# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

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

## 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

# PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

| | |
|---|---|
| School Name: Schwarzkopf Elementary School | District Name: Hillsborough County |
| Principal: Cheryl Holley | Superintendent: Mary Ellen Elia |
| SAC Chair: Susanne Shrewsbury, Shelly Hill | Date of School Board Approval: |

## Student Achievement Data:

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

## Highly Qualified Administrators

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

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | Number of Years at Current School | Number of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Principal | Cheryl Holley | B.S Elementary<br>M.A. Ed Leadership<br>Elementary Ed 1-6<br>Primary Ed ( K-3)<br>Gifted Endorsement<br>ESOL Endorsement<br>Ed Leadership<br>School Principal | 5.5 | 12 | 06/07 A 100% AYP<br>07/08 A 100% AYP<br>08/09 A 97% AYP<br>09/10 A 100% AYP<br>10/11 A 92% AYP<br>11/12 A |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Assistant Principal | Andria Franks | B.S Elementary<br>M.A. Ed Leadership<br>Elementary Ed 1-6<br>ESOL Endorsement<br>Ed Leadership | 3.5 | 3.5 | 08/09 A 97% AYP<br>09/10 A 100% AYP<br>10/11 A 92% AYP<br>11/12 A |

## 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 | Melanie Alsum | ESOL, Elementary Education Grades 1-6 | Less than a year | Less than a year | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

## Highly Qualified Teachers

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

| Description of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date | Not Applicable (If not, please explain why) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Teacher Interview Day | General Directors | June | |
| 2. District Mentor Program | District Mentors | Ongoing | |
| 3. | | | |
| 4. | | | |

## 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** |
|---|---|
| (Jamie Erb, Brittany Wortham) | Attending ESOL courses |

## Staff Demographics

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

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

| Total Number of Instructional Staff | % of First-Year Teachers | % of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience | % of Teachers with Advanced Degrees | % Highly Qualified Teachers | % Reading Endorsed Teachers | % National Board Certified Teachers | % ESOL Endorsed Teachers |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 57 | 5 | 10 | 25 | 17 | 22 | 96 | 1 | 2 | 46 |

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Brittany Robinson | Brittany Payne<br>Tara Riopelle<br>Matthew Gibson<br>Caitlin Lewis<br>Jena Tissier<br>Kaitlyn Tinsley | New teacher | TIP coursework<br>Weekly planning sessions<br>Observed lessons<br>Open Communication<br>Lesson Modeling |
| Andria Franks | Brittany Wortham | More than 1 year experience prior to entering Hillsborough County | TIP Coursework<br>Ongoing resource |

# 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 |
| Title I, Part C- Migrant |
| Title I, Part D |
| Title II |
| Title III |
| Title X- Homeless |
| Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) |
| Violence Prevention Programs |
| Nutrition Programs |

| |
|---|
| Housing Programs |
| Head Start |
| Adult Education |
| Career and Technical Education |
| Job Training |
| Other |

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

| **School-Based MTSS/RtI Team** |
|---|
| Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.<br>The RtI Leadership team (Problem Solving Leadership Team – PSLT) includes:<br>• Principal – Cheryl Holley<br>• Assistant Principal – Andria Franks<br>• Guidance Counselor - Kelly Minnear<br>• School Psychologist – Linda Hill<br>• Social Worker – Melissa Fiore-Sluka<br>• Academic Coaches (Reading) – Melanie Alsum<br>• ESE teacher – Karen Salesky, Annette Villarosa<br>• Grade Level PLC Facilitators – Mercedes Rivero-Sanchez, Jessica Oberlander, Jennifer Goff, Dina Siembak, Nicole Cotner, Emily Fegan<br>• SAC Co-Chairs – Susanne Shrewsbury, Shelly Hill<br>• ELP Coordinator – Andria Franks<br>• ELL Representative – Shalanda Bell<br>(Note that not all members attend every meeting, but are invited based on the goals for the meeting) |
| 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>The purpose of the MTSS in our school is to ensure high quality instruction/intervention matched to student needs and using performance level and learning rate over time to make data-based decisions to guide instruction. The MTSS reviews school-wide data to address the progress of low-performing students and determine the enrichment and acceleration needs of high performing students. The major goal is for all students to achieve adequate yearly progress and improve other long-term outcomes (behavior, attendance, etc.). The team uses the Collaborative Culture Problem Solving Model and ALL decisions are guided by the review and analysis of student data. |

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

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

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

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

- The Co- Chairs of SAC are members of the MTSS.
- The MTSS and SAC were involved in the School Improvement Plan development during preplanning for the 2012-2013 school year.
- The School Improvement Plan is the working document that guides the work of the MTSS. The large part of the work of the team is outlined in the Expected Improvements/Problem Solving Process sections (and related professional development plans) for school-wide goals in Reading, Math, Writing, Science, Attendance and Suspension/Behavior.
- Given that one of the main tasks is to monitor student data related to instruction and interventions, the MTSS will monitor the effectiveness of the strategies developed in problem solving plans by reviewing student data as well as data related to various levels of fidelity. Using data gathered from PLCs, the team will monitor the data and make progress statements on the School Improvement Plan at the end of the first, second and third nine weeks. The MTSS will use the following rubric to evaluate Strategy Fidelity of Implementation and Strategy Effectiveness:

| Indicator | Strategy Fidelity Check | Strategy Data Check |
|---|---|---|
| Not Evident | Teacher monitoring indicates strategy implementation has not begun. | Student data indicate that strategy implementation is showing no positive effect on student achievement. |
| Emerging | Some (25-75%) of the intended teachers are implementing the strategy with fidelity. Evidence indicates early or preliminary stages of implementation. | Student data indicate that strategy implementation is showing minimal or poor effect on student achievement. |
| Operational | Most (>75%) of the intended teachers are implementing the strategy with fidelity. Evidence indicates active implementation. | Student data indicate that strategy implementation is mostly showing a positive effect on student achievement. |
| Highly Functional | Teacher monitoring indicates that all of the intended teachers are implementing the strategy with fidelity. Evidence exists that the strategy is fully integrated and effectively/consistently implemented. | Student data indicate that strategy implementation is showing a significant positive effect on student achievement. |

