers	After School Training	Administrators and Reading Coach conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor proper implementation	Administration/Reading Coach

End of Reading Goals

Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in mathematics (Level 3-5).			1.1. - Lack of understanding of how to implement the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM with the core curriculum), as the emphasis has been placed on F-CIM for targeted mini lessons and NOT on the core curriculum. - Need additional training to implement effective PLCs. - Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students). -Lack of knowledge on how to best implement the newly adopted math	1.1. Strategy: - The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through teachers using the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM) with core curriculum and providing Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the problem-solving model. Action Steps: 1. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) 2. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling researched-based DI best-practice strategies. In addition,	1.1. Who -Principal -APEI -Math Resource Teacher -Lead Teacher for Curriculum Integration How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). The C-CIM and DI strategies will be added to the form. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.	1.1. Teacher Level Classroom teachers will analyze student data from assessments. PLC/Department Level PLC unit assessment data will be recorded in a course-specific PLC data base (excel spread sheet). PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. Leadership Team Level PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check*	1.1. 2-3x Per Year -District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During Grading Period -MidPoint Chapter Tests -Chapter Tests -Benchmark mini assessments
Mathematics Goal #1: **In grades 3-5, the percentage of standard curriculum students scoring a level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT mathematics test will increase from 42% to 70%**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **42% (58/139)**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **70% (100/143)**					

			textbook series called “Go Math”	math teachers visit exemplary math classrooms where DI is emphasized. 3. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions. 4. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 6. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective. 7. Based on the data, teachers a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students. 8. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and	-Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	*3rd Grading Period Check*	

				enrichment). 9. PLCs record their work in logs.			
			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**
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics.			2.1. - Teachers are at varying skill levels with Webbs hierarchy of higher order questioning techniques. - PLC meetings do not focus on higher order questioning strategies for upcoming lessons.	2.1. Strategy: The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through paMTSScipation in higher order questioning As a result, there will be increased use of higher level questions versus lower level questions for both teachers and students. Action Steps: 1. As a professional development activity, PLCs study Webbs Level of Questioning/Depth of Knowledge techniques. 2. Teachers implement lessons using Webbs Level of Questioning/Depth of Knowledge .	2.1. Who -Principal -APEI -Math Resource Teacher -Lead Teacher for Curriculum Integration How -HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool) *(which has HOTS as a strategy listed on the form.)* *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	2.1. Teacher Level Classroom teachers will analyze student data from assessments. PLC/Department Level PLCs examine student work and data showing higher order thinking and questioning With teachers, administration reviews HCPS Information observation Pop-In Form (EET tool where HOTS as a strategy Data from review of unit assessments will be analyzed at PLC meetings. Leadership Team Level PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check*	2.1. 2-3x Per Year -District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During Grading Period -Student work -MidPoint Chapter Tests -Chapter tests -Benchmark Assessments
Mathematics Goal #2: **In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 19% to 35%.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **19% (26/139)**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **35% (50/143)**					

				3. Teachers assess students by having them identify and create different levels of questions. 4. Teachers bring student work and/or assessments to PLCs. 5. As a professional development activity, PLCs use the data to discuss techniques that were successful. 6. Based on the data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps for implementing Webbs Level of Questioning/Depth of Knowledge techniques. 7. PLCs record their work on the PLC logs.		*2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	
			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. - Lack of understanding of how to implement the Core Continuous	3.1. Strategy: The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum.	3.1. Who -Principal -APEI -Math Resource	3.1. Teacher Level Classroom teachers will analyze student data from assessments.	3.1. 2-3x Per Year -District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing
Mathematics Goal #3:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

In grades 3-5, the points earned for standard curriculum students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT mathematics test will increase from 70 to 75.	**70 (97/139)**	**75 (107/143)**	Improvement Model (C-CIM with the core curriculum), as the emphasis has been placed on F-CIM for targeted mini lessons and NOT on the core curriculum. - Need additional training to implement effective PLCs. - Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students). -Lack of knowledge on how to best implement the newly adopted math textbook series called "Go Math"	Students' math skills will improve through the use of technology and hands-on activities to implement the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. Action Steps: 1. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) 2. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling technology and hands-on strategies. 3. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating strategies from their PLC discussions. 5. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 6. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 7. As a Professional	Teacher -Lead Teacher for Curriculum Integration How PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	PLC/Department Level PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. Leadership Team Level PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	During Grading Period -MidPoint Chapter Tests -Chapter Tests -Benchmark mini assessments

