# Florida Department of Education



# School Improvement Plan (SIP)

# Form SIP-1

### Monroe Middle School
### Global Leadership Academy

## 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

# PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

| | |
|---|---|
| School Name:  Monroe Middle School | District Name:  Hillsborough |
| Principal:  Kenneth Hart | Superintendent:  MaryEllen Elia |
| SAC Chair:   Stephanie Dershem and Andrea Stingone | Date of School Board Approval:  Pending 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

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

List your school's highly qualified administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school.  Include history of school grades, FCAT/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 | Kenneth Hart | MA Educational Leadership | 0 | 27 | 11/12:      % AYP<br>10/11:      % AYP<br>09/10:      % AYP |
| Assistant Principal | Darrell Faber | MA Educational Leadership | 0 | 6 | 11/12:      % AYP<br>10/11:      % AYP<br>09/10:      %AYP |
| Assistant Principal | Denise Anderson | MS Educational Leadership Elementary Education K-6 | 9 | 9 | 11/12:  D      % AYP<br>10/11:  C 72% AYP<br>09/10:  C 82% AYP |
| Administrative Resource Teacher | Bruce Miller | MS Ed Leadership BS Elem. Ed (grades 1-6) | 2 | 2 | 11/12:  D      % AYP<br>10/11:  C 72% AYP |

## Highly Qualified Instructional Coaches

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

| Subject Area | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | Number of Years at Current School | Number of Years as an Instructional Coach | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels,  Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reading | Patricia Fisher | MA Reading Early Childhood Elementary Education | 16 | 12 | 11/12:  D      % AYP<br>10/11:  C 72% AYP<br>09/10:  C 82% AYP |

| Writing | Nicole Starbuck | BS Public Relations<br>MA Reading Education<br>English 6-12<br>Reading k-12<br>ESE K-12<br>ESOL | 0 | 0 | 11/12: A       AYP<br>10/11: A 92% AYP<br>09/10: A 92% AYP |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Highly Qualified Teachers

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

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

## Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 9 out of field<br>7 not highly qualified | Depending on the needs of the teacher, one or more of the following strategies are implemented.<br>**Administrators**<br>Meet with the teachers four times per year to discuss progress on:<br>● Preparing and taking the certification exam<br>● Completing classes need for certification<br>● Provide substitute coverage for the teachers to observe other teachers<br>● Discussion of what teachers learned during the observation(s)<br>**Academic Coach**<br>● The coach co-plans, models, co-teaches, observes and conferences with the teacher on a regular basis<br>**Subject Area Leader/PLC**<br>● The teachers will attend PLC meetings for on-going adult learning, striving to understand how they as an individual teacher and PLC member can improve learning for all. |

## Staff Demographics

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

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

| Total Number of Instructional Staff | % of First-Year Teachers | % of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience | % of Teachers with Advanced Degrees | % Highly Qualified Teachers | % Reading Endorsed Teachers | % National Board Certified Teachers | % ESOL Endorsed Teachers |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 54 | 14% (4) | 24%(13) | 31%(17) | 37%(20) | 43%(23) | 87%(47) | 11%(6) | 1%(1) | 20%(11) |

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Andrea Stingone | Natalie Laguela | Lead Teacher | Edline |
| Andrea Stingone | Jason Crawford | Lead Teacher | Edline |

| Andrea Stingone | Lewis Singleton | Lead Teacher-UNESCO Program | Curriculum Coaching |
|---|---|---|---|

# 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 and summer programs, quality teachers through professional development, content resource teachers, and mentors. |
| Title I, Part C- Migrant |
| The migrant advocate provides services and support to students and parents. The advocate works with teachers and other programs to ensure that the migrant students' needs are being met. |
| Title I, Part D |
| The district receives funds to support the Alternative Education Program which provides transition services from alternative education to school of choice. |
| Title II |
| The district receives funds for staff development to increase student achievement through teacher training. In addition, the funds are utilized in the Salary Differential Program at Renaissance schools. |
| Title III |
| Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners |
| Title X- Homeless |
| The district receives funds to provide resources (social workers and tutoring) for students for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education. |
| Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) |
| SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school, reading coaches, and extended learning opportunity programs. |

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

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

| School-Based MTSS/RtI Team |
|---|
| Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team. The Leadership team includes:<br>● Principal<br>● Assistant Principal for Curriculum<br>● Assistant Principal for Administration<br>● Guidance Counselor<br>● School Psychologist<br>● Social Worker<br>● Academic Coaches (Reading and Writing),<br>● ESE teacher<br>● Subject Area Leaders<br>● Team Leaders<br>● SAC Chair<br>● ELP Coordinator<br>● ELL Representative<br>● *Attendance Committee Representative* |
| 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?<br>Meetings are held bi-monthly with running agenda much like our PLC process. |
| Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?<br>The PLC process of our team uses the Plan Do Check Act model to evaluate and provide strategy input and feedback to the SIP process. |
| **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.<br>Data is from county systems such as IPT, EASI, EdLine and SDHC as well as individual classroom assessments (formative and summative) |
| Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.<br>Teachers will be trained to implement the problem solving model within their PLCs using data from their common assessments in order to differentiate instruction.<br>Low 3's and high 2's will be identified at each grade level, assessment data monitored and students mentored to drive future instruction. |

