Florida Department of Education

School Improvement Plan (SIP)

Form SIP-1

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: BRANDON HIGH SCHOOL	District Name: HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY
Principal: Carl Green	Superintendent: Mary Ellen Elia
SAC Chair: Jennifer Cary-Greco	Date of School Board Approval:

<u>Highly Qualified Administrators</u>

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, Lowe 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Carl Green	M.A. in Educational Leadership	4	10	11/12: ? 10/11: A72% AYP 09/10: B 72% AYP 08/09: C 74% AYP
Assistant Principal of Curriculum	Dina Langston	Ed. S in Educational Leadership	5	9	11/12: ? 10/11: A72% AYP 09/10: B 72% AYP 08/09: C 74% AYP

Assistant Principal of Administration	Tibor Kovacs	M.A. in Educational Leadership	3	7	11/12: ? 10/11: A72% AYP 09/10: B 72% AYP 08/09: B 82% AYP (Former School- Durant High School)
Assistant Principal of Student Affairs	Claudette Allen	Ed. S in Educational Leadership	6	16	11/12: ? 10/11: A 72% AYP 09/10: B 72% AYP 08/09: C 74% AYP
Assistant Principal of Student Affairs	Mistie Rodriguez	M.A. in Educational Leadership	1	1	11/12: ? 10/11: C 64% AYP (Former School- Shields Middle School) 09/10: C 77% AYP (Former School- Burnett Middle School) 08/09: C 72% AYP (Former School- Burnett Middle School)
Assistant Principal of Student Affairs	Rashad Woods	M.A. in Educational Leadership	3	3	11/12: ? 10/11: A72% AYP 09/10: B 72% AYP 08/09: A 72% AYP (Former School- Marshall Middle Schoo
Administrative Resource Teacher	Jennifer Cary-Greco	M.A. in Educational Leadership	2	N/A	11/12: ? 10/11: A72% AYP 09/10: B 87% AYP (Former School- Steinbrenner High Scho 08/09: D 69% AYP (Former School- Blake High School)

Highly Qualified Instructional Coaches

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	Lisa F. Jones	BA English Literature M.A. in Education	2	2	11/12: ? 10/11: A 72% AYP 09/10: B 72% AYP

Highly Qualified Teachers

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable

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

			(If not, please explain why)
1. Teacher Interview Day	District staff	June	
2. District Mentor Program	District Mentors	ongoing	
3. District Peer Program	District Peers	ongoing	
4. School-based teacher recognition system	Principal	ongoing	
5. Opportunities for teacher leadership	Principal	ongoing	
6. Regular time for teacher collaboration	Principal	ongoing	
7. Collegial Buzz	Claudette Allen	Ongoing	
8. Small Learning Communities	Dina Langston	Ongoing	

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

List all instructional staff and paraprofessionals who are teaching out-of-field and/or who are NOT highly qualified.

Name	Certification	Teaching Assignment	Professional Development/Support to Become Highly Qualified
Jamall Crook		Biology	Agreement to earn based on acquiring certification in area
Courtney Kyle	Exceptional Education	VE/Math	Agreement to earn based on acquiring certification in area
Enid Hutchinson	Math 5-9	Algebra and Liberal Arts	Agreement to earn based on acquiring certification in area
Laura Persaud	English 6-12/ESOL Endorsed	Reading/Creative Writing	Agreement to earn based on acquiring certification in area
Semoya Phillips	Biology	Physical Science	Agreement to earn based on acquiring certification in area
Alysia Cruz	Math/English	Math	Currently completing ESOL endorsement
Ryan Hendricks	Exceptional Education	Access points	Currently completing ESOL endorsement
Elizabeth Holloman	English	Reading	Agreement to earn based on acquiring certification in area/ currently completing ESOL endorsement
Angela Hutches	English	English	Currently completing ESOL endorsement

Eric Mondor	Math and Chemistry	Chemistry/Computer Science	Currently completing ESOL endorsement
Terrance O'Grady	Math	Math	Currently completing ESOL endorsement
Karen Riggs	Math	Math	Currently completing ESOL endorsement
John Van Dyke	English	English	Currently completing ESOL endorsement

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
129	9% (12)	22 % (29)	40% (51)	29% (37)	43% (56)	95% (123)	12% (15)	4% (5)	22% (29)

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
Deborah Keith	Faculty	Mentor with EET initiative. Has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Jeremy Monette	Faculty	Mentor with EET initiative. Has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.

Additional Requirements

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team. Carl Green (Principal), Dina Langston (APC), Dr. Richter (School Psychiatrist), Alisha Brill (Social Worker), Jennifer Cary-Greco (Drop Out Prevention Specialist) and (SAC Chair) , Lisa F. Jones (Reading Coach), Kristin Alvarez-Craft (ESE Specialist)
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? Our goal is to meet monthly to discuss the needs of our school. We will review and interpret data; organize and share the data with colleagues; utilize our data in PLCs; address the needs of our low performing students; help meet AYP; coordinate information with our AVID and Reading Leadership Team; identify professional development needs and resources. We are making efforts to reduce the number of articulation hearings needed for incoming freshmen by working more closely with our feeder schools.
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? Our SAC chair will chair our RtI and coordinate with our SAC team to develop activities that are conducted during the year. Our SIP is the document that guides our agenda. Meetings will be used to monitor our effectiveness in implementing the Action Steps. Modifications will be made as necessary and as new data is made available.
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. We are currently implementing the FCIM in science, English, math, and reading. We will utilize this data to measure progress for the duration of the 2012-2013 school year. With the addition of an Administrative Resource Teacher, it is our intention to analyze discipline data from the 2011-2012 school year and implement an intervention based discipline plan to deter inappropriate behavior. There is also a greater emphasis placed on monitoring the attendance of our at risk students by our school based attendance committee.
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. We will continue to educate our staff on RTI. We will begin with department heads and team leaders and move from there to small groups in their Small Learning Community and Professional Learning Community meetings.
Describe plan to support MTSS. Response to Intervention (RtI) has also been described in Florida as a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) for providing high quality instruction and intervention matched to student needs using learning rate over time and level of performance to inform instructional decisions. In order to support MTSS in our schools, we will: ● Consistently promote the shared vision of one system meeting the needs of ALL students with MTSS as the platform for integrating all school initiatives (i.e., PLC, PSLT, and SAC meetings, lesson study, school-wide behavior management plans). ● Provide designated school personnel with the requisite knowledge and experience to support coordination and implementation of MTSS. ● Provide continued training and support to all school based personnel in problem solving, responding to student data and the use of a systematic method to increase student achievement.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

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

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Carl Green (Principal), Dina Langston (APC), Lisa F. Jones (Reading Coach), Christy Shimkus (Language Arts DH), Patricia Wrona (Media Specialist), Teresa Reeves, Elizabeth Holloman, Ruth Kanzlemar, Sandra Misciasci, Brian Ayers and Greg Parris
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The goal of the Reading Leadership Team is to create a greater capacity of reading knowledge within the school building and focus on areas of literacy concerns across the school. The RLT fosters collaboration by involving teachers, administrators, parents and students; while also developing a culture in which literacy is developed and supported at the school site. This year's focus is on two beginning projects - "Watch me Soar" and "Get Caught Reading". Watch Me Soar will highlight effective teaching practices throughout the school and Get Caught Reading will highlight the importance of literacy at all ages and in all places throughout the school. We are competing against other high schools within the district with similar demographics using Skype. We are utilizing the FCIM model as an assessment to determine which class wins the challenge to compete against other schools.
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)

