# Florida Department of Education

# School Improvement Plan (SIP)

# Form SIP-1

## 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

# PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

| | |
|---|---|
| School Name:  Barrington Middle School | District Name:  Hillsborough County |
| Principal:  Maribeth Brooks | Superintendent:  Mary Ellen Elia |
| SAC Chair:   Jaclyn Rowehl and Nicole Hildebrand | Date of School Board Approval: |

## Student Achievement Data:

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

# Highly Qualified Administrators

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

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | Number of Years at Current School | Number of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Principal | Maribeth Brooks | Masters Degree in Educational Leadership, Bachelors Degree in Social Science | 3 | 16 | 2011-2012 school grade: "A" (622 points) High Standards Met: 64% in reading, 69% in math, 86% in writing, 56% in science; % of Students making learning gains: 68% in reading, 70% in math; AYP of lowest 25%: 64% in reading, 66% in math<br><br>2010-2011 school grade: "A"(563 points) with 100% of AYP met; High Standards Met: 72% in reading, 76% in math, 86% in writing, 51% in science; % of Students making learning gains: 65% in reading, 74% in math; AYP of lowest 25%: 65% in reading, 74% in math<br><br>2009-2010 year school grade "B"(518 points), "A" all other years as principal, achieved AYP 3 out of last 7 years, 2009-2010 61% made learning gains in reading, 65% made learning gains in math, 59% of lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 59% of lowest 25% made learning gains in math |

| Assistant Principal | Peter Megara | Masters Degree in Elementary Education, Bachelors Degree in Elementary Education | 3 | 3 | 2011-2012 school grade: "A" (622 points) High Standards Met: 64% in reading, 69% in math, 86% in writing, 56% in science; % of Students making learning gains: 68% in reading, 70% in math; AYP of lowest 25%: 64% in reading, 66% in math |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 2010-2011 school grade: "A"(563 points) with 100% of AYP met; High Standards Met: 72% in reading, 76% in math, 86% in writing, 51% in science; % of Students making learning gains: 65% in reading, 74% in math; AYP of lowest 25%: 65% in reading, 74% in math |
| | | | | | 2009-2010 school grade: "B" (518 points); 69% of 6th grade scored level 3 or above, 66% of 7th grade scored level 3 or above, 46% of 8th grade scored level 3 or above; 61% made learning gains in reading, 59% of lowest 25% made learning gains in reading. |

| Assistant Principal | Kisha Douglas | Specialist Degree in Educational Leadership, Masters Degree in Curriculum Instruction and Technology, Bachelors Degree in Newspaper Journalism | 3 | 3 | 2011-2012 school grade: "A" (622 points) High Standards Met: 64% in reading, 69% in math, 86% in writing, 56% in science; % of Students making learning gains: 68% in reading, 70% in math; AYP of lowest 25%: 64% in reading, 66% in math |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 2010-2011 school grade: "A"(563 points) with 100% of AYP met; High Standards Met: 72% in reading, 76% in math, 86% in writing, 51% in science; % of Students making learning gains: 65% in reading, 74% in math; AYP of lowest 25%: 65% in reading, 74% in math |
| | | | | | 2009-2010 school grade: "B" (518 points); 69% of 6th grade scored level 3 or above, 66% of 7th grade scored level 3 or above, 46% of 8th grade scored level 3 or above; |
| | | | | | 61% made learning gains in reading, 59% of lowest 25% made learning gains in reading. |

## Highly Qualified Instructional Coaches

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

| Subject Area | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | Number of Years at Current School | Number of Years as an | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | Instructional Coach | school year) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reading | Brooke Whalen | Masters Degree in Reading/Literacy, Bachelors Degree in ESE K-12 | 3 | 3 | | 2011-2012 school grade: "A" (622 points) High Standards Met: 64% in reading, 69% in math, 86% in writing, 56% in science; % of Students making learning gains: 68% in reading, 70% in math; AYP of lowest 25%: 64% in reading, 66% in math |
| | | | | | | 2010-2011 school grade: "A"(563 points) with 100% of AYP met; High Standards Met: 72% in reading, 76% in math, 86% in writing, 51% in science; % of Students making learning gains: 65% in reading, 74% in math; AYP of lowest 25%: 65% in reading, 74% in math |
| | | | | | | 2009-2010 school grade: "B" (518 points); 69% of 6th grade scored level 3 or above, 66% of 7th grade scored level 3 or above, 46% of 8th grade scored level 3 or above; 61% made learning gains in reading, 59% of lowest 25% made learning gains in reading. |