				Development activity, teachers use data to discuss strategies that were effective. 8. Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of planning technology and hands-on strategies. 9. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.			
			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. - Teachers at varying skill levels with the FCIM model. - Teachers' implementation of the FCIM model is not consistent across math classes. - Lack of understanding of when and how to implement the mini lessons within the District pacing guide	4.1. Strategy: – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through teachers using the FCIM strategy on identified tested benchmarks Action Steps: 1. Through data analysis of FCAT, baseline data, classroom assessments and student performance, PLCs identify essential tested benchmarks for	4.1. Who -Principal -APEI -Math Resource Teacher -Lead Teacher for Curriculum Integration How PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson	4.1. Teacher Level Classroom teachers will analyze student data from assessments. PLC/Department Level -PLCs will review mini-assessment data. Mini-assessment data recorded in a course specific PLC data base (excel spread sheet). -For the mini-assessments, PLCs will chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least	4.1. 2-3x Per Year -District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During Grading Period -MidPoint Chapter Tests -Chapter Tests -Benchmark mini assessments -Unit assessments
Mathematics Goal #4: **In grades 3-5, the points for All Curriculum students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 68 to 73.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **68 (24/35)**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **73 (26/36)**					

				their students that need reinforcement and/or remediation. 2. Based on the data, PLCs develop a 10 day projected timeline/calendar for re-teaching the essential skills and/or standards covered in the core curriculum. 3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers identify and/or develop mini lessons and mini assessments for benchmarks. PLCs use a combination of District and school-generated mini lessons/assessments. 4. Teachers implement the mini lessons and mini assessments. 5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 6. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers use the mini assessment data and classroom assessments to adjust the timeline/calendar. Based on mini assessment data, skills are moved to a maintenance or re-	plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -A fidelity tool will be the PLC calendars/timeline/ logs of targeted skills reviewed by the administration. - PSLT will review the calendars/logs and make progress statements at the end of each nine weeks *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	80% mastery on each mini-assessment. Leadership Team Level PLCs will review evaluation data. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team reviews data that includes all skills covered during the nine week period. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	

				teaching schedule. 7. As a PLC, teachers will use unit tests as a school-based assessment that covers all mini lesson skills taught within the nine week period. *(identifying the specific skills)* 8. PLCs record their work in logs.			
			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%. Math Goal #5: In six years, Dunbar will reduce the achievement gap by 50%.							
5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics** Mathematics Goal #5A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	5A.1. - Lack of understanding of how to implement the Core Continuous	5A.1. Strategy: - The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will	5A.1. Who -Principal -APEI -Math Resource Teacher	5A.1. Teacher Level Classroom teachers will analyze student data from assessments.	5A.1. 2-3x Per Year -District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing

In grades 3-5, the following All Curriculum student subgroups will score a Level 3 or higher on the 2012 FCAT Mathematics or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 10%. *(Safe Harbor Targets: Black – 54% and Hispanic -77 %)* .	White: Black:38 Hispanic:41 Asian: American Indian:	White: Black:43 Hispanic:47 Asian: American Indian:	Improvement Model (C-CIM with the core curriculum), as the emphasis has been placed on F-CIM for targeted mini lessons and NOT on the core curriculum. - Need additional training to implement effective PLCs. - Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students). -Lack of knowledge on how to best implement the newly adopted math textbook series called "Go Math"	improve through teachers using the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM) with core curriculum and providing Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the problem-solving model. Action Steps: 1. Through data analysis of FCAT, baseline data, classroom assessments and student performance, PLCs identify essential tested benchmarks for their students that need reinforcement and/or remediation. 2. Based on the data, PLCs develop a 10 day projected timeline/calendar for re-teaching the essential skills and/or standards covered in the core curriculum. 3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers identify and/or develop mini lessons and mini assessments for benchmarks. PLCs use a combination of District and school-generated mini lessons/assessments. 4. Teachers implement the mini lessons and mini	-Lead Teacher for Curriculum Integration How PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -A fidelity tool will be the PLC calendars/timeline/ logs of targeted skills reviewed by the administration. - PSLT will review the calendars/logs and make progress statements at the end of each nine weeks *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	PLC/Department Level -PLCs will review mini-assessment data. Mini-assessment data recorded in a course specific PLC data base (excel spread sheet). -For the mini-assessments, PLCs will chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on each mini-assessment. Leadership Team Level *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	During Grading Period -MidPoint Chapter Tests -Chapter Tests -Benchmark mini assessments -Unit assessments

				assessments. 5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 6. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers use the mini assessment data and classroom assessments to adjust the timeline/calendar. Based on mini assessment data, skills are moved to a maintenance or re-teaching schedule. 7. As a PLC, teachers will use unit tests as a school-based assessment that covers all mini lesson skills taught within the nine week period. *(identifying the specific skills)* 8. PLCs record their work in logs.			
			5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.
			5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5B.1.	5B.1. Strategy:	5B.1. Who	5B.1. Teacher Level	5B.1. 2-3x Per Year