| Describe plan to support MTSS. |
| --- |
| |

# Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

| **School-Based Literacy Leadership Team** |
| --- |
| Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).<br>     Principal<br>     Assistant Principal for Curriculum<br>     Reading Coach<br>     Reading Teachers<br>     Media Specialist<br>     Teachers across content areas (Language Arts, Math, Science, Social Studies and Electives) who have demonstrated effective reading instruction as reflected through positive student reading gains<br>     Language Arts Subject Area Leaders |
| Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).<br>1. Review school-wide assessment data on an ongoing basis in order to identify instructional needs at all grade levels.<br>2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels.<br>3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains.<br>4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams. |
| What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?<br><br>Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum)  instruction through the STAAR Process:<br>     Implementation and support of PLCs<br>     Review of teacher/PLC core curriculum assessments/chapters tests/checks for understanding (data will be collected and analyzed by PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT)<br>     Use of Common Core Assessments by teachers teaching the same grade/subject area/course (data will be collected and analyzed by PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT)<br>     Implementation of research-based scientifically validated instructional strategies and/or interventions.<br>     Communication with major stakeholders (e.g., parents, business partners, etc.) regarding student outcomes through data summaries and conferences. |

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

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

## *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.

Reading Coach will monitor all subjects according to weekly walk through to determine fidelity of implementation of cross content reading strategies. Strategy Implementation calendar will be monitored by STAAR team in monthly meetings.

# 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).** | Prior to this school year, a plan was not implemented to train teachers outside of the reading area on reading strategies.  Prior to this school year, minimal emphasis on higher order questions (especially text dependent questions.  Prior to this school year, teachers did not meet in PLCs and collaborative plan. | Reading teachers will implement the Plan-Do-Check-Act to strengthen the core curriculum.  Teachers will meet a minimum 3 times per month in PLCs with site-based coaches to plan collaboratively.  Teachers will effectively unpack and deliver reading assessment through the core curriculum.  Data will be used to differentiate future instruction.  Reading Coach will conduct coach-teacher data chats.  Student reading comprehension improves when students are required to provide evidence to support their answers to text-dependent questions.  Students' reading comprehension improves when students are engaged in specific close reading strategies, such as AVID's marking the text, writing in the margins, and Socratic Seminars, in complex text across content areas. | PLC Logs Walk-through data Student assessment data Teacher-coach data chats | Teachers/PLCs use data gathered from checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments to drive future instruction.  Common core curriculum assessment data and teacher walk-through data is shared with the Leadership Team.  This data is used to drive problem-solving, professional development, teacher support, and supplemental instruction.  The data gathered by the Leadership team is shared every three weeks with the district STAAR team using the problem solving model.  Specifically, the data is examined using the following questions:  1) What is the evidence of implementation, 2) What are the concerns?  What are the celebrations?  and 3) What are the next steps? | 3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reading Goal #1: <br><br> The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 36% to 39%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | **36%** | **39%** | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** <br> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** <br> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.** | Prior to this school year, a plan was not implemented to train teachers outside of the reading area on reading strategies. Prior to this school year, minimal emphasis on higher order questions (especially text dependent questions. Prior to this school year, teachers did not meet in PLCs and collaborative plan. | Prior to this school year, a plan was not implemented to train teachers outside of the reading area on reading strategies. Prior to this school year, minimal emphasis on higher order questions (especially text dependent questions. Prior to this school year, teachers did not meet in PLCs and collaborative plan. | PLC Logs Walk-through data Student assessment data Teacher-coach data chats | Teachers/PLCs use data gathered from checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments to drive future instruction. Common core curriculum assessment data and teacher walk-through data is shared with the Leadership Team. This data is used to drive problem-solving, professional development, teacher support, and supplemental instruction. The data gathered by the Leadership team is shared every three weeks with the district STAAR team using the problem solving model. Specifically, the data is examined using the following questions: 1) What is the evidence of implementation, 2) What are the concerns? What are the celebrations? and 3) What are the next steps? | 3x per year - FAIR <br><br> During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks | |
| Reading Goal #2: <br><br> The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2012 FCAT Reading will increase from 13% to 16% | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
| | **13%** | **16%** | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