## **Highly Qualified Teachers**

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

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

## Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

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

| Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective. | Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective |
|---|---|
| 6 staff members | Depending on the needs of the teacher, one or more of the following strategies are implemented.<br><br>**Administrators**<br><br>Meet with the teachers four times per year to discuss progress on:<br><br>● Preparing and taking the certification exam<br><br>● Completing classes need for certification<br><br>● Provide substitute coverage for the teachers to observe other teachers<br><br>● Discussion of what teachers learned during the observation(s)<br><br>**Academic Coach**<br><br>● The coach co-plans, models, co-teaches, observes and conferences with the teacher on a regular basis<br><br>**Subject Area Leader/PLC**<br><br>● The teachers will attend PLC meetings for on-going adult learning, striving to understand how they as an individual teacher and PLC member can improve learning for all. |

## Staff Demographics

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

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

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

| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 71 | 8% | 37% | 30% | 25% | 39% | 95% | 6% | 0% | 24% |

# 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 |
|---|---|---|---|

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Donna Thomas | Jennifer Austin | Ms. Thomas is a mentor with the EET initiative. She 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. |
| Donna Thomas | Laura Hope | Ms. Thomas is a mentor with the EET initiative. She 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. |

| Donna Thomas | Dawn Martin | Ms. Thomas is a mentor with the EET initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement. | Weekly visits to include: modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assess ments, conferen cing, and problem solving. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Donna Thomas | Kathryn Poplin | Ms. Thomas is a mentor with the EET initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement. | Weekly visits to include: modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assess ments, conferen cing, and problem solving. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Donna Thomas | Max Roberts | Ms. Thomas is a mentor with the EET initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement. | Weekly visits to include: modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assess ments, conferen cing, and problem solving. |
| Donna Thomas | Kelly Cassidy | Ms. Thomas is a mentor with the EET initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement. | Weekly visits to include: modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assess ments, conferen cing, and problem solving. |

| Donna Thomas | Jesse Gross | Ms. Thomas is a mentor with the EET initiative. She 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. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Donna Thomas | Lori Farnum | Ms. Thomas is a mentor with the EET initiative. She 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. |

# <u>Additional Requirements</u>

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

| School-Based MTSS/RtI Team |
| --- |
| Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.<br><br><br>Maribeth Brooks, Principal<br><br>Kisha Douglas, Assistant Principal<br><br>Peter Megara, Assistant  Principal<br><br>Tyra Piergrossi, ESE Specialist<br><br>Brooke Whalen, Reading Coach<br><br>Nora Nelson, Social Worker<br><br>Jennifer Arroyo, Psychologist<br><br>Team Leaders<br><br> |

Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?

The purpose of the PSLT in our school is to ensure high quality instruction/intervention matched to student needs and using performance level and learning rate over time to make data-based decisions to guide instruction. The PSLT reviews school-wide data to address the progress of low-performing students and determine the enrichment and acceleration needs of high performing students. The major goal is for all students to achieve adequate yearly progress and improve other long-term outcomes (behavior, attendance, etc.). The team uses the Collaborative Culture Problem Solving Model and ALL decisions are guided by the review and analysis of student data.

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

- Oversee the multi-layered model of service delivery (Tier 1/Core, Tier 2/Supplemental and Tier 3/Intensive)

- Based on student data, recommend, coordinate and implement supplemental services (Tiers 2 and 3) that match students' non-mastery of skills through:

    ○ Tutoring during the day in small group pull-outs in reading, math and science

    ○ Extended Learning Programs during and after school

    ○ Intensive Reading and Math classes

- Determine scheduling needs, curriculum materials, and intervention resources based on identified needs derived from data analysis

- Determine the school-wide professional development needs of faculty and staff and arrange trainings aligned with the SIP goals

- Review and interpret student data (academic,  behavior, and attendance) at the school and grade levels