Mathematics Goal #5B: **In grades 3-5, All Curriculum student subgroups for Economically Disadvantaged Subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress will decrease from 61% to 58% on the 2012 FCAT Mathematics test.** .	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **40%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **46%**	- Lack of understanding of how to implement the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM with the core curriculum), as the emphasis has been placed on F-CIM for targeted mini lessons and NOT on the core curriculum. - Need additional training to implement effective PLCs. - Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students). -Lack of knowledge on how to best implement the newly adopted math textbook series called "Go Math"	- The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through teachers using the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM) with core curriculum and providing Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the problem-solving model. Action Steps: 1. Through data analysis of FCAT, baseline data, classroom assessments and student performance, PLCs identify essential tested benchmarks for their students that need reinforcement and/or remediation. 2. Based on the data, PLCs develop a 10 day projected timeline/calendar for re-teaching the essential skills and/or standards covered in the core curriculum. 3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers identify and/or develop mini lessons and mini assessments for benchmarks. PLCs use a combination of District and school-generated	-Principal -APEI -Math Resource Teacher -Lead Teacher for Curriculum Integration How PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -A fidelity tool will be the PLC calendars/timeline/ logs of targeted skills reviewed by the administration. - PSLT will review the calendars/logs and make progress statements at the end of each nine weeks *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	Classroom teachers will analyze student data from assessments. PLC/Department Level -PLCs will review mini-assessment data. Mini-assessment data recorded in a course specific PLC data base (excel spread sheet). -For the mini-assessments, PLCs will chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on each mini-assessment. Leadership Team Level *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	-District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During Grading Period -Benchmark mini assessments -Unit assessments -MidPoint Chapter Tests -Chapter Tests

				mini lessons/assessments. 4. Teachers implement the mini lessons and mini assessments. 5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 6. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers use the mini assessment data and classroom assessments to adjust the timeline/calendar. Based on mini assessment data, skills are moved to a maintenance or re-teaching schedule. 7. As a PLC, teachers will use unit tests as a school-based assessment that covers all mini lesson skills taught within the nine week period. (*identifying the specific skills)* 8. PLCs record their work in logs.			
			5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.
			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 mathematics.			5C.1. -Lack of understanding of skills and strategies utilized with ELL students - Lack of understanding of how to implement the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM with the core curriculum), as the emphasis has been placed on F-CIM for targeted mini lessons and NOT on the core curriculum. - Need additional training to implement effective PLCs. - Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students). -Lack of knowledge on how to best implement the newly adopted math textbook series	5C.1. Strategy: - The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through teachers using the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM) with core curriculum and providing Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the problem-solving model. Action Steps: 1. Through data analysis of FCAT, baseline data, classroom assessments and student performance, PLCs identify essential tested benchmarks for their students that need reinforcement and/or remediation. 2. Based on the data, PLCs develop a 10 day projected timeline/calendar for re-teaching the essential skills and/or standards covered in the core curriculum. 3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers identify and/or develop	5C.1. Who -Principal -APEI -Math Resource Teacher -Lead Teacher for Curriculum Integration How PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -A fidelity tool will be the PLC calendars/timeline/ logs of targeted skills reviewed by the administration. - PSLT will review the calendars/logs and make progress statements at the end of each nine weeks *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check*	5C.1. Teacher Level Classroom teachers will analyze student data from assessments. PLC/Department Level -PLCs will review mini-assessment data. Mini-assessment data recorded in a course specific PLC data base (excel spread sheet). -For the mini-assessments, PLCs will chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on each mini-assessment. Leadership Team Level *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	5C.1. 2-3x Per Year -District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During Grading Period -Benchmark mini assessments -Unit assessments -MidPoint Chapter Tests -Chapter Tests
Mathematics Goal #5C: **In grades 3-5, English Language Learners making Adequate Yearly Progress will increase from 27% to 34% on the 2012 FCAT Mathematics test.** .	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **27%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **34%**					

			called "Go Math"	mini lessons and mini assessments for benchmarks. PLCs use a combination of District and school-generated mini lessons/assessments. 4. Teachers implement the mini lessons and mini assessments. 5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 6. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers use the mini assessment data and classroom assessments to adjust the timeline/calendar. Based on mini assessment data, skills are moved to a maintenance or re-teaching schedule. 7. As a PLC, teachers will use unit tests as a school-based assessment that covers all mini lesson skills taught within the nine week period. *(identifying the specific skills)* 8. PLCs record their work in logs.	*3rd Grading Period Check*		
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.