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

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

| 3. **FCAT 2.0:** Points for students making Learning Gains in reading. | Prior to this school year, a plan was not implemented to train teachers outside of the reading area on reading strategies. Prior to this school year, minimal emphasis on higher order questions (especially text dependent questions. Prior to this school year, teachers did not meet in PLCs and collaborative plan. | Reading teachers will implement the Plan-Do-Check-Act to strengthen the core curriculum. Teachers will meet a minimum 3 times per month in PLCs with site-based coaches to plan collaboratively. Teachers will effectively unpack and deliver reading assessment through the core curriculum. Data will be used to differentiate future instruction. Reading Coach will conduct coach-teacher data chats. Student reading comprehension improves when students are required to provide evidence to support their answers to text-dependent questions. Students' reading comprehension improves when students are engaged in specific close reading strategies, such as AVID's marking the text, writing in the margins, and Socratic Seminars, in complex text across content areas. | PLC Logs Walk-through data Student assessment data Teacher-coach data chats | Teachers/PLCs use data gathered from checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments to drive future instruction. Common core curriculum assessment data and teacher walk-through data is shared with the Leadership Team. This data is used to drive problem-solving, professional development, teacher support, and supplemental instruction. The data gathered by the Leadership team is shared every three weeks with the district STAAR team using the problem solving model. Specifically, the data is examined using the following questions: 1) What is the evidence of implementation, 2) What are the concerns? What are the celebrations? and 3) What are the next steps? | 3x per year - FAIR <br><br> During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks | | |

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

| Reading Goal #3:<br><br>The percentage of students who make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 52% to 55%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **52%** | **55%** | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | |

| 4. **FCAT 2.0:** Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. | Prior to this school year, a plan was not implemented to train teachers outside of the reading area on reading strategies. Prior to this school year, minimal emphasis on higher order questions (especially text dependent questions. Prior to this school year, teachers did not meet in PLCs and collaborative plan. | Reading teachers will implement the Plan-Do-Check-Act to strengthen the core curriculum. Teachers will meet a minimum 3 times per month in PLCs with site-based coaches to plan collaboratively. Teachers will effectively unpack and deliver reading assessment through the core curriculum. Data will be used to differentiate future instruction. Reading Coach will conduct coach-teacher data chats. Student reading comprehension improves when students are required to provide evidence to support their answers to text-dependent questions. Students' reading comprehension improves when students are engaged in specific close reading strategies such as AVID's marking the text, writing in the margins, and Socratic Seminars, in complex text across content areas. | PLC Logs Walk-through data Student assessment data Teacher-coach data chats | Teachers/PLCs use data gathered from checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments to drive future instruction. Common core curriculum assessment data and teacher walk-through data is shared with the Leadership Team. This data is used to drive problem-solving, professional development, teacher support, and supplemental instruction. The data gathered by the Leadership team is shared every three weeks with the district STAAR team using the problem solving model. Specifically, the data is examined using the following questions: 1) What is the evidence of implementation, 2) What are the concerns? What are the celebrations? and 3) What are the next steps? | <u>3x per year</u> - FAIR<br><br><u>During the Grading Period</u> - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks | | |

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

| Reading Goal #4:<br><br>Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 55 points to 58 points. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **55 points** | **58 points** | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | | |
| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target | **2011-2012** | **2012-2013** | **2013-2014** | **2014-2015** | **2015-2016** | **2016-2017** | |
| **5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.** | | | | | | | |
| Reading Goal #5:<br>**Students will reduce their achievement gap by 50% in six years.** | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity** (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.** | 5A.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: | 5A.1 See Goals 1, 2,3, & 4 | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. FAIR <u>During the Grading Period</u> -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for AMO Sub-group performance | | |

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

| Reading Goal #5A: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| . The percentage of White students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 46% to 51%.<br><br>The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 20% to 28%.<br><br>The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 43% to49%.<br><br>The percentage of Asian students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 69% to 72%. | | | | | | |
| | White:46%<br>Black:20%<br>Hispanic:43%<br>Asian:69%<br>American Indian: | White:51%<br>Black:28%<br>Hispanic:49%<br>Asian:72%<br>American Indian: | | | | |
| | | 5A.2. | 5A.2 | 5A.2 | 5A.2 | 5A.2 |

|  |  | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |  |  |
| **5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.** | 5B.1. | 5B.1 See Goals 1, 2,3, & 4 | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1 . FAIR  During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for ED performance |  |  |
| Reading Goal #5B:  The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 30% to 37%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **30%** | **37%** |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 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.** | 5C.1. | 5C.1. See Goals 1, 2,3, & 4 | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. FAIR -CELLA  During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for ELL performance | |
| Reading Goal #5C:  The percentage of English Language Learner students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 24% to 32%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
| | **24%** | **32%** | | | | |
| | | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. |
| | | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.** | 5D.1. | 5D.1. See Goals 1, 2,3, & 4 | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. FAIR During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for SWD performance | | |
| Reading Goal #5D: The percentage of Students with Disability students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 8% to 17%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | **8%** | **17%** | | | | | |
| | | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | |
| | | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | |

## Reading Professional Development

| Professional | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | |

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

| Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Marking the Text | 6-8 | Reading Coach and Avid Teacher | School-wide | August to October | Walk Though Fidelity Checks | Administration and Coaches |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