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

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

All content teachers will increase the amount of time spent silently reading using strategic reading strategies up to 60 minutes per week over a six month period. Students' reading comprehension will improve through teachers across content areas implementing appropriately leveled, cognitively complex lessons. ● Consensus on site SLC/PLC schedule will provide common planning time. ● As a Professional Development activity, PLCs will familiarize themselves with the content standards. ● As a Professional Development activity, PLCs will recognize complexity levels within and across standards. ● PLCs will come to consensus on the use of common assessments: 1) an end of the unit/segment assessment. 2) Language Arts- will use embedded writing prompts and/or 3) any program assessment provided in curriculum resources and materials. ● As a Professional Development activity, PLCs will come to consensus on the cognitive complexity of questions within common assessments. ● Teachers will implement the scaffolded lessons. ● Teachers will implement the common assessments. ● Based on data, PLCs will use the problem-solving process to determine next steps in cognitive complexity strategy implementation. ● PLCs will record their work in the PLC logs. ● SLCs will record their work and make efforts to utilize reading teachers and other content areas. PLC logs will be turned into administration; administration will then provide appropriate feedback necessary for continuous improvement. Evidence of strategy

in teachers' lesson plans will be seen during administrative walk-throughs. Classroom walk-through form for Grades K-12 Reading Intervention classes will be utilized. Data accumulated during the walk- through process will be reviewed every nine weeks. PLCs will review evaluation data. PLC facilitators 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. SLCs will review evaluation data. SLC facilitator will share data with SLC members for further discussion.

*High Schools Only

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

We assist the students to see the relationship between the subjects and relevance to their future by providing the AVID program, Small Learning Communities, and a cross-curricular approach. We also participate in College and Career Fairs, provide a College/Career Counselor, and include higher level questioning in all classes.

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?

To promote academic planning, we encourage participation in co-curricular clubs, Night of Focus, and career academies that offer specific career targets. We also promote higher level education with college day attire weekly, visits to campuses, opportunities for students to meet with campus counselors here, and a specialized guidance counselor. We also have a lab manager that assists students with registration for SAT/ACT/CPT and on-line applications. We have also begun hosting workshops during conference night so that parents can learn more about college and career planning.

Postsecondary Transition

Analysis of High School Feedback Report

Brandon Senior High School has reflected over our *High School Feedback Report* Trends for the last three years. The following is a summary from our annual analysis.

Brandon Senior High School's percentage of graduates completing a college prep curriculum has decreased from 63.5% to 60.8% over a three year period, a 2.7% decrease. During that same time period, the district increased by 1.5% (64.2% - 65.7%) and the state increased by 2.3% (57.9% - 60.2%). In addition, the number of graduates that enrolled in Algebra 1 prior to 9th grade was well above the state average and just below the district for the three year period. For the same three year period, the number of graduates completed at least one Level 3 high school math course was well above the state average and even with district performance. For the 2008-2009 and 2019-2010 school years, the number of graduates that completed at least one Dual Enrollment math course was below the state and district average. However, for the following year, Brandon Senior High School was above the district average in this particular area. The number of graduates that completed at least one Level 3 or higher science course was above the state average and just below the performance of the district for the same three year period.

Strategies for Improving Student Readiness for Postsecondary

District-Level

The Career and Technical Education (CTE) Department provides our counselors with a binder and data base of the Programs of Study to help guide students with their educational pathway. The Program of Study maps out the courses and timeline for students to be program completers and successfully transition to postsecondary institutions.

Our district provides a variety of opportunities for students to learn about career pathways at postsecondary institutions through programs such as:

- **Career Seeking and Investigations -** Provides 8th grade students an opportunity to explore the campus of Hillsborough Community College (HCC) and experience campus life and activities
- **Amazing Race -**Provides 12th grade students an opportunity to gather enrollment requirements, scholarship opportunities and program offerings for incoming college freshmen
- **Hi-Tec Trek -** Provides 11th graders with an opportunity to explore Hillsborough County's postsecondary technical centers career and program opportunities.

Additionally, the Hillsborough County Career Pathways Consortium coordinates articulation agreements to provide Career and Technical Education Program Completers with free credit at postsecondary institutions across the state of Florida.

School-Level
- Using ELP funds, Saturday SAT and ACT prep classes are offered. Counselors will meet with all students to encourage students to complete the class and take the test. Communication letters on the SAT and ACT will be sent home with students to advertise the SAT and ACT prep classes and testing dates.
- College Visits - Various college representatives visit Brandon Senior High School to share information about their specific colleges or universities with students. This takes place during college night and at various times throughout the year during our lunch periods.
- ASVAB - Students interested in possibly enlisting in the military are given an opportunity to take this aptitude test.
- USF Senior Access Day - Disadvantaged and underrepresented students are invited to visit USF and learn about careers in various health professions.
- Ready to Work - Students in 12th grade have the opportunity to complete three assessments in the areas of math, reading and interpreting data on the computer in the Success Center. After completing the assessments students are sent a certificate that indicates their scores and the correlating skills. The students then show this certificate to an employer when applying for a job, which makes them more marketable.
- Senior Night - All seniors are encouraged to attend senior night, where they receive their senior handbook and the counselors share valuable information about their senior year. This includes postsecondary information, a timeline of what seniors should be doing during the course of the year, SAT/ACT test dates, etc.
- Junior Night - Juniors and their parents are given important information about testing and senior year is shared. This includes postsecondary information, a timeline of what they should be doing during the course of the year, SAT/ACT test dates, etc.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

Reading Goals	Problem-Solving Process to					

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

	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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5).	1.1. -Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13. -Training all content area teachers	1.1. **Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas** Reading comprehension improves when **students are engaged in grappling with complex text**. Teachers need to understand how to **select/identify** complex text, **shift** the amount of informational text used in the content curricula, and **share** complex texts with all students. **All content area teachers are responsible for implementation.** **Action Steps** Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.	1.1. **Who** -Principal -APC -Department Heads -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses -Reading Coach **How** -English PLC Logs -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -Administration and coach rotate through PLCs looking for complex text discussion. -Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis. -Elective & all content area PLC logs posted on Internal	1.1. **Teacher Level** -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line systems to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. **PLC Level** -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. **Leadership Team Level** -PLC facilitator/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	1.1. **3x per year** - FAIR **During the Grading Period** - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks) **Progress Monitor** -Monthly assessments via Florida Achievers and Achievement Series		
Reading Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 44% to 47%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	44%	47%					

		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		-Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13. -Training all content area teachers via Lunch & Learn	**Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas** Common Core Questions of all types and levels are necessary to scaffold students' understanding of complex text. Teachers need to understand and use **higher-order, text-dependent questions** at the word/ phrase, sentence, and paragraph/passage levels (Webb's, Bloom, Costas). Student reading comprehension improves when students are required to provide evidence to support their answers to text-dependent questions. Scaffolding of students' grappling with complex text through well-crafted text-dependent question assists students in discovering and achieving deeper understanding of the author's meaning. **All content area teachers are responsible for implementation**. **Action Steps** Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.	**Who** -Principal -AP -Reading Coaches -Department Heads **How** -Reading PLC Logs -English PLC Logs -Social Studies PLC Logs -Elective PLC Logs -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Reading Coach observations and walk-throughs -Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency. -Administrator and Reading Coach aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation.	**Teacher Level** -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line data to calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal **PLC Level** -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. **Leadership Team Level** -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	**3x per year** - FAIR **During the Grading Period** - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks) **Progress Report** -FCIM Assessments	