- The MTSS will communicate with and support the PLCs in implementing the proposed strategies by assigning MTSS members as consultants to the PLCs to facilitate planning and implementation. Once strategies are put in place, PLCs will periodically report on their efforts and student outcomes to the larger MTSS team through the subject area MTSS representatives.
- The MTSS and PLCs both use the problem solving process: Problem Identification, Problem Analysis, Intervention Design and Implementation and Evaluation to:
  - review and analyze screening and collateral data
  - develop and test hypotheses about why student/school problems are occurring (changeable barriers)
  - develop and target interventions based on confirmed hypotheses
  - establish methods to track students' progress with appropriate progress monitoring assessments at intervals matched to the intensity of the interventions and/or enrichment
  - develop progress monitoring goals to determine when student(s) need more or less support (e.g., frequency, duration, intensity) to meet established class, grade, and/or school goals (e.g., use of data-based decision-making to fade, maintain, modify or intensify interventions and/or enrichments)
  - review goal statements to ensure they are ambitious, time-bound and meaningful (e.g., SMART goals)
  - assess the fidelity of instruction/intervention implementation and other PS/RtI processes

## MTSS Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.
The following table contains a summary of the assessments used to measure student progress in core, supplemental and intensive instruction and their sources and management:

**Core Curriculum (Tier 1)**

| Data Source | Database | Person (s) Responsible |
|---|---|---|
| FCAT released test | School Generated Excel Database | Reading Coach, AP |
| Baseline and Midyear District | Scantron Achievement Series | MTSS, PLCs, individual teachers |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Assessments | Data Wall | |
| Subject-specific assessments generated by District-level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Math, Writing and Science | Scantron Achievement Series<br>Data Wall | MTSS, PLCs, individual teachers |
| Program Generated Assessments | Software | Individual teachers |
| FAIR | Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network<br>Data Wall | Reading Coach/ Reading PLC Facilitator |
| CELLA | Sagebrush (IPT) | ELL MTSS Representative |
| Common Assessments* *(see below)* of chapter/segments tests using adopted curriculum resources | Subject Area Generated Database | Iindividual teachers, MTSS |
| Mini-Assessments on specific tested Benchmarks | Subject Area Generated Excel Database | Individual teachers |

*A Common Assessment covers a "chunk" of instruction within the District adopted curriculum. It covers all of the skills taught within a certain time period. The purpose of the Common Assessment is to assess students' knowledge of the core curriculum. The results of the Common Assessment are used to:

- Determine if the lesson plans and teaching strategies used to teach the core curriculum were effective or need to be modified.
- Determine which skills need to be taught with alternative strategies.
- Determine which skills need to be re-taught within the core curriculum and which skills need to be moved to the Reinforcement Instructional Calendar.
- Determine which students need Differentiated Instruction within the classroom and which students might need Supplemental Services.

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

| Data Source | Database | Person (s) Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|
| Extended Learning Program (ELP)* *(see below)* Ongoing Progress Monitoring (mini-assessments and other assessments from adopted curriculum resource materials) | School Generated Database in Excel | MTSS/ ELP Facilitator |
| FAIR OPM | School Generated Database in Excel | MTSS/ Reading Coach |
| Other Curriculum Based Measurement** *(see below)* | School Generated Database in Excel | MTSS/PLCs |

*Students receiving pull-out tutoring during the school day or Extended Learning Program (ELP) after school will receive instruction on the specific skills they have not mastered in the core curriculum. As students work on these specific skills, they will be assessed during tutoring and ELP to ensure mastery of skills. In order to make this process effective, a communication system between classroom teacher and the tutor/ELP teacher will be developed by the PSLT and monitored for effectiveness throughout the school year. As students progress through Supplementary Support and Intensive Instruction, the number/type of supplemental services, time spent in the supplemental services and frequency of assessment will increase in duration.

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

- assess the same skills over time
- have multiple equivalent forms
- are sensitive to small amounts of growth over time.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Staff received overview training over the course of several faculty meetings during the 2012-2013 school year. MTSS members who attended the district level RtI trainings served as consultants to the PLCs to guide the process of data review and interpretation. The MTSS will continue to work to build consensus with all stakeholders regarding a need for and a focus on school improvement efforts. The MTSS will work to align the efforts of other school teams that may be addressing similar identified issues.

As the District's Problem Solving Team develops resources and staff development trainings on PS/RtI, these tools and staff development sessions will be conducted with staff when they become available. Professional Development sessions will occur during Tuesday faculty meeting times or rolling faculty meetings. New staff will be directed to participate in trainings relevant to PLCs and PS/RtI as they become available. All teachers will complete the state perceptions of PS/RtI Skills Survey midyear and at the end of the year to determine their development of skills and knowledge related to PS/RtI implementation

Describe plan to support MTSS.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

**School-Based Literacy Leadership Team**

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).