		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**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: N/A.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
		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: N/A	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**
Alg2. Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in Algebra.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Algebra Goal #2: N/A	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 PaMTSScipants (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
Instructional Planning Tools and Math Norms	Grades K – 5	Shelly Fritz	All curriculum teachers	September 2012	Administrators and Math Resource Teacher conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor proper implementation	Administration/Math Resource Teacher
Problem Solving Strategies	Grades K – 5	Rachel Buchanan	All math teachers	November 2012	Administrators and Math Resource Teacher conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to	Administration/Math Resource Teacher

					monitor proper implementation	
Math Technology Overview	Grades K – 5	Rachel Buchanan	All math teachers	December 2012	Administrators and Math Resource Teacher conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor proper implementation	Administration/Math Resource Teacher
Basic Fact Strategies for Addition and Subtraction (Primary)	Grades K – 2	Rachel Buchanan	All K – 2 math teachers	January 2013	Administrators and Math Resource Teacher conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor proper implementation	Administration/Math Resource Teacher
Basic Fact Strategies for Multiplication and Division (Intermediate)	Grades 3 – 5	Rachel Buchanan	All 3 – 5 math teachers	February 2013	Administrators and Math Resource Teacher conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor proper implementation	Administration/Math Resource Teacher
Online Testing for FCAT (Grade 5 Only)	Grade 5	Rachel Buchanan	All fifth grade math teachers	March 2013	Administrators and Math Resource Teacher conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor proper implementation	Administration/Math Resource Teacher

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science.			1.1. -Not all teachers know how to identify misconceptions and depth of student knowledge of science concepts. -Not all teachers are knowledgeable of the strategies of inquiry based instruction such as engaging the students, explore time, accountable talk, higher order questioning, etc. -Not all PLC meetings include regular discussion of the implementation of the inquiry model -Teachers unfamiliar with the new National Geographic textbooks and the NGSSS.	1.1. Strategy: Tier 1 – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students will develop problem-solving and creative thinking skills while constructing new knowledge. To achieve this goal, science teachers will increase the number of inquiry based instruction (such as student engagement, explore time, accountable talk and higher order questioning) per unit of instruction. Action Steps: 1. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) 2. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching,	1.1. Who -Principal -APEI -Lead Teacher for Curriculum Integration How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. - Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administrative walk-throughs. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	1.1. Teacher Level Classroom teachers will analyze student data from assessments. PLC/Department Level Science PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching the SMART goals created for units of instruction. Leadership Team Level PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	1.1. 2-3x Per Year -District-level baseline and mid-year tests During Grading Period -Unit assessments -Science Mini Benchmark Assessments
Science Goal #1: **In grade 5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science Assessment will increase from 38% to 60%.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **38% (19/50)**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **60% (31/50)**					

				teaching, and modeling inquiry based instruction strategies. 3. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum and inquiry based instruction strategies. 4. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 6. Based on the data, teachers discuss inquiry based instruction strategies that were effective. 7. Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of planning inquiry based instruction strategies. 8. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.			
			1.2 - Teachers at varying skills levels with the FCIM model. - Teachers' implementation of the	1.2. Strategy Tier 1 – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students'	1.2. Who Teacher Principal APEI Lead Teacher	1.2. Teacher Level Classroom teachers will analyze student data from assessments. PLC/Department Level	1.2 2-3x Per Year -District-level baseline and mid-year tests

		FCIM model is not consistent across science classes.	science skills will improve through teachers using the FCIM strategy on identified tested benchmarks Action Steps 1. Through data analysis of FCAT, baseline data, classroom assessments and student performance, PLCs identify essential tested benchmarks for their students that need reinforcement and/or remediation. 2. Based on the data, PLCs develop a 10 day projected timeline/calendar for re-teaching the essential skills and/or standards covered in the core curriculum, documenting the timeline in their lesson plans. 3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers identify mini lessons and mini assessments for benchmarks. PLCs use District mini lessons/assessments. 4. Teachers implement the mini lessons and mini assessments.	How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -A fidelity tool will be the PLC calendars/timeline/ logs of targeted skills reviewed by the administration - PSLT will review the calendars/logs and make progress statements at the end of each nine weeks.	Science PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. Leadership Team Level PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.	During Grading Period -Unit assessments -Science Mini Benchmark Assessments .

			5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 6. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers use the mini assessment data and classroom assessments to adjust the timeline/calendar. Based on mini assessment data, skills are moved to a maintenance or re-teaching schedule. 7. PLCs record their work in logs.			
		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**
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science.		2.1. - Teachers are at varying skill levels with Blooms Hierarchy of higher order questioning techniques. - PLC meetings do not focus on higher order questioning strategies for upcoming lessons.	2.1. Strategy: Tier 1 The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' science skills will improve through paMTSScipation in Webbs Level of Questioning/Depth of Knowledge. As a result, there will be increased use of higher level questions versus lower level questions for both teachers and students. Action Steps:	2.1. Who Principal -APEI -Lead Teacher for Curriculum Integration How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during	2.1. Teacher Level Classroom teachers will analyze student data from assessments. PLC/Department Level Science PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. Leadership Team Level PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving	2.1. 2-3x Per Year -District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During Grading Period -Unit assessments -Science Mini Benchmark Assessments
Science Goal #2: **In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science Assessment will increase from 8% to 25%.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **8% (4/50)**	2013Expected Level of Performance:* **25% (13/50)**				