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.	2.1.	2.1. See Goals 1, 3, & 4	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Reading Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 23% to 26%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	23%	**26%**					
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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.	3.1. -PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum conversations and data analysis to deepen their leaning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act process. PLC logs will have similar format.	3.1. **Strategy** Student achievement improves through **teachers working collaboratively** to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act** model and gather data to drive instruction. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions while in PLCs: 1. What is it we expect them to learn? 2. How will we if they have learned it? 3. How will we respond if they don't learn? 4. How will we respond if they already know it? **Actions/Details** -Monthly FCIM data will be discussed in PLC to drive instruction.	3.1. - Principal -APC -Reading Coaches -Department Heads -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses **How** PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after weekly meetings. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.	3.1. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team. Along with weekly meetings.	3.1. **3x per year** FAIR **During the Grading Period** Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)		

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

Reading Goal #3: Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 55 points to 58 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	55 points	**58 points**				

		3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	
		-Teachers tend to only differentiate after the lesson is taught instead of planning how to differentiate the lesson when new content is presented. -Teachers are at varying levels of using Differentiated Instruction strategies. -Teachers tend to give all students the same lesson, handouts, etc.	**Strategy/Task** Student achievement improves when teachers use on-going student data to **differentiate instruction**. **Actions/Details** *Within PLCs Before Instruction and During Instruction of New Content* -Using data from previous assessments and daily classroom performance/ work, teachers plan Differentiated Instruction groupings and activities for the delivery of new content in upcoming lessons. -Teachers attend professional development training via Lunch and Learn. *In the classroom* -During the lessons, **students** are involved in flexible grouping techniques *PLCs After Instruction* -Teachers reflect and discuss the outcome of their DI lessons. -Teachers use student data to identify successful DI techniques for future implementation. -Teachers, using a problem-solving question protocol,	**Who** -Principal -APC -Reading Coaches -Department Heads -PLC leads of like grades and/or like courses **How** -PLC logs turned into administration, and DH -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team. -Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis.	**Teacher Level** -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal. **PLC Level** -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. **Leadership Team Level** -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	**3x per year** FAIR **During the Grading Period** Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit) **Progress Monitoring** -FCIM -Assessments	

			identify students who need re-teaching/ interventions and how that instruction will be provided. -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/ content area PLCs.				
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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4.1. -Scheduling time for the principal/APC to meet with the reading coach on a regular basis. -Teachers willingness to accept support from the coach.	4.1. **Strategy Across all Content Areas** **Strategy/Task** Student achievement improves through **teachers' collaboration with the reading coach** in all content areas. **Actions/Details** *Reading Coach* -The reading coach and administration conducts one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the teacher's student past and/or present data. -The reading coach rotates through all subjects' PLCs to: --Facilitate lesson planning that embeds rigorous tasks/backwards design --Facilitate development, writing, selection of higher-order, text-dependent questions/ activities, with an emphasis on Costa's questioning hierarchy --Facilitate the identification, selection,	4.1. **Who** Administration **How** -Review of coach's log -Review of coach's log of support to targeted teachers. -Administrative walk-throughs of reading coach working with teachers (either in classrooms, PLCs or planning sessions)	4.1. -Tracking of coach's participation in PLCs. -Tracking of coach's interactions with teachers (planning, co-teaching, modeling, de-debriefing, professional development, and walk throughs) -Administrator-Instructional Coach meetings to review log and discuss action plan for coach for the upcoming two weeks	4.1. **3x per year** - FAIR **During the Grading Period** - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)		

		development of rigorous core curriculum common assessments --Facilitate core curriculum assessment data analysis -FCIM Data -Facilitate development and writing of lessons incorporating Janet Allen, Power 8 Strategies to improve reading strategies --Facilitate the planning for interventions and the intentional grouping of the students. -Using walk-through data, the reading coach and administration identify teachers for support in co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing and debriefing. -The reading coach trains each subject area PLC on how to facilitate their own PLC using structured protocols. -Throughout the school year, the reading coach/				

		administration conducts one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the data gathered from walk-through tools. This data is used for future professional development, both individually and as a department. ***Leadership Team and Coach*** -The reading coach meets with the principal/APC to map out a high-level summary plan of action for the school year. -Every two weeks, the reading coach meets with the principal/APC to: --Review log and work accomplished and --Develop a detailed plan of action for the next two weeks. -The reading coach meets with the Instructional Leadership Team to review data and discuss the next steps or plan of action.				

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

Reading Goal #4: Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 60 points to 63 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	60 points	**63 points**				

| | | 4.2.
-Not always a direct correlation between what the students is missing in the regular classroom and the instruction received during ELP.
-Minimal communication between regular and ELP teachers. | 4.2.
Strategy
Students' reading comprehension improves through receiving **ELP supplemental instruction on targeted skills** that are not at the mastery level.

Action Steps
-Reading coach and Instructional Leadership Team will identify areas of weakness and create the focus for bottom quartile ELP.
-Classroom teachers communicate with the ELP teachers regarding specific skills that students have not mastered.
-ILT will identify lessons for students that target specific skills that are not at the mastery level.
-Students attend ELP sessions.
-Progress monitoring data collected by the ELP teacher on a weekly or biweekly basis and communicated back to the regular classroom teacher.
-When the students have mastered the specific skill, they are exited from the ELP | 4.2.
Who
Administrators

How Monitored
-Reading coach will meet with ELP teachers to discuss progress and data.
-Reading coach will meet with Administrators to review progress and data. | 4.2.
Supplemental data shared with leadership and classroom teachers who have students. | 4.2.
Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM) | |

		program. -After state assessment, students exit BQ ELP.					
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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	**2011-2012** **45%**	**2012-2013** **58%**	**2013-2014** **62%**	**2014-2015** **66%**	**2015-2016** **70%**	**2016-2017** **75%**	
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		See Goals 1, 3, & 4					
Reading Goal #5: The percentage of students scoring below the proficiency/satisfactory level will be reduced by from 45% to 75% in six school years.							

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

5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**	5A.1. See Goals 1, 3, & 4	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.		
Reading Goal #5A: The percentage of White students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Reading will increase from **54% to 66%.** The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Reading will increase from **25% to 28%.** The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Reading will increase from **38% to 41%.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	White:54% Black:25% Hispanic:38% Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A	White:66% Black:28% Hispanic:41% Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A					

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5C.1. -Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our student is of high priority. -The majority of the teachers are unfamiliar with this strategy. To address this barrier, the school will schedule professional development delivered by the school's ERT. -Teachers implementation of CALLA is not consistent across core courses. -ELLs at varying levels of English language acquisition and acculturation is not consistent across core courses. -Administrators at varying skill levels regarding use of CALLA/ in order to effectively	5C.1. ELLs (LYs/LFs) comprehension of course content/standard improves through participation in the **Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA)** strategy across Reading, Language Arts, Math, Social Studies and Science. **Action Steps** -ESOL Resource Teacher (ERT) provides professional development to all content area teachers on how to embed CALLA into core content lessons. -ERT models lessons using CALLA. -ERT observes content area teachers using CALLA and provides feedback, coaching and support. -District Resource Teachers (DRTs) provide professional	5C.1. **Who** -School based Administrators -District Resource Teachers -ESOL Resource Teachers **How** -Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the walkthrough form from: **The CALLA Handbook**, p. 101, Table 5.4 "Checklist for Evaluating CALLA Instruction.	5C.1. **Teacher Level** -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual ELL SMART Goal. **PLC Level** -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -ERTs meet with Reading, Language Arts, Social Studies and Science PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the ELL SMART Goal. **Leadership Team Level** -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares ELL SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. -ERTs meet with RtI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs)	5C.1. -FAIR -CELLA **During the Grading Period** -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for ELL performance		

	conduct a CALLA fidelity check walk-through.	development to all administrators on how to conduct walk-through fidelity checks for use of CALLA. -Core content teachers set SMART goals for ELL students for upcoming core curriculum assessments. -Core content teachers administer and analyze ELLs performance on assessments. -Teachers aggregate data to determine the performance of ELLs compared to the whole group. -Based on data core content teachers will differentiate instruction to remediate/enhance instruction.					
Reading Goal #5C: The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Reading will increase from 12% to 15%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	12%	**15%**					

| | | 5C.2.
-Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our school is of high priority.
-The majority of the teachers are unfamiliar with this strategy.
To address this barrier, the school will schedule professional development delivered by the school's ERT.
-Teachers implementation of A+ Rise is not consistent across core courses.
-Administrators at varying skill levels regarding use of A+ Rise in order to effectively conduct an A+ Rise fidelity check walk-through. | 5C.2.
ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/ standards increases in reading, language arts, math, science and social studies through the use of the district's on-line program **A+Rise** located on IDEAS under Programs for ELL.