*End of Reading Goals*

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

## Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1. FCAT 2.0:  Students scoring proficient in mathematics (Level 3-5).** | Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques. -PLC meetings need to focus on identifying and writing higher order questions to deliver during the lessons. | Teachers will implement the Plan-Do-Check-Act model to strengthen core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through implementation of the core curriculum with fidelity. Teachers will meet a minimum 3 times per month in PLCs with SAL to engage in lesson planning to increase content knowledge and pedagogy. Students' math skills will improve through engagement in higher order questions with students being able to explain orally or in writing to justify their responses. Students' understanding of math improves through unpacking the standards and identifying/ developing the common assessments. Data from these assessments will be used to drive differentiated instruction (both remediation and enrichment). Student achievement improves when students are engaged in frequent checks for understanding (during the lesson, end of lesson, after the lesson) that provide timely feedback in order to | PLC Logs Walk-through data Student assessment data Teacher-coach data chats | Teachers/PLCs use data gathered from checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments to drive future instruction.  Common core curriculum assessment data and teacher walk-through data is shared with the Leadership Team.  This data is used to drive problem-solving, professional development, teacher support, and supplemental instruction. The data gathered by the Leadership team is shared every three weeks with the district STAAR team using the problem solving model.  Specifically, the data is examined using the following questions:  1) What is the evidence of implementation, 2) What are the concerns?  What are the celebrations?  and 3) What are the next steps? | 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing  Semester Exams  During the Grading Period -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, etc.) | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | ensure learning prior to the summative assessment (end of unit/big idea assessment.). | | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #1:<br><br>The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 41% to 44%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | **41%** | **44%** | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics.** | Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques. -PLC meetings need to focus on identifying and writing higher order questions to deliver during the lessons. | Teachers will implement the Plan-Do-Check-Act model to strengthen core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through implementation of the core curriculum with fidelity. Teachers will meet a minimum 3 times per month in PLCs with SAL to engage in lesson planning to increase content knowledge and pedagogy. Students' math skills will improve through engagement in higher order questions with students being able to explain orally or in writing to justify their responses. Students' understanding of math improves through unpacking the standards and identifying/developing the common assessments. Data from these assessments will be used to drive differentiated instruction (both remediation and enrichment). Student achievement improves when students are engaged in frequent checks for understanding (during the lesson, end of lesson, after the lesson) that | PLC Logs Walk-through data Student assessment data Teacher-coach data chats | Teachers/PLCs use data gathered from checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments to drive future instruction. Common core curriculum assessment data and teacher walk-through data is shared with the Leadership Team. This data is used to drive problem-solving, professional development, teacher support, and supplemental instruction. The data gathered by the Leadership team is shared every three weeks with the district STAAR team using the problem solving model. Specifically, the data is examined using the following questions: 1) What is the evidence of implementation, 2) What are the concerns? What are the celebrations? and 3) What are the next steps? | 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing  Semester Exams  During the Grading Period -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, etc.) | | |

| | | provide timely feedback in order to ensure learning prior to the summative assessment (end of unit/big idea assessment.). | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mathematics Goal #2:<br><br>The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 14% to 17%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | **14%** | **17%** | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **3. FCAT 2.0:** **Points for students making learning gains in mathematics.** | Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques. -PLC meetings need to focus on identifying and writing higher order questions to deliver during the lessons. | Teachers will implement the Plan-Do-Check-Act model to strengthen core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through implementation of the core curriculum with fidelity. Teachers will meet a minimum 3 times per month in PLCs with SAL to engage in lesson planning to increase content knowledge and pedagogy. Students' math skills will improve through engagement in higher order questions with students being able to explain orally or in writing to justify their responses. Students' understanding of math improves through unpacking the standards and identifying/ developing the common assessments. Data from these assessments will be used to drive differentiated instruction (both remediation and enrichment). Student achievement improves when students are engaged in frequent checks for understanding (during the lesson, end of lesson, after the lesson) that provide timely feedback in order to | PLC Logs Walk-through data Student assessment data Teacher-coach data chats | Teachers/PLCs use data gathered from checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments to drive future instruction. Common core curriculum assessment data and teacher walk-through data is shared with the Leadership Team. This data is used to drive problem-solving, professional development, teacher support, and supplemental instruction. The data gathered by the Leadership team is shared every three weeks with the district STAAR team using the problem solving model. Specifically, the data is examined using the following questions: 1) What is the evidence of implementation, 2) What are the concerns? What are the celebrations? and 3) What are the next steps? | 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing

Semester Exams

During the Grading Period -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, etc.) | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | ensure learning prior to the summative assessment (end of unit/big idea assessment.). | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #3:<br><br>Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 57 points to 60 points. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
| | **57 points** | **60 points** | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **4. FCAT 2.0:** Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. | Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques. -PLC meetings need to focus on identifying and writing higher order questions to deliver during the lessons. | Teachers will implement the Plan-Do-Check-Act model to strengthen core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through implementation of the core curriculum with fidelity. Teachers will meet a minimum 3 times per month in PLCs with SAL to engage in lesson planning to increase content knowledge and pedagogy. Students' math skills will improve through engagement in higher order questions with students being able to explain orally or in writing to justify their responses. Students' understanding of math improves through unpacking the standards and identifying/ developing the common assessments. Data from these assessments will be used to drive differentiated instruction (both remediation and enrichment). Student achievement improves when students are engaged in frequent checks for understanding (during the lesson, end of lesson, after the lesson) that provide timely feedback in order to | PLC Logs Walk-through data Student assessment data Teacher-coach data chats | Teachers/PLCs use data gathered from checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments to drive future instruction. Common core curriculum assessment data and teacher walk-through data is shared with the Leadership Team. This data is used to drive problem-solving, professional development, teacher support, and supplemental instruction. The data gathered by the Leadership team is shared every three weeks with the district STAAR team using the problem solving model. Specifically, the data is examined using the following questions: 1) What is the evidence of implementation, 2) What are the concerns? What are the celebrations? and 3) What are the next steps? | 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing<br><br>Semester Exams<br><br>During the Grading Period -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, etc.) | | |