- Principal – Cheryl Holley
- Assistant Principal – Andria Franks
- Reading Coach – Melanie Alsum
- Media Specialist – Holly Menendez
- ELL Resource – Shalanda Bell

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

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

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

The principal also ensures that the LLT monitors reading data, identifies school-wide and individual teachers' reading-focused instructional strengths and weaknesses, and creates a professional development plan to support identified instructional needs in conjunction with the Problem Solving Leadership team's support plan. Additionally the principal ensures that

time is provided for the LLT to collaborate and share information with all site stakeholders including other administrators, teachers, staff members, parents and students.

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

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

***NCLB Public School Choice***

- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**

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

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

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

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

## *High Schools Only

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

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

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

## Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.
Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report.

# PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

## Reading Goals

| Reading Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5).** | | | 1.1.<br>- More understanding of how to implement the core continuous improvement model, as the emphasis has been placed on FCIM for targeted mini-lessons and not on the core curriculum.<br><br>- Teacher knowledge of differentiated instruction<br><br>-Reluctant readers | 1.1.<br>1.1.<br>The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' reading comprehension will improve through teachers using the **Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM)** with core curriculum and providing **Differentiated Instruction (DI)** as a result of the problem-solving model.<br><br>Action Steps<br>1. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling researched-based best-practice strategies.<br><br>2. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions.<br><br>3. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum | 1.1.<br>Who<br>Administration<br>Reading Coach<br>PLC Facilitators<br>Mentors<br><br>How<br>-PLC logs turned into administration.<br><br>-Administration provides feedback.<br><br>-Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.<br><br>-Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.<br><br>-Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.<br><br>**First Nine Week Check**<br><br>**Second Nine Week Check** | 1.1.<br>PLCs will review unit assessments and document which students need to be targeted for re-teach, core instruction or enrichment activities daily and additional grade level regrouping on early release days.<br><br>PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. | 1.1.<br>2-3x Per Year<br>FAIR<br><br>During Nine Weeks<br>On-going progress monitoring<br><br>Core common assessments |
| Reading Goal #1:<br><br>In grades 3-5 the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 83% to 85%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>**83%** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>**85%** | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | material.<br><br>4. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs.<br><br>5. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective.<br><br>6. Based on the data, teachers a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students.<br><br>7. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment).<br><br>8. Teachers incorporate HOTS questions during reading instruction.<br><br>9. PLCs record their work in logs.<br><br>10.Utilize level 2 interns for small group instruction in grades 3 – 5.<br><br>11. Text Complexity<br><br>12. Cloze Reading<br><br>13. SAC funds used to purchase substitute teachers to allow classroom teachers to observe model | **Third Nine Week Check** | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | classrooms. | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.** | | | 2.1.<br>- More understanding of how to implement the core continuous improvement model, as the emphasis has been placed on FCIM for targeted mini-lessons and not on the core curriculum.<br><br>- Teacher knowledge of differentiated instruction<br><br>- More training to increase teacher knowledge in high-end RtI | 2.1.<br>The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students reading comprehension will improve through the use of differentiated instruction targeting high-end RtI.<br><br>Action Steps.<br>PLCs will meet twice monthly to analyze data and plan lessons that include higher order thinking questions and other DI strategies.<br><br>Teachers will be trained on differentiated instruction strategies.<br><br>Teachers will be trained on CIM/RtI by school and district personnel.<br><br>SEM-R will be used for independent reading and enrichment.<br><br>Problem-based Learning Projects will be used to give students an opportunity to research topics of their choice.<br><br>Teachers incorporate | 2.1.<br><br>Who<br>Administration<br>Reading Coach<br>PLC Facilitators<br>Mentors<br><br>How<br>-PLC logs turned into administration.<br><br>-Administration provides feedback.<br><br>-Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.<br><br>-Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.<br><br>-Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.<br><br>**First Nine Week Check**<br><br>**Second Nine Week Check**<br><br>**Third Nine Week Check** | 2.1.<br><br>PLCs will review unit assessments and document which students need enrichment activities daily and additional grade level regrouping on early release days.<br><br>PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. | 2.1.<br><br>2-3x Per Year<br>FAIR<br><br>During Nine Weeks<br>On-going progress monitoring<br><br>Problem-Based Learning Artifacts<br><br>Comprehension strategy assessments |
| Reading Goal #2:<br><br>In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 55% to 57%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>**55%** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>**57%** | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | HOTS questions during reading instruction. | | | |
| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.** | | | 3.1. See 1.1 | 3.1. See 1.1 | 3.1 See 1.1 . | 3.1. See 1.1 | 3.1. See 1.1 |
| Reading Goal #3:<br><br>In grades 3-5, the percentage of ALL curriculum students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 79% to 81%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | **79%** | **81%** | | | | | |
| | | | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. |
| | | | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3..3. | 3.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.** | | | 4.1. - More understanding of how to implement the core continuous improvement model, as the emphasis has been | 4.1. The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' reading comprehension will improve through teachers | 4.1. Who Administration Teachers | 4.1. PLCs will review unit assessments and document which students need to be targeted for re-teach, core | 4.1. 2-3x Per Year FAIR |
| Reading Goal #4: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In grades 3-5, the percentage of All Curriculum students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 89% to 91%. | **89%** | **91%** | placed on FCIM for targeted mini-lessons and not on the core curriculum.<br><br>- Teacher knowledge of differentiated instruction | using the **Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM)** with core curriculum and providing **Differentiated Instruction (DI)** as a result of the problem-solving model.<br><br>Action Steps<br>1. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling researched-based best-practice strategies.<br>2. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions.<br>3. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material.<br>4. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs.<br>5. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective.<br>6. Based on the data, teachers a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students.<br>7. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and | ELP Teachers<br><br>PLC Facilitators<br><br>How<br>Student growth charts will be used to show progress in ELP.<br><br>PLC Logs turned in to administration.<br><br>Evidence of DI Strategies in teacher lesson plans seen during administrative walk-throughs.<br><br>**First Nine Week Check**<br><br>**Second Nine Week Check**<br><br>**Third Nine Week Check** | instruction or enrichment activities daily and additional grade level regrouping on early release days.<br><br>PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.<br><br>ELP growth charts will be provided to classroom teachers allowing monitoring of student progress. | During Nine Weeks<br>Mini-assessment data<br><br>Common assessment data<br><br>ELP growth charts |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | enrichment).<br>8. Teachers incorporate HOTS questions during reading instruction.<br>9. PLCs record their work in logs.<br><br>Tutoring Program will be offered to our bottom quartile students. They will be given intensive reading instruction for 1.5 hours per week.<br><br>Utilize level 2 interns for small group instruction in grades 3 – 5.<br><br>Small group tutoring.<br><br>Family Nights to provide information and resources to parents. | | | |
| | | | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. |
| | | | 4.3 | 4.3. | 4.3. | 4.3. | 4.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target | | | **2011-2012** | **2012-2013** | **2013-2014** | **2014-2015** | **2015-2016** / **2016-2017** |
| **5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.**<br>Reading Goal #5: | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity** (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.** | | | 5A.1.<br>White:<br>Black:<br>Hispanic:<br>Asian:<br>American Indian: | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. |
| Reading Goal #5A:<br><br>**Y** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>White: Y<br>Black: Y<br>Hispanic: Y<br>Asian: n/a<br>American Indian:n/a | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>White:<br>Black:<br>Hispanic:<br>Asian:<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**<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.** | | | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. |
| Reading Goal #5B:<br><br>**Y** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | 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**<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the | **Student Evaluation Tool** |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | effectiveness of strategy? | |
| **5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.** | | | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. |
| Reading Goal #5C:<br><br>**Y** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | 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**<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** |
| **5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.** | | | 5D.1.<br>See 1.1 | 5D.1.<br>See 1.1 | 5D.1.<br>See 1.1 | 5D.1.<br>See 1.1 | 5D.1.<br>See 1.1 |
| Reading Goal #5D:<br><br>The percentage of Students with Disabilities (SWD)scoring satisfactory on the FCAT will increase from 56% to 63%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>**56%** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>**63%** | | | | | |
| | | | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. |
| | | | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 |