Action Steps
-ESOL Resource Teacher (ERT) provides professional development to all content area teachers on how to access and use A+ Rise Strategies for ELLs at http://arises2s.com/s2s/ into core content lessons.
-ERT models lessons using A+ Rise Strategies for ELLs.
-ERT observes content area teachers using A+Rise and provides feedback, coaching and support.
-District Resource Teachers (DRTs) provide professional development to all administrators on how to conduct walk-through fidelity checks for use of A+ Rise strategies for ELLs. | 5C.2.
Who
-School based Administrators
-District Resource Teachers
-ESOL Resource Teachers

How
-Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the CRISS walkthrough form | 5C.2.
Teacher Level
-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.
-Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual ELL SMART Goal.
PLC Level
-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL SMART goal data across all classes/courses.
-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.
-ERTs meet with Reading, Language Arts, Social Studies and Science PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data.
- For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the ELL SMART Goal.
Leadership Team Level
-PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares ELL SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.
-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.
-ERTs meet with RtI team | 5C.2.
-FAIR
-CELLA

During the Grading Period
-Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for ELL performance | |

					to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs)		
		5C.3. -Lack of understanding teachers can provide ELL accommodations beyond FCAT testing. -Bilingual Education Paraprofessionals at varying levels of expertise in providing support. -Allocation of Bilingual Education Paraprofessional dependent on number of ELLs. -Administrators at varying levels of expertise in being familiar with the ELL guidelines and job responsibilities of ERT and Bilingual paraprofessional.	5C.3. ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/ standards improves through participation in the following **day-to-day accommodations on core content and district assessments across** Reading, LA, Math, Science, and Social Studies: 1. Extended time (lesson and assessments) 2. Small group testing 3. Para support (lesson and assessments) 4. Use of heritage language dictionary (lesson and assessments)	5C.3. **Who** -School based Administrators -ESOL Resource Teachers **How** -Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the walk-throughs look for Committee Meeting Recommendations. In addition, tools from the RtI Handbook and ELL RtI Checklist, and ESOL Strategies Checklist can be used as walk-through forms	5C.3. Analyze core curriculum and district level assessments for ELL students. Correlate to accommodations to determine the most effective approach for individual students.	5C.3. **During the Grading Period** -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests	

| | | 5C.4.
-Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our school is of high priority.
-Teachers need support in drilling down their core assessments to the ELL level. | 5C.4.
ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/ standards improves in reading, language arts, math, science and social studies through teachers working collaboratively to focus on ELL student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act model** to structure their way of work for ELL students.

Action Steps
-Teachers analyze CELLA data to identify ELL students who need assistance in the areas of listening/speaking, reading and writing.
-Teachers use time during PLCs to reinforce and strengthen targeted ELL effective teaching strategies (CALLA and A+ Rise) in the areas of listening/ speaking, reading and writing.
-Teachers use time during PLCs to reinforce and strengthen targeted ELL Differentiated Instruction lessons using the district provided ELL Differentiated Instruction binders (provided by the ELL Department) in | 5C.4.
Who
-School based Administrators
-ESOL Resource Teachers
-PLC Facilitators

How
PLC logs (with specific ELL information) for like courses/ grades. | 5C.4.
Teacher Level
-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.
-Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual ELL SMART Goal.
PLC Level
-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL SMART goal data across all classes/courses.
-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.
-ERTs meet with Reading, Language Arts, Social Studies and Science PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data.
-For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the ELL SMART Goal.
Leadership Team Level
-PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares ELL SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.
-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.
-ERTs meet with RtI team | 5C.4.
-FAIR
-CELLA

During the Grading Period
-Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for ELL performance | |

			Reading, Language Arts, Math, Science and Social Studies. -PLCs generate SMART goals for ELL students for upcoming units of instruction. -PLCs/teachers plan for upcoming lessons/units using targeted CALLA and A+ Rise strategies and Differentiated Instruction strategies based on ELLs needs in the areas of listening/ speaking, reading and writing. -PLCs/teachers plan for accommodations for core curriculum content and assessment. -When conducting data analysis on core curriculum assessments, PLCs aggregate the ELL data. -Based on the data, PLCs/teachers plan interventions for targeted ELL students using the resources from CALLA, A+ Rise, and Differentiated instruction binders.		to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs)		
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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5D.1. -Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs by both the general education and ESE teacher. To address this barrier, the APC will put a system in place for this school year.	5D.1. **Strategy** SWD student achievement improves through the effective and **consistent implementation of students' IEP** goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations. -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/ SWD strategies and modifications into lessons.	5D.1. **Who** Principal, Site Administrator, Assistance Principal ESE Specialist **How** IEP Progress Reports reviewed by APC	5D.1. **Teacher Level** -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. **PLC Level** -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. **Leadership Team Level** -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	5D.1. -FAIR **During the Grading Period** -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for SWD performance		

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

Reading Goal #5D: The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 21% to 24%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	21%	**24%**					

| | | 5D.2. -Improving the proficiency of SWD in our school is of high priority. -Teachers need support in drilling down their core assessments to the SWD level. -General educational teacher and ESE teacher need consistent, on-going co-planning time. | 5D.2. **Strategy/Task** SWD student achievement improves through **teachers' implementation of the Plan-Do-Check-Act model** in order to plan/carry out lessons/ assessments with appropriate strategies and modifications.

Actions *Plan* For an upcoming unit of instruction determine the following: -What do we want our SWD to learn by the end of the unit? -What are standards that our SWD need to learn? -How will we assess these skills/standards for our SWD? -What does mastery look like? -What is the SMART goal for this unit of instruction for our SWD?

Plan for the "Do" What do teachers need to do in order to meet the SWD SMART goal? -What resources do we need? -How will the lessons be designed to maximize the learning | 5D.2. **Who** -School based Administrators -PLC Facilitators

How PLC logs (with specific SWD information) for like courses/grades. | 5D.2. **Teacher Level** -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SWD SMART Goal.

PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SWD SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SWD SMART Goal.

Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SWD SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. | 5D.2. -FAIR

During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for SWD performance | |

			of SWD? -What checks-for-understanding will we implement for our SWD? -What teaching strategies/best practices will we use to help SWD learn? -Specifically how will we implement the strategy during the lesson? -What are teachers going to do during the lesson for SWD? -What are SWD going to do during the lesson to maximize learning? ***Reflect on the "Do"/ Analyze Checks for Understanding and Student Work <u>during the unit</u>.*** For lessons that have already been taught within the unit of instruction, teachers **<u>reflect</u>** and discuss one or more of the following regarding their SWD: -What worked within the lesson? How do we know it was successful? Why was it successful? -What didn't work within the lesson? Why? What are we going to do next? -For the implementation of the strategy, what worked? How do we				

| | | | know it was successful? Why was it successful? What checks for understanding were used during the lessons?
-For the implementation of the strategy, what didn't work? Why? What are we going to do next?
-What were the outcomes of the checks for understanding? And/or analysis of student performance?
-How do we take what we have learned and apply it to future lessons?