				1. Science teachers attend on-going HOTS training provided by the Reading Coach 2. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) 3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers discuss HOT strategies and how they can be implemented in the upcoming lessons. 4. Teachers implement the targeted higher order questioning strategies in their lessons. 5. Teachers implement the common assessments. 6. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 7. PLCs study specifically students' responses to the higher order questions to assess students' higher order thinking processes. 8. Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving	administration walk-throughs. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	

				process to determine next steps of higher order strategy implementation. 9. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.			
			2.2. - Lack of planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. -Lack of planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments. -Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices.	2.2. Strategy Tier 1 The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' science comprehension will improve through teachers using the Continuous Improvement Model with core curriculum and providing Differentiated Instruction as a result of the problem-solving model Action Steps 1. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) 2. As a Professional Development activity, teachers use district textbook adopted materials and resources within their PLCs to plan and deliver lessons.	2.2. Who -Principal -APEI -Lead Teacher How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration classroom walk-throughs	2.2. Teacher Level Classroom teachers will analyze student data from assessments. PLC/Department Level Science PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. Leadership Team Level PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.	2.2. 2-3x Per Year -District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing -Think Link Assessments During Grading Period -Unit assessments -Science Mini Benchmark Assessments

			3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling researched-based best-practice strategies. 4. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions. 5. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 6. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 7. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective. 8. Based on the data, teachers 1) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, 2) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class 3) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students (remediation and enrichment).			

			9. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.			
		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 PaMTSScipants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
STEM Fair Training	Grades K - 5	District Science Resource Teachers	Grade K-5 Teachers – School Wide	August 2012	Administrators conduct targeted walk-throughs to monitor STEM Fair instruction	Administration Team
Long Term Investigations Training	Grades K - 5	District Science Resource Teachers	Grade K-5 Teachers – School Wide	August 2012	Administrators conduct targeted walk-throughs to monitor long term investigations	Administration Team

End of Science Goals

Writing/Language Arts Goals

Writing/Language Arts Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing.			1.1. -Not all teachers know how to identify student needs from demand writes and/or ask higher order/open-ended questions during one-on-one/Star Interview conferences. -Not all teachers are able to attend writing trainings on dates available by the district. -Teachers do not have adequate time to administer one-on –one STAR conferences. -New teachers may not be familiar with "Writer's Craft" and extension and elaboration.	1.1. Strategy: Tier 1 – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' use of elaboration will improve through the teachers use of daily Writers' Workshop lessons focused on craft through elaboration and one-on-one conferencing to support differentiated instruction. School will implement embedded writing assessments in the core curriculum and monthly/ongoing formative writing assessments to monitor student progress/improvement. Action Steps: 1. Based on baseline data, PLCs write SMART goals for each nine weeks. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 50% of the students will score 4.0 or above on the monthly writing prompt.)	1.1. Who -Principal -APEI -Lead Teacher for Curriculum Integration -Writing Resource Contact How - PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. - Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. - Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. - Administrator Writers' Workshop Walk-through Checklist for HCPS *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	1.1. Teacher Level Classroom teachers will analyze student data from assessments. PLC/Department Level PLCs – Monthly demand writes, daily drafts, and conferencing notes are reviewed to determine the number of students demonstrating proficiency in writing through scoring data and benchmark attainment. Leadership Team Level PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. District Writing Team-Monthly demand write scores provided through email to Writing Supervisor followed by fourth-grade writing review meetings and support pieces provided at monthly resource/contact	1.1. 2-3x Per Year -Student Monthly Demand Writes During Grading Period -Student daily drafts -Student STAR conferencing notes -Student Monthly Demand Writes
Writing/LA Goal #1: **In grades 3-5, the percentage of All Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writing Assessment will increase from 88% to 90%.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 88% (38/43)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 90% (44/49)					

				2. As a Professional Development activity PLCs paMTSScipate in discussions that share PLC data, trends, and best-practice instructional strategies. Teachers will reach a consensus regarding student trends, needs, and scores based on connecting student writing with state anchors. 3. Teachers and students will maintain writing portfolios to demonstrate student engagement in all stages of the writing process. 4. As a Professional Development activity, teachers complete the online MOODLE course, *Write on Target: Best Practice in Elementary Writing* and return to this professional development course when needing to refresh knowledge. 5. As a Professional Development activity, PLCs reconvene to discuss ideas/lessons from the online MOODLE course and share monthly writing resource/contact meeting information. 6. As a Professional	.	meetings. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	

				Development activity, PLCs meet and discuss data in order to implement effective teaching strategies and lesson plans targeted to meet the needs of students. 7. As a Professional Development activity, PLCs examine student conference notes, daily drafts, monthly demand writes and adjust the writing focus teaching points in order to share ideas to grow students through daily Writers' Workshops. 8. PLCs review nine-week data and set a new goal for the following nine weeks. 9. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.			
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Writing/Language Arts Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD PaMTSScipants (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
	3 – 5 Grade	District	Grades 3-5 Teachers	October – November 2012	Writing Meetings to score papers	Administration