## Reading Professional Development

| **Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity**<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 Reading Goals*

# Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

| **Elementary School Mathematics Goals** | | | **Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in mathematics (Level 3-5).** | | | 1.1.<br>-More understanding of how to implement the Core Continuous Improvement Model as the emphasis has been placed on the F-CIM for targeted mini lessons and NOT on the core curriculum.<br><br>-More knowledge on differentiated instruction.<br><br>-Gaps of knowledge between old standards and new standards. | 1.1.<br>The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through teachers using the Core Continuous Improvement Model with core curriculum and providing Differentiated Instruction as a result of the problem-solving model.<br><br><u>Action Steps</u><br>PLC's will meet twice monthly to analyze data and write SMART goals based off of that data.<br><br>PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions.<br><br>At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material.<br><br>Teachers bring assessment data back to PLCs.<br><br>Based on the data, teachers discus strategies that were effective. | 1.1.<br><br><u>Who</u><br>Administration<br>PLC Facilitators<br>Classroom Teachers<br><u>How</u><br>PLC logs turned into administration<br><br>Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy<br><br>Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.<br><br>**<u>First Nine Week Check</u>**<br><br>**<u>Second Nine Week Check</u>**<br><br>**<u>Third Nine Week Check</u>** | 1.1.<br><br>PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 70% mastery on units of instruction.<br><br>PLC facilitator will share data with the PSLT. The PSLT will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. | 1.1.<br><br><u>2-3x Per Year</u><br>District Base-Line and Mid-Year Testing<br><br><u>During Nine Weeks</u><br>Unit Assessment<br><br>Benchmark mini-assessments |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #1:</u><br><br>In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 76% to 78%. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u><br>**76%** | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u><br>**78%** | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Based on the data teachers a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class and c) decide what skills need to be re-taught to targeted students.<br><br>Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students.<br><br>PLCs record their work in logs.<br><br>Utilize level 2 interns for small group instruction in grades 3 – 5. | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics.** | | | 2.1.<br>Teachers at varying skill levels with Higher Order Thinking Questions (H.O.T.S.) techniques.<br><br>-More understanding of how to implement the Core Continuous Improvement Model as the emphasis has been placed on the F-CIM for targeted mini | 2.1.<br>Strategy<br>The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through participation in Higher Order Thinking Questioning. As a result, there will be increased use of higher level questions versus lower level questions for both teachers and students. | 2.1.<br><u>Who</u><br>Administration<br>PLC Facilitators<br>Classroom Teachers<br><br><u>How</u><br>PLC logs turned into administration<br><br>Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy | 2.1.<br><br>Data from review of unit assessment and interactive notebooks will be analyzed at PLC meetings.<br><br>PLC facilitator will share data with the PSLT. The PSLT will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. | 2.1.<br><u>2-3x Per Year</u><br>District Base-Line ad Mid-Year Testing<br><br><u>During Nine Weeks</u><br>Student work<br>Unit Assessments |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #2:</u><br><br>In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 45% to 47%. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u><br>**45%** | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u><br>**47%** | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | lessons and NOT on the core curriculum.<br><br>-More knowledge on differentiated instruction.<br><br>-Gaps of knowledge between old standards and new standards. | <u>Action Steps</u>.<br>Teachers implement lessons using Higher Order Thinking Questioning techniques.<br><br>Teachers bring students work and/or assessments to PLCs.<br><br>PLCs use the data to discuss techniques that were successful.<br><br>PLCs record their work on the PLC logs.<br><br>PLC's will meet twice monthly to analyze data and write SMART goals based off of that data.<br><br>PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions.<br><br>At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material.<br><br>Teachers bring assessment data back to PLCs.<br><br>Based on the data, teachers discus strategies that were effective.<br><br>Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students.<br><br>PLCs record their work in | Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.<br><br>**<u>First Nine Week Check</u>**<br><br>**<u>Second Nine Week Check</u>**<br><br>**<u>Third Nine Week Check</u>** | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | logs. | | | |
| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making learning gains in mathematics.** | | | 3.1.<br>Teachers at varying skill levels with Higher Order Thinking Questions (H.O.T.S.) techniques.<br><br>-More understanding of how to implement the Core Continuous Improvement Model as the emphasis has been placed on the F-CIM for targeted mini lessons and NOT on the core curriculum.<br><br>-More knowledge on differentiated instruction.<br><br>-Gaps of knowledge between old standards and new standards. | 3.1.<br>Strategy<br>The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through the use of technology and hands-on activities to implement the NGSSS.<br><br>Action Steps<br>1.PLCs will discuss best practices in implementing technology and hands-on activities during math instruction.<br>2.PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating strategies from the PLC discussion.<br>3.At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material.<br>4.Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs.<br>5.PLCs discuss strategies that were effective based off the data.<br>6.Based on the data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of planning technology and hands-on strategies. | 3.1.<br>Who<br><br>Administration<br>PLC Facilitators<br>Classroom Teachers<br>How<br>PLC logs turned into Administration<br><br>Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy<br><br>Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs<br><br>**First Nine Week Check**<br><br>**Second Nine Week Check**<br><br>**Third Nine Week Check** | 3.1.<br><br>PLCs will review unit assessment and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 70% mastery on units of instruction.<br><br>PLC facilitator will share data with the PSLT. The PSLT will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. | 3.1.<br>2-3x Per Year<br>District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing<br><br>During Nine Weeks<br>Unit Assessments<br><br>Benchmark mini-assessments |
| Mathematics Goal #3:<br><br>In grade 3-5, the percentage of All Curriculum students making learning gains on the 2012 FCAT Math will increase from 70% to 81%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>**79%** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>**81%** | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 7.PLCs record their work in the PLC logs<br><br>Service Teachers incorporate core curriculum into lessons.<br><br>Utilize level 2 interns for small group instruction in grades 3 – 5.<br><br>Tutor groups.<br><br>Service teachers integrate core curriculum into lessons. | | | |
| | | | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. |
| | | | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3..3. | 3.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.** | | | 4.1.<br>Teachers at varying skill levels with Higher Order Thinking Questions (H.O.T.S.) techniques.<br><br>-More understanding of how to implement the Core Continuous Improvement Model as the emphasis has been placed on the F-CIM for targeted mini lessons and NOT on the core curriculum.<br><br>-More knowledge on differentiated instruction. | 4.1.<br><br>The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through the implementation of tutors and FASTT Math.<br><br><u>Action Steps</u><br>Through data analysis of FCAT, baseline data, classroom assessment and student performance, PLCs identify essential tested benchmarks for their students that need reinforcement and/or remediation.<br><br>t PLCs develop mini-lessons | 4.1.<br><u>Who</u><br>Administration<br>PLC Facilitators<br>Classroom Teachers<br>ELP Teachers<br><br><u>How</u><br>Walk throughs to monitor implementation of FASTT Math<br><br>Evidence of mini-lesson implementation to targeted students seen in teacher lesson plans during administration walk-throughs.<br><br>Monitoring of ELP data | 4.1.<br>PLCs will review mini-assessment data<br><br>PLCs will review mini-assessment data and chart the increase of the number of students reaching at least 70% mastery. | 4.1.<br><u>2-3x Per Year</u><br>District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing<br><br><u>During Nine Weeks</u><br>Benchmark mini-assessments<br><br>Unit assessments |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #4:</u><br><br>In grades 3-5, the percentage of All Curriculum students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 76% to 78%. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u><br>**76%** | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u><br>**78%** | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | -Gaps of knowledge between old standards and new standards.<br><br>-FASST Math – not always working | to be re-taught in ELP<br><br>Teacher will communicate regularly with the ELP tutors so that they too can implement these mini-lessons during their time with targeted students.<br><br>Teachers bring assessment data back to PLCs.<br><br>PLCs use the data to adjust their ELP and remediation groups of students.<br><br>ELP will be held for Tier 1-2 students after school.<br><br>PLCs record their work in logs.<br><br>Teachers will have students complete 2-3 FASTT math lessons per week<br><br>Before school Bash Homework Help Teachers provide help with homework (2 times a week)<br><br>Breakfast Bunch Teachers provide time for students to work on academic programs (computer lab - mornings) | PLC logs turned into administration<br><br>**First Nine Week Check**<br><br>**Second Nine Week Check**<br><br>**Third Nine Week Check** | | |
| | | | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. |
| | | | 4.3 | 4.3. | 4.3. | 4.3. | 4.3. |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Y** | | | | | | | |
| | | | 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. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #5C: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| **Y** | | | | | | | |
| | | | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. |
| | | | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **5D. Student with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.** | | | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #5D: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Y** | | | | | | | |
| | | | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. |
| | | | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 |