Reflect/Check – Analyze Data
Discuss one or more of the following:
-What is the SWD data?
-What is the data telling us as individual teachers?
-What is the data telling us as a grade level/PLC/ department?
-What are SWD not learning? Why is this occurring?
-Which SWD are learning?

Act on the Data
After data analysis, develop a plan to act on the data.
-What are we going to do about SWD not | | | | |

			learning? -What are the skills/ concepts/standards that need re-teaching/ interventions (either to individual SWD or small groups)? -How are we going to re-teach the skill differently? -How we will know that our re-teaching/ interventions are working?				

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Differentiated Instruction	9-12	-Subject Area Leaders -Course specific PLC Facilitators -Reading Coach	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	-On-going -Demonstration classrooms	Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations	Administration Team Reading Coach Department Heads
The 3 S's of Complex Text: Selecting / Identifying Complex Text, Shifting to Increased Use of Informational Text, and Sharing of Complex Text with All Students (K-12)	Grades 9-12	Reading Coach and Subject Area Leaders	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team Reading Coach Department Heads
Identifying and Creating Text-Dependent Questions to Deepen Reading Comprehension (K-12)	Grades 9-12	Reading Coach and Subject Area Leaders	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team Reading Coach Department Heads
Designing and Delivering a Close Reading Lesson Using in-Depth Questioning (K-12)	Grades 9-12	Reading Coach and Subject Area Leaders	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team Reading Coach Department Heads
IEP Training	9-12	ESE Teachers	ESE Teachers General Ed Teachers PLCs	On-going	Case Manager	ESE Specialist
SWD Co-Teaching	9-12	DRT	ESE Teachers General Ed Teachers PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team DRT
ELL Strategies	9-12	English Language Learner Resource Teacher (ERT)	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team

End of Reading 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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

Alg1. Students scoring proficient in Algebra (Levels 3-5).	1.1. -Lack of infrastructure to support technology -Lack of technology hardware -Teachers at varying understanding of the intent of the CCSS	1.1. **Strategy** Students' math achievements improves through the use of **technology and hands-on activities** to implement the Common Core State Standards. In addition, student practice taking on-line assessments to prepare students for on-line state testing. **Action Steps** -PLCs use their core curriculum information to learn more about hands-on and technology activities. -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans	1.1. **Who** - Principal -Math DH -Technology Specialist **How Monitored** -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/ or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. -Administrator and coach aggregates the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation	1.1. PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 75% mastery on units of instruction. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends.	1.1. **2x per year** District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing Semester Exams **During the Grading Period** -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, etc.)		
Algebra Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013Algebra EOC will increase from 56% to 59%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				

	56%	**59%**					

1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
-Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques. -PLC meetings need to focus on identifying and writing higher order questions to deliver during the lessons. -Finding time to conduct Webb's Depth of Knowledge walk-throughs is sometimes challenging.	**Strategy/Task** Students math achievement improves through frequent participation in **higher order questions/ discussion activities** to deepen and extend student knowledge. These quality questions/prompts and discussion techniques promotes thinking by students, assisting them to arrive at new understandings of complex material. **Actions/Details** *Within PLCs* -Teachers work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively use higher order questions/ activities. -Teachers plan higher order questions/ activities for upcoming lessons to increase the lessons' rigor and promote student achievement. -Teachers plan for scaffolding questions and activities to meet the differentiated needs of students. -After the lessons, teachers examine student work samples and classroom	**Who** -Principal -Math DH -Technology Specialist **How Monitored** -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their Logs. -Classroom walk-throughs using Webb's Depth of Knowledge wheel as a higher order walk-through form. They look for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency -Administrator and coach aggregates the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation	PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 75% mastery on units of instruction. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends.	**2x per year** District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing Semester Exams **During the Grading Period** -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, interventions etc.)	

| | | | questions using Webb's Depth of Knowledge to evaluate the sophistication/ complexity of students' thinking.
-Use student data to identify successful higher order questioning techniques for future implementation.

In the classroom
During the lessons, teachers:
-Ask questions and/ or provides activities that require students to engage in frequent higher order thinking as defined by Webb's Depth of Knowledge.
-Wait for full attention from the class before asking questions.
-Provide students with wait time.
-Use probing questions to encourage students to elaborate and support assertions and claims drawn from the text/content.
-Allow students to "unpack their thinking" by describing how they arrive at an answer.
-Encourage discussion by using open-ended questions.
-Ask questions with multiple correct answers or multiple | | | | |

			approaches. -Scaffold questions to help students with incorrect answers. -Engage all students in the discussion and ensure that all voices are heard. **During the lessons, students:** -Have opportunities to formulate many of the high-level questions based on the text/ content. -Have time to reflect on classroom discussion to increase their understanding (and without teacher mediation). **School Leadership** - PLC member/ administrator collects higher order questioning walk-through data using Webb's Depth of Knowledge wheel. -Monthly, school leaders conduct one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the data gathered from walk-through tools. This teacher data/chats guides the leadership's team professional development plan (both individually and whole faculty).				

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
Alg2. Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in Algebra.	2.1.	2.1. **See Goal 1**	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Algebra Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or 5 on the 2013Algebra EOC will increase from 1% to 21%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	1%	**21%**					

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.					

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Differentiated Instruction	9-12	-Math DH	Math Departmental and course-specific PLCs	PLC Meetings every two weeks	Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor DI implementation	Administration Team
Analyzing first semester exams	9-12	-Math DH	Math Departmental and course-specific PLCs	After the administration of the test	PLC logs	APC
IEP Training	9-12	ESE Teachers	ESE Teachers General Ed Teachers PLCs	On-going	Case Manager	ESE Specialist
SWD Co-Teaching	9-12	ESE DH and ESE Specialist	ESE Teachers General Ed Teachers PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team DRT
ELL Strategies	9-12	English Language Learner Resource Teacher (ERT)	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team

End of Mathematics 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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing.	1.1. -Not all teachers know how to plan and execute writing lessons with a focus on mode-based writing. -Not all teachers know how to review student writing to determine trends and needs in order to drive instruction. -All teachers need training to score student writing accurately during the 2012-2013 school year using information provided by the state.	1.1. **Strategy** Students' use of mode-specific writing will improve through use of Writers' Workshop/daily instruction with a focus on mode-specific writing. **Action Steps** -Based on baseline data, PLCs write SMART goals for each Grading Period. (For example, during the first Grading Period, 50% of the students will score 4.0 or above on the end-of-the Grading Period writing prompt.) *Plan:* -Professional Development for updated rubric courses -Professional Development for instructional delivery of mode-specific writing -Using data to identify trends and drive instruction -Lesson planning	1.1. **Who** Principal APC DH English Department Teachers District (Writing Team, Supervisors, Writing Resources, Academic Coaches, and DRTs) **How Monitored** -PLC logs -Classroom walk-throughs Observation Form	1.1. See "Check" & "Act" action steps in the strategies column	1.1. -Student monthly demand writes/ formative assessments -Student weekly drafts -Student revisions -Student portfolios -Final exam data -Springboard Embedded Assessments		

		based on the needs of students ***Do:*** -Daily/ongoing models and application of appropriate mode-specific writing based on teaching points -Daily/ongoing conferencing ***Check:*** Review of weekly drafts and scoring monthly demand writes -PLC discussions and analysis of student writing to determine trends and needs ***Act:*** -Receive additional professional development in areas of need -Seek additional professional knowledge through book studies/research -Spread the use of effective practices across the school based on evidence shown in the best practice of others				