| | | ensure learning prior to the summative assessment (end of unit/big idea assessment.). | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mathematics Goal #4:<br><br>Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 64 points to 67 points. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
| | **64 points** | **67 points** | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | |
| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target | **2011-2012** | **2012-2013** | **2013-2014** | **2014-2015** | **2015-2016** | **2016-2017** |
| **5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.** | | | | | | |
| Math Goal #5: | | | | | | |

| 5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics** | 5A.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: | 5A.1. See Goals 1, 2,3, & 4 | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

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

| Math Goal #5A:<br><br>The percentage of White students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 56% to 60%.<br><br>The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 27% to34%.<br><br>The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 42% to 48%.<br><br>The percentage of Asian students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 75% to 78%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | White:56%<br>Black:27%<br>Hispanic:42%<br>Asian:75%<br>American Indian: | White:60%<br>Black:34%<br>Hispanic:48%<br>Asian:78%<br>American Indian: | | | | | |

| | | 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. See Goals 1, 2,3, & 4 | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | | |
| Mathematics Goal #5B:<br><br>The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Math will increase from 34% to 41%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | **34%** | **41%** | | | | | |

| | | 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. | 5C.1. See Goals 1, 2,3, & 4 | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | | |
| Mathematics Goal #5C: The percentage of English Language Learners students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 32% to 39%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | **32%** | **39%** | | | | | |

| | | 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. See Goals 1, 2,3, & 4 | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | | |
| Mathematics Goal #5D: The percentage of Student with Disabilities students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 12% to 21%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | **12%** | **21%** | | | | | |
| | | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | |
| | | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | |

*End of Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals*

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

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

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

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Alg1. Students scoring proficient in Algebra (Levels 3-5).** | Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques. -PLC meetings need to focus on identifying and writing higher order questions to deliver during the lessons. | Teachers will implement the Plan-Do-Check-Act model to strengthen core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through implementation of the core curriculum with fidelity. Teachers will meet a minimum 3 times per month in PLCs with SAL to engage in lesson planning to increase content knowledge and pedagogy. Students' math skills will improve through engagement in higher order questions with students being able to explain orally or in writing to justify their responses. Students' understanding of math improves through unpacking the standards and identifying/ developing the common assessments. Data from these assessments will be used to drive differentiated instruction (both remediation and enrichment). Student achievement improves when students are engaged in frequent checks for understanding (during the lesson, end of lesson, after the lesson) that provide timely feedback in order to | PLC Logs Walk-through data Student assessment data Teacher-coach data chats | Teachers/PLCs use data gathered from checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments to drive future instruction. Common core curriculum assessment data and teacher walk-through data is shared with the Leadership Team. This data is used to drive problem-solving, professional development, teacher support, and supplemental instruction. The data gathered by the Leadership team is shared every three weeks with the district STAAR team using the problem solving model. Specifically, the data is examined using the following questions: 1) What is the evidence of implementation, 2) What are the concerns? What are the celebrations? and 3) What are the next steps? | | | |

| | | ensure learning prior to the summative assessment (end of unit/big idea assessment.). | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Algebra Goal #1:<br><br>The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 Algebra EOC will increase from 79% to 82%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | **79%** | **82%** | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Alg2.  Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in Algebra.** | Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques. -PLC meetings need to focus on identifying and writing higher order questions to deliver during the lessons. | Teachers will implement the Plan-Do-Check-Act model to strengthen core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through implementation of the core curriculum with fidelity. Teachers will meet a minimum 3 times per month in PLCs with SAL to engage in lesson planning to increase content knowledge and pedagogy. Students' math skills will improve through engagement in higher order questions with students being able to explain orally or in writing to justify their responses. Students' understanding of math improves through unpacking the standards and identifying/developing the common assessments. Data from these assessments will be used to drive differentiated instruction (both remediation and enrichment). Student achievement improves when students are engaged in frequent checks for understanding (during the lesson, end of lesson, after the lesson) that provide timely feedback in order to | PLC Logs Walk-through data Student assessment data Teacher-coach data chats | Teachers/PLCs use data gathered from checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments to drive future instruction.  Common core curriculum assessment data and teacher walk-through data is shared with the Leadership Team.  This data is used to drive problem-solving, professional development, teacher support, and supplemental instruction. The data gathered by the Leadership team is shared every three weeks with the district STAAR team using the problem solving model.  Specifically, the data is examined using the following questions:  1) What is the evidence of implementation, 2) What are the concerns?  What are the celebrations?  and 3) What are the next steps? | | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | ensure learning prior to the summative assessment (end of unit/big idea assessment.). | | | | |
| Algebra Goal #2:<br><br>The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or 5 on the 2013 Algebra EOC will increase from 13% to 16%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
| | **13%** | **16%** | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