*End of Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals*

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

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

| **Algebra EOC Goals** | | | **Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **Alg1. Students scoring proficient in Algebra (Levels 3-5).** | | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| Algebra Goal #1: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |

| **Alg2. Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in Algebra.** | | | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Algebra Goal #2:<br><br>Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |

*End of 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*

# Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

| Science Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science.** | | | 1.1.<br>Not all teachers know how to identify misconceptions and depth of student knowledge of science concepts<br><br>FAIR Game questions on FCAT<br><br>Implementation of new materials | 1.1.<br>**Tier 1** – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students will develop problem-solving and creative thinking skills while constructing new knowledge. To achieve this goal, science teachers will increase the number of **inquiry based instruction** (such as student engagement, explore time, accountable talk, SMATH, higher order questioning, 5 Day Vocabulary, and Reciprocal Teaching) per unit of instruction.<br><br>Action Steps<br>1. Teachers will attend District Science training and share information with their PLCs.<br><br>2. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling inquiry based instruction strategies.<br><br>3. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum and inquiry based instruction strategies. | 1.1.<br>Who<br>Administration<br>PLC Facilitators<br>Classroom teachers<br><br>How<br>-PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback<br>.<br>- Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administrative walk-throughs.<br><br>-Classroom walk-throughs observing inquiry based instruction.<br><br>**First Nine Week Check**<br><br>**Second Nine Week Check**<br><br>**Third Nine Week Check** | 1.1.<br><br>PLCs will review unit assessments and document which students need to be targeted for re-teach, core instruction or enrichment activities daily and additional grade level regrouping on early release days.<br>.<br><br>PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. | 1.1.<br>2-3x Per Year<br><br>District-level baseline and mid-year tests<br><br><br><br>During Nine Weeks<br>- Mini Assessments<br>-Unit assessments<br>-Science Projects |
| Science Goal #1:<br><br>In grade 5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 71% to 73%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>**71%** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>**73%** | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 4. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material .<br>5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs.<br><br>6. Based on the data, teachers discuss inquiry based instruction strategies that were effective.<br><br>7. Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of planning inquiry based instruction strategies.<br><br>8. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.<br><br>9. Vertical Planning<br><br>10: Family Curriculum Nights to provide information on STEM Fair Projects. | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science.** | | | 2.1.<br>- PLC meetings do not focus on higher order questioning strategies for upcoming lessons.<br><br>- Teachers are at varying skill levels with identification and use of HOTS | 2.1<br>Strategy<br>**Tier 1** – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' science skills will improve through participation in **Higher Order Thinking Questions (HOT)** As a result, there will be increased | 2.1.<br>Who<br>Administration<br>PLC Facilitators<br>Classroom Teachers<br><br>How<br>-PLC logs turned into administration. | 2.1.<br><br>PLCs examine student work and data from other assessments with HOTS questions. Data from review of unit assessments will be analyzed at PLC meetings.<br><br>PLC facilitator will share data | 2.1.<br>2-3x Per Year<br><br>District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing<br><br>During Nine Weeks |
| Science Goal #2:<br><br>In grade 5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>**33%** | 2013Expected Level of Performance:*<br>**35%** | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FCAT Science will increase from 33% to 35%. | | | Implementation of new materials | use of higher level questions versus lower level questions for both teachers and students.<br><br>Students will be given opportunities to engage in independent project based learning.<br><br>Students will participate in Science Olympics and Science Fair.<br><br><u>Action Steps</u>.<br>1. Science teachers attend on-going HOT training..<br><br>2. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers discuss HOT strategies and how they can be implemented in the upcoming lessons.<br><br>3. Teachers implement the targeted higher order questioning strategies in their lessons.<br><br>4. Teachers implement the common assessments.<br><br>5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs.<br><br>6. PLCs study specifically students' responses to the higher order questions to assess students' higher order thinking processes.<br><br>9. Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of higher order strategy implementation. | Administration provides feedback.<br><br>-Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.<br><br>-Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.<br><br>**<u>First Nine Week Check</u>**<br><br>**<u>Second Nine Week Check</u>**<br><br>**<u>Third Nine Week Check</u>** | with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. | -Student work<br>-Chapter tests<br>- Assessment of project based learning<br>-HOTS question responses from student work and assessments |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 10. Teachers monitor project based learning assignments to monitor students higher order thinking process.<br><br>11. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs. | | | |
| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |

## Science Professional Development

| **Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity**<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 Science Goals*