		-Use what is learned to begin the cycle again, revise as needed, increase scale if possible, etc. -Plan ongoing monitoring of the solution(s)					
Writing/LA Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring **Level 3.0** or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes will increase from 91% to 95%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	91%	**95%**					

		1.2. -Improve the teaching of reading skills of Language Arts teachers. -Become more proficient at pacing and teaching Springboard lessons.	1.2. **Strategy** **Students' reading, writing, language, and listening /speaking skills improves through engagement in college and career preparatory lessons/activities/tasks that promote high levels of thinking.** **Action Steps** *Within PLCs* **Before the unit** -Create norms. -Unpack an assessment and rubric. -Set SMART goals for the unit of instruction. -Decide on a way to pre-assess the skills and knowledge of students. (What pre-assessment will we all use?) -Choose the anchor activities teachers will use to assess students' understanding along the way to the assessment. -Reflect on barriers and successes from the year before. -Look at student assessment exemplars (previous students' assessments if available). -Visit the pacing guide and determine the pacing for the unit. -Decide on common terminology to use with students and during PLC discussions.	1.2. **Who** -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Department Heads -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses **How** PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis. -Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency. -Administrator and coach aggregates the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation monthly. -Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis.	1.2. **Teacher Level** -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal. **PLC Level** -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/ course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. **Leadership Team Level** -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership	1.2. **During the Grading Period** Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)	

			-Look at the grammar instruction opportunities provided in the unit and determine their potential usage. -Decide on which vocabulary terms need to be taught during the unit. -Discuss the student's curriculum checklist. -Determine how the PLC would like to grade the assessments in order for there to be consistency among grade levels. **During the unit** -Determine: --What is working? --Is there a need to enrich the instruction? How? --What isn't working? --Is there a need to supplement the instruction? How? --Are the needs of our ELL/ SWD being met? --How can civics be added into instruction? --Is there a need for a demonstration classroom and/ or teacher swap? -Conduct a pacing check. -Bring anchor activities (artifacts) to assess student understanding. -Discuss effective student placement (If plausible discuss how classroom environment might help a student that is struggling in a class. Could a change of class period or teacher help?)		Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.		

			-Plan strategies to differentiate. -Plan higher order thinking questions. -Discuss portfolio implementation (Success/ Barriers). -Discuss baseline date/data from anchor activities/data from EAs. -Determine whether teachers want to add additional criteria to the EA rubric. -Discuss additions to the writer's checklists. **During the assessment** -Agree upon a date when all assessments need to be completed. -Discuss successes and challenges. **After the assessment** Participate in an assessment Norming session (Data to be discussed after EAs are all scored). **After all assessments have been scored** -Reflect on the unit. -Reflect on the effectiveness of the PLC (survey). -Revisit portfolios. -Identify the skills students struggled with and determine which activities in further lessons will readdress the skills needing to be re-taught or strengthened.				

| | | | -Recognize successes and celebrate.

In the classroom
<u>During the lessons, </u>**<u>teachers</u>**<u>:</u>
-Post essential questions and daily objectives.
-Explicitly reference connections between the following: essential questions, daily objective, and assessment.
-Select learning strategies as needed.
-Group students appropriately.
-Scaffold instruction building towards higher complexity.
-Model and provide opportunities for guided and independent practice of skills aligned with the assessment.
-Select academic vocabulary from text to be used during a unit of instruction.
-Use multiple types of formative assessment and provide consistent checks for student understanding.
-Use data during the lesson and after the assessment to inform instruction.

<u>During the lessons, students:</u>
-Understand the criteria which will be used to evaluate their work.
-Understand the purpose | | | | |

			of the lesson and its connection to the assessment. -Think critically and creatively. -Actively draw upon prior knowledge and use that knowledge to connect with lesson goals. -Know when, why, and how to use strategies when appropriate free of teacher support. -Collaborate within structured grouping. -Self assess understanding of content. -Use academic vocabulary in written and oral responses. **After the lessons, teachers:** -Post exemplars of student work. -Self reflect on lessons.				

		1.3. -PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum and data analysis discussion to deepen their leaning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act "Instructional Unit" log.	1.3. **Strategy** Student achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: 1. What is it we expect them to learn? 2. How will we know if they have learned it? 3. How will we respond if they don't learn? 4. How will we respond if they already know it? **Actions/Details** -Grade level/like-course PLCs use a **Plan-Do-Check-Act "Unit of Instruction" log** to guide their discussion and way of work. Discussions are summarized on log. -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.	1.3. **Who** -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses **How** PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.	1.3. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team.	1.3. **During the Grading Period** Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)	

Writing/Language Arts Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with						

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

Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Writing Holistic Scoring Training	9-12	PLC facilitators	All Faculty members	On-going	PLC logs turned into administration	Principal APC DH/ADH
Mode-based Writing Training	9-12	PLC facilitators	All Faculty members	On-going	-Administration or Coach walk-throughs -PLC logs turned into administration	Principal APC DH/ADH
Springboard Pacing	9-12	DH ADH	Language Arts Teachers PLC-grade level and vertical teams	On-going	-Administration or Coach walk-throughs -PLC logs turned into administration	Principal APC DH/ADH

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

Attendance Goal(s)	**Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance**					

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Attendance	1.1. -Attendance committee needs to meet on a regular basis throughout the school year. -Need support in building and maintain the student database.	1.1. The school will continue to utilize an attendance committee comprised of Administrators, guidance counselors, school social worker, teachers and other relevant personnel to review the school's attendance plan and discuss school wide interventions to address needs relevant to current attendance data. The attendance committee will also maintain a database of students with significant attendance problems and implement and monitor interventions. The attendance committee meets every two weeks.	1.1. Attendance committee will keep a log and notes that will be reviewed by the Principal on a monthly basis and shared with faculty.	1.1. Attendance committee will monitor the attendance data from the targeted group of students.	1.1. -Instructional Planning Tool -Attendance/Tardy data -Ed Connect		

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

Attendance Goal #1: 1. The attendance rate will increase from 92% in 2011-2012 to 95 % in 2012-2013. 2. The number of students who have 10 or more **unexcused** absences throughout the school year will decrease by 10% 3.T he number of students who have 10 or more **unexcused** tardies to school throughout the school year will decrease by 10%.	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
	92%	**95%**					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	882	**662**					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	345	**259**					

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

		1.2. There is no system to reinforce parents for facilitating improvement in attendance.	1.2. Beginning at the 5th unexcused absence, the Attendance Committee (which is a subgroup of the Leadership Team) collaborate to ensure that a letter is sent home to parents outlining the state statute that requires parents send students to school. If a student's attendance improves (no absences in a 20 day period) a positive letter is sent home to the parent regarding the increase in their child's attendance.	1.2. -Social Worker -Guidance Counselor -PSLT -DPS	1.2. The attendance committee (which is a subset of the leadership Team) will disaggregate attendance data along with the guidance counselor and maintain communication about these children.	1.2. Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/Tardy data	

		1.3. There were no immediate consequences for tardies to class or school.	1.3. Lock Out Policy -Students will be considered locked out of class if they are not in the classroom when the tardy bell rings each period - They will report to the assigned room (auditorium) to receive a lock out tardy notification. - Failure to report to the lockout room will be treated as direct disobedience and disciplined accordingly. -Once students receive their tardy notification, they have five (5) minutes in which to travel to class. - The first lock out tardy will result in a phone call to parents/guardians. - The second lock out tardy will result in a phone call to parents/guardian 1 day of ISS. - The third lock out tardy will result in a phone call home and 2 days of ISS. - The fourth lock out tardy will result in a phone call home and 1 day of OSS. - Every other tardy after the fourth will result in OSS.	1.3. **SEE 1.1**	1.3. Administration Team will examine attendance data weekly during staffing meetings.	1.3. -Instructional Planning Tool -Attendance/Tardy data -Ed Connect -Eagle Net Database	

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

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
EdLine	9-12	AP	School-wide	September and then an as needed basis	Random check of EdLine postings	AP
Eagle Net	9-12	DPS	School-wide	On-going Basis	Weekly	DPS

<u>**Suspension Goal(s)**</u>

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

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

| 1. Suspension | 1.1.
There needs to be common school-wide expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior. | 1.1.
-Student Affairs Office will assign a task force composed of faculty to develop school-wide expectations and rules, set these through staff survey and discussion, and provide training to staff in methods for teaching and reinforcing the school-wide rules and expectations.