Writing Rubric Training	Teachers	Writing Supervisor				
Writing Resource Meetings	Fourth Grade Teachers	District Writing Supervisor	Fourth Grade Teachers	September - May	Monthly Hillsborough Writes scores	Administration

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
1. Attendance			1.1. -Most students with significant unexcused absences (10 or more) have serious personal or family issues that are impacting attendance. -Lack of time to focus on attendance -Lack of staff to focus on attendance.	1.1. The Administration Team along with other appropriate staff will meet every 30 days to review the school's Attendance Plan to 1) ensure that all steps are being implemented with fidelity and 2) discuss targeted students. A data base will be maintained for students with excessive unexcused absences and tardies. This data base will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of attendance interventions and to identify students in need of support beyond school wide attendance initiatives.	1.1. Attendance Committee will run Attendance/Tardy meetings every 30 days with appropriate reports DP Clerk will maintain data base Social Worker Guidance Counselors	1.1. Administration Team and subset of PSLT will examine data monthly	1.1. Attendance Report Tardy Report Attendance Plan
Attendance Goal #1: **The attendance rate will increase from 95.40% in 2011-2012 to 96% in 2012-2013.** **-The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused absences throughout the school year will decrease from 36 students in 2011-2012 to 27 students in 2012-2013.** **-The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused tardies to school throughout the school year will remain steady from 0% in 2011-2012 to 0% in 2012-2013.**	2012 Current Attendance Rate:* 95.4% (233) 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Unexcused Absences (10 or more) 15%(36) 2012 Current Number of Students with Unexcused Excessive Tardies (10 or more) 0% (0)	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* 96% (244) 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Unexcused Absences (10 or more) 11% (27) 2013 Expected Number of Students with Unexcused Excessive Tardies (10 or more) 0%(0)					
			1.2. -Most students with significant unexcused absences (10 or more) have serious personal or family issues that are impacting attendance. -Lack of time to focus on attendance -Lack of staff to focus on attendance	1.2. When a student reaches 15 days of unexcused absences and/or unexcused tardies to school, parents and guardians are notified via mail that future absences/tardies must have a doctor note or other reason outlined in the Student Handbook to receive an excused	1.2. Attendance Committee will run Attendance/Tardy meetings every 30 days with appropriate reports DP Clerk will maintain data base Social Worker	1.2. Administration Team and subset of PSLT will examine data monthly.	1.2. Attendance Report Tardy Report Attendance Plan

			absence/tardy and must be approved through an administrator. A parent-administrator-student conference is scheduled and held regarding these procedures. The goal of the conference is to create a plan for assisting the students to improve his/her attendance/tardies.	Guidance Counselors.		
		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 PaMTSScipants (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 Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
1. Suspension			1.1. -There needs to be common school-wide expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior. -Bus drivers not trained	1.1. Tier 1: Positive Behavior Support (PBS) will be implemented to address school-wide expectations and rules, set these through staff survey and discussion, and provide	1.1. Principal APEI Guidance Counselor School Psychologist School Social Worker	1.1. PSLT with review data on Office Discipline Referrals ODRs and out of school suspensions monthly.	1.1. Crystal Report ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data
Suspension Goal #1: **The total number of In-School Suspensions will decrease from 8 in**	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions 3.2% (8)	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions 2.0% (5)					

2011-2012 to 5 in 2012- 2013. **-The total number of students receiving In-School Suspension will decrease from 6 in 2011-2012 to 3 in 2012-2013.** **-The total number of Out-of-Suspensions will decrease from 12 in 2011-2012 to 10 in 2012-2013.** **-The total number of students receiving Out-of-School Suspension will decrease from 7 students in 2011-2012 to 6 students in 2012- 2013.**	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School **6** 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions 4.7% (12) 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School 7	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School 3 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions 3.9% (10) 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School 6	in student discipline techniques	training to staff in methods for teaching and reinforcing the school-wide rules and expectations.			
			1.2. Data indicates that there is wide variation in the number of Office Discipline Referrals (ODRs) generated across classrooms and between transportation and the school.	1.2. PSLT will review data and make recommendations for additional training in classroom management for teachers in need	1.2. Principal APEI Guidance Counselor School Psychologist School Social Worker	1.2. PSLT with review data on Office Discipline Referrals (ODRs) and out of school suspensions monthly in targeted classrooms	1.2. ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data
			1.3. Few opportunities exist for students to connect and establish mentoring relationships with adults at school.	1.3. Tier 2 A Guidance Behavior Plan will be implemented to support students who accrue more than 10 suspension days in one semester.	1.3. Guidance Social Worker School Psychologist	1.3. The Problem Solving Leadership Team (PSLT) will review suspension data and determine the percent of student with 10 or more suspensions per semester. The Team will review suspension data monthly.	1.3. MonthlySuspension Data

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 PaMTSScipants (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 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)).