# Writing/Language Arts Goals

| Writing/Language Arts Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing.** | | | 1.1.<br>- Teachers need updated training and recalibration regarding the FCAT Writing Assessment and Scoring Rubric.<br><br>- Teachers new to Language Arts may not have FCAT Writing training<br><br>- Teachers do not have confidence using holistic scoring methods<br><br>- Teachers lack sufficient time to score student papers | 1.1.<br>Strategy<br>The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' writing skills will improve through teachers using the **Core Continuous Improvement Model** (C-CIM) with core curriculum. School will implement embedded writing assessments in the core curriculum and **monthly/ongoing formative writing assessments** to monitor student progress/improvement.<br><br>Action Steps.<br>1. As a Professional Development activity PLCs participate in discussions that share PLC data, trends, and best-practice instructional strategies. These discussions are held in both horizontal (across course) and vertical (across grade levels) groups.<br><br>2. Teachers and students will maintain writing portfolios to demonstrate student engagement in all stages of the writing process.<br><br>3.. Teachers and students will | 1.1.<br>Who<br>Administration<br>PLC Facilitators<br><br>How<br>- PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.<br><br>- Classroom walk-throughs observing evidence of student portfolios, embedded assessments, daily learning activity tied to instruction, use of formative assessments, and student engagement in reflection.<br><br>- Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.<br><br>**First Nine Week Check**<br><br>**Second Nine Week Check**<br><br>**Third Nine Week** | 1.1.<br><br>PLCs - Review of monthly formative writing assessments to determine number and percent of students scoring above proficiency as determined by the assignment rubric. PLCs will chart the increase in the number of students reaching 4.0 or above on the monthly writing prompt.<br><br>PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. | 1.1.<br>- Review of monthly formative writing assessments to determine number and percent of students scoring above proficiency as determined by the assignment rubric<br><br>- Embedded writing assessments from the core curriculum<br><br>- Student portfolios |
| Writing/LA Goal #1:<br><br>In grade 4, the percentage of All Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writing will increase from 91% to 93%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>**91%** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>**93%** | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | engage in metacognitive reflection of embedded assessments to celebrate attainment of writing skills and goals and to identify continuing needs and adjust instruction.<br><br>4. As a Professional Development activity, PLCs meet and discuss data in order to implement effective teaching strategies and lesson plans targeted to meet the needs of students.<br><br>5. PLCs review nine week data, set a new goal for the following nine weeks.<br><br>6,PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.<br><br>7.Family Nights to provide information and resources to parents.<br><br>8.4/5 or More Club Incentive | **Check** | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

## Writing/Language Arts Professional Development

| **Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity**<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 Writing Goals*

# Attendance Goal(s)

| Attendance Goal(s) | | | Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **1. Attendance** | | | | | | | |
| Attendance Goal #1:<br><br>**Maintain Goal.** | 2012 Current Attendance Rate:* | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* | | | | | |
| | **96%** | **96%** | | | | | |
| | 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity<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 Attendance Goals*

## Suspension Goal(s)

| Suspension Goal(s) | | | Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **1. Suspension** | | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| Suspension Goal #1: | 2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions | - Student home lives impact their behavior and the choices they make at school. | - The PSLT will be pro-active by providing teachers with a list of behavior interventions they can use in the classroom. | - PSLT<br>- Administration<br>- Guidance counselor<br>- Teachers | -Teachers will discuss the success of interventions during PLC and RtI meetings and determine if identified students are improving. Next steps will be determined. | - Suspension reports |
| -The total number of In-School Suspensions will maintain in 2012 - 2013 | **1** | **maintain** | | | | | |
| | 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School | | - Guidance counselor will conduct classroom lessons on character education. | - Behavior will be monitored through preventative measures discussed at PLCs and RtI meetings. | | |
| -The total number of Out-of-School Suspensions (including ATOSS) - The total number of In-School will maintain in 2012 - 2013 | **1** | **maintain** | | | | | |
| | 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | | Guidance Counselor will use preventative interventions prior to administrative referral. | | | |
| | **8** | **maintain** | | | | | |
| | 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School | | | | | |
| | **4** | **maintain** | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

### Suspension Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity<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 | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | PLC Leader | school-wide) | Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

*End of Suspension Goals*

## Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

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

## Dropout Prevention Professional Development

| **Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity**<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 Dropout Prevention Goal(s)*

## Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

| **Parent Involvement Goal(s)** | | | **Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **1. Parent Involvement**<br>Parent Involvement Goal #1: | | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | 2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:* | 2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:* | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

| **Parent Involvement Goal(s)** | | | **Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **2. Parent Involvement**<br>Parent Involvement Goal #2: | | | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | 2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:* | 2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:* | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| | | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |

## Parent Involvement Professional Development

| **Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity**<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 Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

## Health and Fitness Goal(s)

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

| **Additional Goal(s)** | | | **Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<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**<br><br>Health and Fitness Goal #1:<br><br>During the 2012 - 2013 school year, the number of students scoring in the "Healthy Fitness Zone" (HFZ) on the Pacer for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular health will increase from 81% on the Pretest to 91% on the Posttest. | 2012 Current Level :*<br>**81%** | 2013 Expected Level :*<br>**91%** | 1.1.<br><br>- Increase of sedentary lifestyles of students at home | **1.** Elementary School students will engage in 150 minutes per week of physical education activities. 60 minutes will be during their normally scheduled PE class, and the remaining will be held during Teacher Directed PE. | 1. Administration<br><br>Guidance Counselors<br><br>PE Teacher | 1. Checking of student schedules | 1. Student schedules<br>Master schedule |
| | | | 1.2. | **2.** Health and physical activity initiatives developed | **2.** H.E.A.R.T. team. | **2.** H.E.A.R.T. team notes/agendas | **2.** PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | and implemented by the school's H.E.A.R.T. team. | | | for assessing cardiovascular health. |
| | | 1.3. | **3.** Two physical education classes per week for 30 minutes throughout the entire school year with a certified physical education teacher. | **3.** Physical Education Teacher | **3.** Classroom walk-throughs Class schedules | **3.** PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health. |

## Health and Fitness Goals 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 |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