-Providing teachers with resources for continued teaching and reinforcement of school expectations and rules.

-The data is shared with faculty at a monthly meeting, tracking the overall improvement of the faculty.

-Where needed, administration conducts individual teacher walk-through data chats. | 1.1.
-Leadership Team
-Administration | 1.1.
- Administration team will review data on Office Discipline Referrals ODRs and out of school suspensions, ATOSS data weekly. | 1.1.
EASI ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data | | |

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

Suspension Goal #1: Suspension Goal #1: 1. The total number of In-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%. 2. The total number of students receiving In-School Suspension throughout the school year will decrease by 10%. 3. The total number of Out-of-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%. 4. The total number of students receiving Out-of-School Suspensions throughout the school year will decrease by 10%.	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions				
	781	**702**				
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School				
	417	**375**				
	2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions				
	508	**457**				
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School				

	328	295					

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
School-wide discipline plan	Grades 9-12	Student Affairs Office	School-wide	January 2011	Student Affairs Office will review data on a monthly basis, providing mentoring to students, and establishing ongoing contact with parents.	Administration Team
Classroom Management Classes	Grades 9-12	Staff Development (District)	Teacher specific (as needed)	(Ongoing basis) November 2010 – June 2011	Student Affairs Office will review data on Student Discipline Referrals and out of school suspensions monthly in targeted classrooms	Administration Team

End of Suspension Goals

Health and Fitness Goal(s)

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

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Health and Fitness Goal	-Non-participation -Lack of effort	1.1. High School students will engage in a minimum of two semesters of physical education in grades 9-12.	1.1. -APC -Guidance Counselors	1.1.- Checking of student schedules and transcripts	1.1.		

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

Health and Fitness Goal #1:	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
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 46% on the Pretest to 56% on the Posttest.							
	46%	**56%**					
		1.2.	1.2. Health and physical activity initiatives developed and implemented by the school's H.E.A.R.T. team or principals' designee.	1.2. Principal's Designee	1.2. - H.E.A.R.T. team notes/agendas - Data on the number of students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ) -Through weekly cardiovascular fitness training, students will improve on quarterly Pacer Test	1.2. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.	
		1.3.	1.3. Five physical education classes per week for a minimum of one semester per year with a certified physical education teacher.	1.3. Physical Education Teacher	1.3. - Classroom walk-throughs Class schedules	1.3. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.	
		1.4. -Rainy days affecting HOPE class schedule	1.4. Alternative cardiovascular exercise system (XBOX Kinect) used to reach target heart rate and assess cardiovascular endurance.	1.4. -Physical Education Department Head -Physical Education Teacher	1.4. **SEE 1.2.**	1.4. **SEE 1.2.**	

Health and Fitness Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Physical Education Curriculum	9-12	P.E. Department Head	School-Wide (All students are required to take HOPE)	Biweekly	Scheduled performance testing	-P.E. DH -APC

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

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

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

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

Continuous Improvement Goal #1: The percentage of teachers who strongly agree with the indicator that "teachers meet on a regular basis to discuss their students' learning, share best practices, problem solve and develop lessons/ assessments that improve student performance (under Teaching and Learning)" will increase from 60% in 2012 to 90% in 2013.	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*				
	60%	**90%**				
		1.2. -Not enough time to meet in PLCs.	1.2. Leadership team will use teacher survey information every nine weeks to determine next steps for PLC professional development.	1.2. <u>Who</u> Leadership team <u>How</u> Leadership team aggregates the data	1.2. "Quick" PLC informal surveys will be administered during the school year every two months. The Leadership Team will aggregate the data and share outcomes of the school-wide results with their PLCs. The data will provide direction for future PLC training.	1.2. PLC Survey materials from Teams to Teach (Anne Jolly)	

Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with						

Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD 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
PLCs	9-12	Teachers who have received District training	School-Wide	Preplanning-July 17 Faculty meetings in September and October	Administration walk-throughs of PLC meetings	Administration SALs
Faculty study will be conducted during the first semester using the book, *"The Collaborative Teacher."*	9-12	Principal	SALs Team Leaders PLST Team	PLST meetings – first semester	Administration walk-throughs of PLC meetings	Administration

End of Additional Goal(s)

NEW Reading Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

A. **Florida Alternate Assessment:** **Students scoring proficient in reading (Levels 4-9).**	A.1. **See Reading Goal 5d**	A.1.	A.1.	A.1.	A.1.		

Reading Goal A: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	(87%) LVL. 4	**(88%) LVL. 5**					
B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.**	B.1.	B.1. **See Rea ding Goal 5d**	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.		
Reading Goal B: The percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	19%	**20%**				

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/ Speaking.	1.1.	1.1. **See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4**	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	
CELLA Goal #C: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from **65%** to **68%**.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					

	65%					
Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
D. Students scoring proficient in Reading.	2.1.	2.1. **See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4**	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	
CELLA Goal #D: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase from **23%** to **28%.**	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :					
	23%					
Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

E. Students scoring proficient in Writing.	2.1.	2.1. **See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4**	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	
CELLA Goal #E: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA will increase from **40%** to **45%.**	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
	40%					

NEW Math Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:						

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

F. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at in mathematics (Levels 4-9).**	F.1. -Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs by both the general education and ESE teacher. To address this barrier, the APC will put a system in place for this school year.	F.1. **Strategy** SWD student achievement improves through the **effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals**, strategies, modifications, and accommodations. -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons.	F.1. Who Principal, Site Administrator, Assistance Principal How IEP Progress Reports reviewed by APC	F.1. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SWD SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SWD SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SWD SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	F.1. 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing Semester Exams During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)	

	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Mathematics Goal F: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.							
	(87%) LVL. 4	**(88%) LVL. 5**					

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

		F.2. -Improving the proficiency of SWD in our school is of high priority. -Teachers need support in drilling down their core assessments to the SWD level. -General educational teacher and ESE teacher need consistent, on-going co-planning time.	F.2. **Strategy/Task** SWD student achievement improves through teachers' implementation of the **Plan-Do-Check-Act model** in order to plan/ carry out lessons/ assessments with appropriate strategies and modifications. **Actions** *Plan* For an upcoming unit of instruction determine the following: -What do we want our SWD to learn by the end of the unit? -What are standards that our SWD need to learn? -How will we assess these skills/standards for our SWD? -What does mastery look like? -What is the SMART goal for this unit of instruction for our SWD? ***Plan for the "Do"*** What do teachers need to do in order to meet the SWD SMART goal? -What resources do we need?	F.2. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses <u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration/coaches. Administration/coaches provides feedback -Administrators attended targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team	F.2. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SWD SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team.	F.2. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period of SWD SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team	

			-How will the lessons be designed to maximize the learning of SWD? -What checks-for-understanding will we implement for our SWD? -What teaching strategies/best practices will we use to help SWD learn? -Specifically how will we implement the strategy during the lesson? -What are teachers going to do during the lesson for SWD? -What are SWD student going to do during the lesson to maximize learning? *Reflect on the "Do"/ Analyze Checks for Understanding and Student Work during the unit.* For lessons that have already been taught within the unit of instruction, teachers **reflect** and discuss one or more of the following regarding their SWD: -What worked within the lesson? How do we know it was successful? Why was it successful? -What didn't work within the lesson?				