*End of Algebra EOC Goals*

## Mathematics Professional Development

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

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

*End of Mathematics Goals*

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

<u>**Elementary and Middle School Science Goals**</u>

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

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

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science.** | Need to ensure the core curriculum is being taught with fidelity. Science PLCs by grade-level/ course being implemented to improve pedagogy and 5E instructional model. Need to increase student participation. | Teachers will implement the Plan-Do-Check-Act to strengthen the core curriculum. Teachers will meet a minimum 3 times per month in PLCs .with SAL to increase content knowledge (and pedagogy in order to plan effectively. Students' science skills will improve through engagement in lab-dependent and/or text dependent higher order questions where students are required to support their answers orally or written. Students' understanding of science improves through unpacking the standards and identifying/ developing the common assessment. Data from these assessments will be used to drive future instruction and development of the 5E instructional units. Teachers will effectively | PLC logs Walk-throughs Common core curriculum assessments Student work samples | Teachers/PLCs use data gathered from checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments to drive future instruction. Common core curriculum assessment data and teacher walk-through data is shared with the Leadership Team. This data is used to drive problem-solving, professional development, teacher support, and supplemental instruction. The data gathered by the Leadership team is shared every three weeks with the district STAAR team using the problem solving model.  Specifically, the data is examined using the following questions:  1) What is the evidence of implementation, 2) What are the concerns?  What are the celebrations?  and 3) What are the next steps? | 2x per year District-level baseline and mid-year tests  Semester Exams  During the Grading Period -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, intervention checks, etc.) | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | implement backwards design and develop and implement labs or mini-labs through the core curriculum. Students' comprehension of science content and improves when they are engaged in specific close reading strategies in complex text where appropriate in the 5E instructional model. | | | | |
| Science Goal #1:<br><br>The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 28% to 31%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
| | **28%** | **31%** | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2. FCAT 2.0:** Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science. | Need to ensure the core curriculum is being taught with fidelity. Science PLCs by grade-level/ course being implemented to improve pedagogy and 5E instructional model. Need to increase student participation. | Teachers will implement the Plan-Do-Check-Act to strengthen the core curriculum. Teachers will meet a minimum 3 times per month in PLCs .with SAL to increase content knowledge (and pedagogy in order to plan effectively. Students' science skills will improve through engagement in lab-dependent and/or text dependent higher order questions where students are required to support their answers orally or written.  Students' understanding of science improves through unpacking the standards and identifying/ developing the common assessment. Data from these assessments will be used to drive future instruction and development of the 5E instructional units. Teachers will effectively | PLC logs Walk-throughs Common core curriculum assessments Student work samples | Teachers/PLCs use data gathered from checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments to drive future instruction. Common core curriculum assessment data and teacher walk-through data is shared with the Leadership Team. This data is used to drive problem-solving, professional development, teacher support, and supplemental instruction. The data gathered by the Leadership team is shared every three weeks with the district STAAR team using the problem solving model.  Specifically, the data is examined using the following questions:  1) What is the evidence of implementation, 2) What are the concerns?  What are the celebrations?  and 3) What are the next steps? | 2x per year District-level baseline and mid-year tests  Semester Exams  During the Grading Period      -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, intervention checks, etc.) | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | implement backwards design and develop and implement labs or mini-labs through the core curriculum. Students' comprehension of science content and improves when they are engaged in specific close reading strategies in complex text where appropriate in the 5E instructional model. | | | | |
| Science Goal #2:<br><br>The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 2% to 5%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
| | **2%** | **5%** | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

## Science Professional Development

| **Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |

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

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

*End of Science Goals*

## Writing/Language Arts Goals

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

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing.** | Teachers are at varying skill levels with writing techniques. -PLC meetings need to focus on identifying and writing lessons. | Teachers will implement the Plan-Do-Check-Act to strengthen the core curriculum. Teachers will meet a minimum 3 times per month in PLC's with site-based coaches to plan collaboratively. The coach/SAL supports teachers through co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, debriefing, or teacher/student data chats. Every two weeks the Coach/SAL meets with the principal to review log. Teachers will effectively unpack and deliver common assessments through the core curriculum. Data will be used to drive future instruction.     Teacher will receive professional   development and | PLC logs, physical space walkthrough, pacing data assessment data (writing and Springboard embedded assessments | Teachers/PLCs use data gathered from checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments to drive future instruction. Common core curriculum assessment data and teacher walk-through data is shared with the Leadership Team. This data is used to drive problem-solving, professional development, teacher support, and supplemental instruction. The data gathered by the Leadership team is shared every three weeks with the district STAAR team using the problem solving model.  Specifically, the data is examined using the following questions:  1) What is the evidence of implementation, 2) What are the concerns?  What are the celebrations?  and 3) What are the next steps? | Student monthly demand writes/ formative assessments -Student daily drafts -Student revisions -Student portfolios | | |
| Writing/LA Goal #1:  The percentage of students scoring Level 3.0 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes will increase from 59% to 62%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |

| | **59%** | **62%** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | |

## Writing/Language Arts Professional Development

| **Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity** Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Essay Scoring Training | 7-8 | Nicole Starbuck | 7-8 Language Arts Teachers | Oct 9 and 16 | Calibration of essays | |
| | | | | | | |