# Continuous Improvement Goal(s)

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

| **Additional Goal(s)** | | | **Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **1. Continuous Improvement Goal** | | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| Continuous Improvement Goal #1:<br><br>The percentage of **teachers** who strongly and somewhat agree with the indicator that **"the teachers that I work** | 2012 Current Level :* | 2013 Expected Level :* | -Teachers lack of knowledge of appropriate use of available technology<br><br>- Teachers intimidated by technology<br><br>- Teachers lack of training n available technology (SMART Boards, PowerPoint, etc.) | - SMART Board Training will be offered to staff<br><br>- Utilize teacher technology knowledge through mini-presentations at faculty meetings.<br><br>-Inform teachers of technology available at the school and the appropriate ways to access and use this | Who: Administration<br><br>How:<br>- Use of technology in the classroom will be monitored during classroom walk throughs | - Teachers will be "accomplished" in domain 2E of the Danielson Framework (organizing physical space) | Danielson Framework (Domain 2)<br><br>2012 -2013 Climate and Perception Survey |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **with effectively use technology in the classroom" will increase from 78% to 84% in 2012 - 2013** | | | | technology in their classrooms.<br><br>-Survey to assess teachers regarding technological needs | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

## Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development

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

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">A. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring proficient in reading (Levels 4-9).</td><td>A.1.</td><td>A.1.</td><td>A.1.</td><td>A.1.</td><td>A.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Reading Goal A:<br><br>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td>n/a</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2" rowspan="2"></td><td>A.2.</td><td>A.2.</td><td>A.2.</td><td>A.2.</td><td>A.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td>A.3.</td><td>A.3.</td><td>A.3.</td><td>A.3.</td><td>A.3.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.</td><td>B.1.</td><td>B.1.</td><td>B.1.</td><td>B.1.</td><td>B.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Reading Goal B:<br><br>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2" rowspan="2"></td><td>B.2.</td><td>B.2.</td><td>B.2.</td><td>B.2.</td><td>B.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td>B.3.</td><td>B.3.</td><td>B.3.</td><td>B.3.</td><td>B.3.</td></tr>
</table>

# NEW Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

| CELLA Goals | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking.** | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| CELLA Goal #C:<br><br>The percentage of students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking will increase from 69% to 71% in 2013. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:<br><br>**69%** | See 1.1 | See 1.1 | See 1.1 | See 1.1 | See 1.1 |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **D. Students scoring proficient in Reading.** | | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| CELLA Goal #D:<br><br>The number of students scoring proficient in Reading will increase from 40% to 42% in 2013. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :<br><br>**40%** | See 1.1 | See 1.1 | See 1.1 | See 1.1 | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |

| Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **E. Students scoring proficient in Writing.** | | 2.1. See Writing 1.1 | 2.1. See Writing 1.1 | 2.1. See Writing 1.1 | 2.1. See Writing 1.1 | 2.1. See Writing 1.1 |
| CELLA Goal #E:<br><br>The percentage of students scoring proficient in Writing will increase from 34% to 36% in 2013. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :<br>**34%** | | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |

## NEW Math Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **F. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at in mathematics (Levels 4-9).** | | | F.1. | F.1. | F.1. | F.1. | F.1. |
| Mathematics Goal F:<br><br>Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>**n/a** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | F.2. | F.2. | F.2. | F.2. | F.2. |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | F.3. | F.3. | F.3. | F.3. | F.3. |
| **G. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.** | | G.1. | G.1. | G.1. | G.1. | G.1. |
| Mathematics Goal G:<br>Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | G.2. | G.2. | G.2. | G.2. | G.2. |
| | | G.3. | G.3. | G.3. | G.3. | G.3. |

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

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **I. Students scoring in the upper third on Geometry.** | | | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| Geometry Goal I:<br><br>Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |

*End of Geometry EOC Goals*

## NEW Science Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

| **Elementary, Middle and High Science Goals** | **Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **J. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at proficient in science (Levels 4-9).** | J.1. | J.1. | J.1. | J.1. | J.1. |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Science Goal J:<br><br>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.<br><br>**N/A** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | J.2. | J.2. | J.2. | J.2. | J.2. |
| | | | J.3. | J.3. | J.3. | J.3. | J.3. |

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

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

| **Biology EOC Goals** | | | **Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **K. Students scoring in the middle or upper third (proficient) in Biology.** | | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| Biology Goal K:<br><br>Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>**n/a** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |

| **L. Students scoring in upper third in Biology.** | | | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Biology Goal L:<br><br>Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |

## NEW Writing Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

| **Writing Goals** | | | **Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<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** |
| **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>Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | **n/a** | | | | | | |
| | | | M.2. | M.2. | M.2. | M.2. | M.2. |
| | | | M.3. | M.3. | M.3. | M.3. | M.3. |

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

| STEM Goal(s) | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| STEM Goal #1:<br><br>We will collect data from number of STEM Fair projects and plan to increase the number of STEM Fair projects submitted. | 1.1.<br><br>Lack of student and parent knowledge regarding requirements of STEM Fair projects process and scientific method. | 1.1.<br><br>See Science 1.1. | 1.1.<br><br>See Science 1.1. | 1.1.<br><br>See Science 1.1. | 1.1.<br><br>See Science 1.1. |
| | 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 |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

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

| CTE Goal(s) | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| CTE Goal #1:<br><br>Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

## CTE Professional Development

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

X Yes ☐ No

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

| **Describe the use of SAC funds**. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Name and Number of Strategy from the School Improvement Plan | Description of Resources that improves student achievement or student engagement | Projected Amount | Final Amount |
| Reading Goal 1<br>Math Goal 1<br>Writing Goal 1<br>Science Goal 1 | Utilize SAC funds to purchase substitutes to cover teachers observing model classroom teachers across the subject areas. | $1,601.10 | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Final Amount Spent | | | |