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">Dropout Prevention Goal(s)</th><th colspan="5">Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Fidelity Check
Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</td><td>Strategy Data Check
How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</td><td>Student Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">1. Dropout Prevention

Dropout Prevention Goal #1:
*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</td><td>1.1.</td><td>1.1.</td><td>1.1.</td><td>1.1.</td><td>1.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="5">N/A</td><td>2012 Current Dropout Rate:*</td><td>2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*</td><td rowspan="5"></td><td rowspan="5"></td><td rowspan="5"></td><td rowspan="5"></td><td rowspan="5"></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>2012 Current Graduation Rate:*</td><td>2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>1.2.</td><td>1.2.</td><td>1.2.</td><td>1.2.</td><td>1.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>1.3.</td><td>1.3.</td><td>1.3.</td><td>1.3.</td><td>1.3.</td></tr>
</table>

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 PaMTSScipants (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:			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
See Parent Involvement Plan	2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*					
			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:			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
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.

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 PaMTSScipants (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) Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement **Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
1. Health and Fitness Goal			1.1. Lack of time available in the daily schedules of teachers	1.1. Elementary students will engage in 150 minutes of physical education per week in kindergarten through fifth grade	1.1. Teacher daily schedules	1.1. . Amount of students involved with Teacher Directed PE	1.1. Teacher schedules to determine hours of TDPE Results of the Healthy Fitness Zone Posttest
Health and Fitness Goal #1: **During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students scoring in the "Healthy Fitness Zone" (HFZ) on the Pacer for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular health will increase from 25% on the Pretest to 32% on the Posttest.**	2012 Current Level :* **25% (63/253)**	2013 Expected Level :* **32% (81/254)**					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Health and Fitness Goals Professional Development

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

Continuous Improvement Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s) Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement 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			1.1. Lack of time and student understanding of the principal role	1.1. Build relationships and communicate daily with students; visit classrooms; eat lunch with students; attend class and school events	1.1. Administration through student feedback; midyear student survey to 3rd-5th	1.1. Administration will review the survey results	1.1.2012-2013 School Climate and Perception Survey for Instructional Staff
Continuous Improvement Goal #1: **Based on the 2011-2012 School Climate and Perception Survey for Instructional Staff, the percentage of students who strongly agree with the statement that "the principal is involved with students in a variety of ways throughout the year" is 47%. We will increase this belief to 80% during the school year.**	2012 Current Level :* **47%**	2013 Expected Level :* **80%**					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD PaMTSScipants (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
Effective Professional Learning Communities	Grades K-5	PLC Facilitators	School Wide	Faculty Meetings Weekly PLCs Weekly Data Chats Monthly Faculty PLCs	PLC Facilitators will meet and discuss progress of PLCs	Administration; Leadership Team

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.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **0**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**					
			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.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **0**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**					
			B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.
			B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.

NEW Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking.		1.1. Lack of teaching skills related to working with English Language Learners in the classroom Lack of understanding of the FCIM and CCIM processes How to implement both the FCIM and CCIM strategies while maintaining a focus on the core curriculum. Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students).	1.1. Strategy: The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Teachers will utilize ELL strategies in the classroom to meet the needs of the ELL students. Students' reading comprehension will improve through teachers using the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM) with core curriculum and providing Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the Problem-Solving Model. Action Steps: 1. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) 2. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling researched-based best-practice strategies. 3. PLC teachers instruct students using the core	1.1. Who Principal -APEI -Reading Coach -Academic Intervention Specialist -Lead Teacher for Curriculum Integration -Reading Literacy Team -ELL Paraprofessional How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). The C-CIM and DI strategies will be added to the form. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen	1.1. Teacher Level Classroom teachers will analyze student data from assessments. PLC/Department Level PLC unit assessment data will be recorded in a course-specific PLC data base (excel spread sheet). PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. Leadership Team Level PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check*	1.1. 2-3x Per Year - FAIR -On-going Progress Monitoring (OPM)in comprehension During Grading Period - Course unit assessments - Florida Achieves CIM Mini Assessment -FCAT Weekly Assessments -CELLA Assessment
CELLA Goal #C: The percent of students who score proficient in the Listening/Speaking component of the CELLA Assessment will increase from 61% to 71%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: **61%**					

			curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions. 4. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 6. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective. 7. Based on the data, teachers a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students. 8. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment) based on concepts learned in the Differentiated Instruction Training. 9. PLCs record their work in logs.	during administration walk-throughs. -Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	*3rd Grading Period Check*	
		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.		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
CELLA Goal #D: The percent of students who score	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :	Lack of teaching skills related to working with English Language	Strategy: The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen	Who Principal -APEI	Teacher Level Classroom teachers will analyze student data from	2-3x Per Year - FAIR -On-going Progress