*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** | | |

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

| 1. Attendance | Student attendance below the district average. | Student attendance will improve through a comprehensive social emotional academic mentoring program. (Big Brother MacDill AFB, Gentlemen's Club, Housing Mentoring, Student to Student (New military enrollees), Operation BIGS, Child/Family Counseling Program (THA) and Ambassador Program Attendance procedures developed and professional development provided to faculty. On-going progress monitoring to ensure fidelity of implementation. Implementation of CHAMPS program school wide. Fidelity of implement monitored throughout the school year. | Student attendance reports. Champs walk-through form. | Teachers/PLCs use data gathered from checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments to drive future instruction. Common core curriculum assessment data and teacher walk-through data is shared with the Leadership Team. This data is used to drive problem-solving, professional development, teacher support, and supplemental instruction. The data gathered by the Leadership team is shared every three weeks with the district STAAR team using the problem solving model. Specifically, the data is examined using the following questions: 1) What is the evidence of implementation, 2) What are the concerns? What are the celebrations? and 3) What are the next steps? | Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/ Tardy data Ed Connect | | |

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

| Attendance Goal #1: | 2012 Current Attendance Rate:* | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The attendance rate will increase from 91.14% in 2011-2012 to 94.14% in 2012-2013.<br><br>2. The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused absences throughout the school year will decrease by 10%.<br><br>3. The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused tardies to school throughout the school year will decrease by 10%. | | | | | | |
| | **91.14%** | **94.14%** | | | | |
| | 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | | | | |
| | **140** | **126** | | | | |
| | 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | | | | |
| | **3** | **2.7** | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| **Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity** Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Intervention Forms | 6-8 | Social Worker | School Wide | September | Tracking of Attendance Ref. | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

*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** | |

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

| 1. Suspension | High level of OSS and ISS | Student attendance will improve through a comprehensive social emotional academic mentoring program. (Big Brother MacDill AFB, Gentlemen's Club, Housing Mentoring, Student to Student (New military enrollees), Operation BIGS, Child/Family Counseling Program (THA) and Ambassador Program Attendance procedures developed and professional development provided to faculty. On-going progress monitoring to ensure fidelity of implementation. Implementation of CHAMPS program school wide. Fidelity of implement monitored throughout the school year. | Behavior reports | Teachers/PLCs use data gathered from checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments to drive future instruction. Common core curriculum assessment data and teacher walk-through data is shared with the Leadership Team. This data is used to drive problem-solving, professional development, teacher support, and supplemental instruction. The data gathered by the Leadership team is shared every three weeks with the district STAAR team using the problem solving model. Specifically, the data is examined using the following questions: 1) What is the evidence of implementation, 2) What are the concerns? What are the celebrations? and 3) What are the next steps? | UNTIE , EASI ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data | | |

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

| Suspension Goal #1: | 2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The total number of In-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%.  2. The total number of students receiving In-School Suspensions throughout the school year will decrease by 10%.  3. The total number of Out-of-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%.  4. The total number of students receiving Out-of-School Suspensions throughout the school year will decrease by 10%. | | | | | | |
| | **227** | **204.3** | | | | |
| | 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School | | | | |
| | **144** | **129.6** | | | | |
| | 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | | | | |
| | **858** | **772.2** | | | | |
| | 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School | | | | |

| | **244** | **219.6** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | |

**Suspension Professional Development**

| **Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity** <br> Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| C.H.A.M.P.S | 6-8 | District Raining Staff from Title I | School Wide | August 2012 | C.H.A.M.P.S. Cmt- Karen Palumbo -assisting teachers in implementation of strategies | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

*End of Suspension Goals*

## Health and Fitness Goal(s)

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

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

| Additional Goal(s) | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | |
| **1. Health and Fitness Goal** | 1.1. | 1.1. Middle School students will engage in the equivalent of one class period per day of physical education for one semester of each year in grades 6 through 8. (JLC is an optional substitute for PE) | 1.1. APC Guidance | 1.1. Checking student schedules | 1.1. NA | |
| Health and Fitness Goal #1:<br><br>During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students scoring in the "Healthy Fitness Zone" (HFZ) on the Pacer for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular health will increase from _____% on the Pretest to _____% on the Posttest. | 2012 Current Level :* | 2013 Expected Level :* | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 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 Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

## Continuous Improvement Goal(s)

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

| | **Problem-Solving Process to Increase** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