			Why? What are we going to do next? -For the implementation of the strategy, what worked? How do we know it was successful? Why was it successful? What checks for understanding were used during the lessons? -For the implementation of the strategy, what didn't work? Why? What are we going to do next? -What were the outcomes of the checks for understanding? And/ or analysis of student performance? -How do we take what we have learned and apply it to future lessons? ***Reflect/Check – Analyze Data*** Discuss one or more of the following: -What is the SWD data? -What is the data telling us as individual teachers? -What is the data telling us as a grade level/PLC/ department? -What are SWD not			

		learning? Why is this occurring? -Which SWD are learning? **Act on the Data** After data analysis, develop a plan to act on the data. -What are we going to do about SWD not learning? -What are the skills/ concepts/standards that need re-teaching/ interventions (either to individual SWD or small groups)? -How are we going to re-teach the skill differently? -How we will know that our re-teaching/ interventions are working?					
G. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.**	G.1.	G.1. # See FAA Math Goal F.1.	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.		

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

Mathematics Goal G:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.							
	50%	**51%**					

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

H. Students scoring in the middle or upper third (proficient) in Geometry.	1.1.	1.1. **See Math Goals 1.1,1.2 &2.1**	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Geometry Goal H: The percentage of students scoring in the middle or upper third on the 2013 End-of-Course Geometry Exam will increase from 61% to70%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	61%	**70%**					
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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

I. Students scoring in the upper third on Geometry.	2.1.	2.1. See Math Goals 1.1,1.2 & 2.1	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Geometry Goal I: The percentage of students scoring in the upper third on the 2013 End-of-Course Geometry Exam will increase from 29% to 36%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	29%	**36%**					

End of Geometry EOC Goals

NEW Science Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

Elementary, Middle and High Science Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

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

		into lessons.				
<u>Science Goal J:</u> The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>				
	12%	**13%**				

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

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

K. Students scoring in the middle or upper third (proficient) in Biology.	1.1. -Teachers are at varying skill levels in the use of inquiry and the 5E lesson plan model. -Lack of common planning time to facilitate and hold PLCs for like courses.	1.1. **Strategy** Students' science skills will improve through participation in the **5E instructional model.** **Action Steps** -Teachers will attend District Science training and share 5 E Instructional Model information with their PLCs. -PLCs write SMART goals based for units of instruction. -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time collaboratively building 5E Instructional Model for upcoming lessons. -PLC teachers instruct students using the 5E Instructional Model.	1.1. **Who** Principal APC Science Coach (where available) Science SAL **How Monitored** -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.	1.1. **Teacher Level** -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. **PLC Level** -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. **Leadership Team Level** -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	1.1. **2x per year** District-level baseline and mid-year tests Semester Exams **During the Grading Period** -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, intervention checks, etc.)		

		-At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. -Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. -Based on the data, teachers discuss effectiveness of the 5E Lesson Plans to drive future instruction.					
Biology Goal K: The percentage of students scoring in the middle and upper third on the 2013 End-of-Course Biology Exam will increase from 62% to 66%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	62%	**66%**					

		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		-PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum conversations and data analysis to deepen their leaning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act "Instructional Unit" log.	**Strategy** Student achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning using the 5E Instructional Model. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act model** to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for unit of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: 1. What is it we expect them to learn? 2. How will we know if they have learned it? 3. How will we respond if they don't learn? 4. How will we respond if they already know it? **Actions/Details** *Within PLCs:* -PLCs will use a PLC log to monitor the following: --Guide their Plan-Do-Check-Act conversations and way of work. --Monitor the frequency of meetings. All grade level/subject area PLCs collaborate 2 times per month for curriculum planning, reflection, and data analysis.) -Working with the core curriculum, within grade	**Who** -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses **How** -PLC logs turned into administration/coaches provides feedback -Administrators attended targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.	School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team.	**2x per year** District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing Semester Exams **During the Grading Period** Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)	

		level PLCs teachers will: --Unpack the benchmark and identify what students need to understand, know, and do. --Plan for checks for understanding during the unit. --Plan for the End-of-Unit Assessment --Plan upcoming lessons/ units using the 5E Instructional Model. --Reflect on the outcome of lessons taught --Analyze checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments. --Act on the core curriculum data by planning interventions for the whole class or small group. -PLCs will generate SMART goals for upcoming units of instruction. -PLCs will report SMART goal data through their logs. As a Science Department -PLC, share action plan successes and challenges of the grade levels courses. -PLCs will adjust action plans based on teacher/ coach walk-through data, PLC collaboration, and student data.		

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
L. Students scoring in upper third in Biology.	2.1.	2.1. **SEE Goals 1.1 & 1.2**	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Biology Goal L: The percentage of students scoring in the upper third on the 2013 End-of-Course Biology Exam will increase from 24% to 35%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	24%	**35%**					

NEW Writing Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

Writing Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
M. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing (Levels 4-9).**	M.1. -Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs To address this barrier, the APC will put a system in place for this school year.	M.1. **Strategy** SWD student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations. -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/ SWD strategies and modifications into lessons.	M.1. **Who** Principal, Site Administrator, Assistance Principal **How** IEP Progress Reports reviewed by APC	M.1. **Teacher Level** -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. **PLC Level** -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. **Leadership Team Level** -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	M.1. On-going writing prompts and assessments		

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

Writing Goal M: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	37%	**38%**					

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: Implement/expand project/problem-based learning in math, science and CTE/STEM electives.	1.1. Need common planning time for math, science, ELA and other STEM teachers	1.1. -Explicit direction for STEM professional learning communities to be established. -Documentation of planning of units and outcomes of units in logs. -Increase effectiveness of lessons through lesson study and district metrics, etc.	1.1. PLC or Department Heads (DH)	1.1. Administrative/DH walk-throughs	1.1. Logging number of project-based learning in math, science and CTE/STEM elective per nine week. Share data with teachers.

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

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Project-based learning	9-12	DH	Science, math, ELA and technology teachers PLCs	On-going	Administrator walk-throughs	Administration

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

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

CTE Goal #1: Sustain/Increase the number of Career Technical Student Organization chapters from _____ in 2011-2012 to _____in 2012-2013. Increase the student membership from _____ in 2011-2012 to _____in 2012-2013.	1.1.	1.1. Increase student participation in CTSO competitions/ events.	1.1. CTE Teachers	1.1. Aggregate and analyze the data every quarter to develop next steps	1.1. Log of number of CTSO events Log of number of students who attend CTSO events
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Establishing or growing a CTSO.	9-12	District	CTE Teachers	October, 2012	Log of events and attendance	CTE Contact Teacher

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

Differentiated Accountability

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
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
Continuous School Improvement	Student incentives aimed at improving attendance, discipline and academic achievement	$3,000	
Teacher Mini-Grants	Grants are made available to teachers to aid in improving the academic achievement in their classrooms. Funds are used to purchase aids/materials that benefit areas of academia which need enrichment.	$2,000	
Technology	Software used to enhance learning experience	$813	

Hillsborough 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised July, 2012

Final Amount Spent			