proficient in the Reading component of the CELLA Assessment will increase from 42% to 52%.	**42%**	Learners in the classroom Lack of understanding of the FCIM and CCIM processes How to implement both the FCIM and CCIM strategies while maintaining a focus on the core curriculum. Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students).	the core curriculum. Teachers will utilize ELL strategies in the classroom to meet the needs of the ELL students. Students' reading comprehension will improve through teachers using the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM) with core curriculum and providing Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the Problem-Solving Model. Action Steps: 1. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) 2. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling researched-based best-practice strategies. 3. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions. 4. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 6. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were	-Reading Coach -Academic Intervention Specialist -Lead Teacher for Curriculum Integration -Reading Literacy Team -ELL Paraprofessional How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). The C-CIM and DI strategies will be added to the form. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check*	assessments. PLC/Department Level PLC unit assessment data will be recorded in a course-specific PLC data base (excel spread sheet). PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. Leadership Team Level PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	Monitoring (OPM)in comprehension During Grading Period - Course unit assessments - Florida Achieves CIM Mini Assessment -FCAT Weekly Assessments -CELLA Assessment

			effective. 7. Based on the data, teachers a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students. 8. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment) based on concepts learned in the Differentiated Instruction Training. 9. PLCs record their work in logs.	*3rd Grading Period Check*		
		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. Lack of teaching skills related to working with English Language Learners in the classroom Lack of understanding of the FCIM and CCIM processes How to implement both the FCIM and CCIM strategies while maintaining a focus on the core curriculum. Lack of common planning time to discuss best	2.1. Strategy: The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Teachers will utilize ELL strategies in the classroom to meet the needs of the ELL students. Students' reading comprehension will improve through teachers using the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM) with core curriculum and providing	2.1. Who Principal -APEI -Reading Coach -Academic Intervention Specialist -Lead Teacher for Curriculum Integration -Reading Literacy Team -ELL Paraprofessional	2.1. Teacher Level Classroom teachers will analyze student data from assessments. PLC/Department Level PLC unit assessment data will be recorded in a course-specific PLC data base (excel spread sheet). PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of	2.1. 2-3x Per Year - Dunbar Monthly Writes -On-going Progress Monitoring (OPM)in writing During Grading Period - Monthly Writes -Star Conferencing -Daily Writing -CELLA Assessment
CELLA Goal #E: The percent of students who score proficient in the Writing component of the CELLA Assessment will increase from 18%% to 28%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : **18%**					

		practices before the unit of instruction. Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students).	Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the Problem-Solving Model. <u>Action Steps:</u> 1. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) 2. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling researched-based best-practice strategies. 3. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions. 4. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 6. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective. 7. Based on the data, teachers a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students. 8. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students	<u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). The C-CIM and DI strategies will be added to the form. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks <u>*1st Grading Period Check*</u> <u>*2nd Grading Period Check*</u> <u>*3rd Grading Period Check*</u>	instruction. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. <u>*1st Grading Period Check*</u> <u>*2nd Grading Period Check*</u> <u>*3rd Grading Period Check*</u>	

			(remediation and enrichment) based on concepts learned in the Differentiated Instruction Training. 9. PLCs record their work in logs.			
		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: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **0**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**					
			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:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	0	N/A					
			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: N/A	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**

I. Students scoring in the upper third on Geometry.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Geometry Goal I: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	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: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	0	**N/A**					
			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** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
K. Students scoring in the middle or upper third (proficient) in Biology.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Biology Goal K: N/A	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: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	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: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **0**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**					
			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** 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**

In grade 5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science Assessment will increase from 38% to 60%. Students will produce high quality STEM Fair Projects	1.1. Lack of understanding about the STEM Fair process and procedures	1.1. School Wide professional development over STEM Fair Projects	1.1. Who -Principal -APEI -Lead Teacher for Curriculum Integration How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. - Evidence of STEM Fair planning in teachers' lesson plans seen during administrative walk-throughs. -High quality STEM Fair projects	1.1. Teacher Level Classroom teachers will analyze STEM Fair Projects. PLC/Department Level Science PLCs will review and discuss STEM Fair projects during the STEM Fair cycle (September through December) Leadership Team Level PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.	1.1 2-3x Per Year -District-level baseline and mid-year tests -STEM Fair Projects During Grading Period -Unit assessments -Science Mini Benchmark Assessments -Scientific Method evidenced in student learning .
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD PaMTSScipants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
STEM FairTraining	Grades K - 5	District Science Resource Teachers	Grade K-5 Teachers – School Wide	August 2012	Administrators conduct targeted walk-throughs to monitor STEM Fair instruction	Administration Team

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: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	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.

CTE Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD PaMTSScipants (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 CTE Goal(s)

Differentiated Accountability

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
☐ Priority	☐ Focus	x ☐ Prevent

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

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

Describe the use of SAC funds.			
Name and Number of Strategy from the School Improvement Plan	Description of Resources that improves student achievement or student engagement	Projected Amount	Final Amount
Final Amount Spent			