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

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

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

| 1. Continuous Improvement Goal | 1.1. There is still confusion on how to conduct PLCs that are focused on deepening the knowledge base of teachers and improving student performance by the implementation of the Plan-Do-Check-Act model. -Still confusion on how the Plan-Do-Check-Act model works. -Still some resistance to staff members attending PLCs and/or arriving on time to meetings. -Teachers asking for more PLC collaboration time. Possibility of waiver will be explored. | 1.1. The leadership team will become trained on the use of the PLC "Unit of Instruction" log that follows the Plan-Do-Check-Act model. Subject Area Leader and/or PLC facilitators will guide their PLCs through the Plan-Do-Check-Act model for units of instruction. The work will be recorded on PLC logs that are reviewed by the Leadership Team. | 1.1. Who Principal Leadership Team Subject Area Leaders PLC facilitators | 1.1."Quick" PLC informal surveys will be administered during the school year every two months. The Leadership Team will aggregate the data and share outcomes of the school-wide results with their PLCs. The data will provide direction for future PLC training. | 1.1. PLC Survey materials from Teams to Teach | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Continuous Improvement Goal #1:<br><br>The percentage of teachers who strongly agree with the indicator that "teachers meet on a regular basis to discuss their students' learning, share best practices, problem solve and develop lessons/ assessments that improve student performance (under Teaching and Learning)" will increase from ____ % in 2012 to % in 2013. | 2012 Current Level :*<br><br>2013 Expected Level :* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | 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 | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | |

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

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

*End of Additional Goal(s)*

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

## NEW Reading Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

| A. **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Students scoring proficient in reading (Levels 4-9). | A.1. | A.1. | A.1. | A.1. | A.1. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reading Goal A: Not enough students to complete this goal. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | A.2. | A.2. | A.2. | A.2. | A.2. | |
| | | A.3. | A.3. | A.3. | A.3. | A.3. | |

| B. **Florida Alternate Assessment:** **Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.** | B.1. | B.1. | B.1. | B.1. | B.1. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reading Goal B: Not enough students to complete this goal. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | B.2. | B.2. | B.2. | B.2. | B.2. | |
| | | B.3. | B.3. | B.3. | B.3. | B.3. | |

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

| CELLA Goals | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | |

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

| C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/ Speaking. | 1.1. | 1.1. See Reading Goals 1, 2,3, & 4 | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CELLA Goal #C:<br><br>The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from 45% to 49%. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: | | | | | |
| | **45%** | | | | | |
| | | 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**<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | |

| D. Students scoring proficient in Reading. | 2.1. | 2.1. See Reading Goals 1, 2,3, & 4 | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CELLA Goal #D:<br><br>The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 reading section of the CELLA will increase from 25% to 29%. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading : | | | | | |
| | **25%** | | | | | |
| | | 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**<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | |

| E. Students scoring proficient in Writing. | 2.1. | 2.1. See Writing Goal 1 | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CELLA Goal #E:<br><br>The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA will increase from 21% to 25%. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : | | | | | |
| | **21%** | | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |

## NEW Math Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **F. Florida Alternate Assessment:** **Students scoring at in mathematics (Levels 4-9).** | F.1. | F.1. | F.1. | F.1. | F.1. | |
| Mathematics Goal F:<br><br>Not enough students to complete this goal. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | F.2. | F.2. | F.2. | F.2. | F.2. |
| | | F.3. | F.3. | F.3. | F.3. | F.3. |
| **G. Florida Alternate Assessment:** **Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.** | G.1. | G.1. | G.1. | G.1. | G.1. | |

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

| Mathematics Goal G: Not enough students to complete this goal. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | |
| | | G.2. | G.2. | G.2. | G.2. | G.2. | |
| | | G.3. | G.3. | G.3. | G.3. | G.3. | |

## NEW Science Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **J. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at proficient in science (Levels 4-9).** | J.1. | J.1. | J.1. | J.1. | J.1. | |
| Science Goal J:<br><br>Not enough students to complete this goal. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
| | *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | |
| | | J.2. | J.2. | J.2. | J.2. | J.2. |
| | | J.3. | J.3. | J.3. | J.3. | J.3. |

# NEW Writing Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

| Writing Goals | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | 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: <br><br> Not enough students to complete this goal. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | M.2. | M.2. | M.2. | M.2. | M.2. | |
| | | M.3. | M.3. | M.3. | M.3. | M.3. | |

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

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

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

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

## STEM Professional Development

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

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

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

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

<u>**NEW Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)**</u>

| 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** |
| <u>CTE Goal #1:</u><br><br>Sustain/Increase the number of Career Technical Student Organization chapters from <u>0</u> in 2011-2012 to <u>1</u> in 2012-2013. | 1.1. | 1.1. Increase student participation in CTSO competitions/events. | 1.1. CTE Teacher | 1.1. Aggregate and analyze the data every quarter to develop next steps | 1.1. Log of number of CTSO events Log of number of students who attend CTSO events |
| | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

## CTE Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |

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

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

*End of CTE Goal(s)*

# Differentiated Accountability

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

| School Differentiated Accountability Status | | |
|---|---|---|
| □Priority | □Focus | □Prevent |

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

## School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

Yes               x□ No

| If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements. |
|---|
| We have an imbalance of school board employees to parent/ community members.  We are working with PTSA to get some parent members of the SAC Team. |

| **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 | 1607.77 | | |
|---|---|---|---|