- Organize and support systematic data collection as needed

- Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum)  instruction through:

    ○ Implementation and support of PLCs

○ Use of school-based *Reinforcement Instructional Calendars, Mini-Lessons* and *Mini-Assessments*

○ Use of Mini Assessments (data will be collected by PLCs and entered and compiled for analysis by members of the PSLT)

○ Use of *Common Core Assessments* at the end of segments/chapters (data will be collected by PLCs and entered and compiled for analysis by members of the PSLT)

○ Implementation of research-based, scientifically validated instructional strategies and/or interventions (e.g., Differentiated Instruction)

○ Communication with major stakeholders (e.g., parents, business partners, etc.) regarding student outcomes through data summaries and conferences

● Assist at the end of each nine weeks in the evaluation of teacher fidelity data and student achievement data collected during the nine weeks.

● Assist with planning, implementing, and evaluating the outcomes of supplemental and intensive interventions in conjunction with PLCs.

● Work collaboratively with the PLCs in the implementation of the C-CIM (Core Continuous Improvement Model) and F-CIM (Florida Continuous Improvement Model on specific tested benchmarks) and progress monitoring.

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

- The Chair of SAC is a member of the PSLT.

- The PSLT and SAC were involved in the School Improvement Plan development that was initiated during preplanning for the 2010-11 school year.

- The School Improvement Plan is the working document that guides the work of the PSLT. The large part of the work of the team is outlined in the Expected Improvements/Problem Solving Process sections (and related professional development plans) for school-wide goals in Reading, Math, Writing, Science, Attendance and Suspension/Behavior.

- Given that one of the main tasks is to monitor student data related to instruction and interventions, the PSLT will monitor the effectiveness of the strategies developed in problem solving plans by reviewing student data as well as data related to various levels of fidelity. Using data gathered from PLCs, the team will monitor the data and make progress statements on the School Improvement Plan at the end of the first, second and third nine weeks. The PSLT will use the following rubric to evaluate Strategy Fidelity of Implementation and Strategy Effectiveness:

| Indicator | Strategy Fidelity Check | Strategy Data Check |
|---|---|---|
| Not Evident | Teacher monitoring indicates strategy implementation has not begun. | Student data indicates that strategy implementation is showing no positive effect on student achievement. |
| Emerging | Some (25-75%) of the intended teachers are implementing the strategy with fidelity. Evidence indicates early or preliminary stages of implementation. | Student data indicates that strategy implementation is showing minimal or poor effect on student achievement. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Operational | Most (>75%) of the intended teachers are implementing the strategy with fidelity. Evidence indicates active implementation. | Student data indicates that strategy implementation is mostly showing a positive effect on student achievement. |
| Highly Functional | Teacher monitoring indicates that all of the intended teachers are implementing the strategy with fidelity. Evidence exists that the strategy is fully integrated and effectively/consistently implemented. | Student data indicates that strategy implementation is showing a significant positive effect on student achievement. |

- The PSLT will communicate with and support the PLCs in implementing the proposed strategies by assigning PSLT members as consultants to the PLCs to facilitate planning and implementation. Once strategies are put in place, PLCs will periodically report on their efforts and student outcomes to the larger PSLT team through the subject area PSLT representatives.

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

    o  review and analyze screening and collateral data

    o  develop and test hypotheses about why student/school problems are occurring (changeable barriers)

    o  develop and target interventions based on confirmed hypotheses

    o  establish methods to track students' progress with appropriate progress monitoring assessments at intervals matched to the intensity of the interventions and/or enrichment

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

    o  review goal statements to ensure they are ambitious, time-bound and meaningful (e.g., SMART goals)

    o  assess the fidelity of instruction/intervention implementation and other PS/RtI processes

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

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

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

**Core Curriculum (Tier 1)**

| Data Source | Database | Person (s) Responsible |
|---|---|---|
| FCAT released test | School Generated Excel Database | Reading Coach, LA SAL, Math  SAL, Science SAL, APC |
| Baseline and Midyear District Assessments | Scantron Achievement Series | PSLT, PLCs, individual teachers |
| Subject-specific assessments generated by District-level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Math, Writing, and Science <br><br> ● Formatives <br><br> ● Semester Exams <br><br> ● Practice Writing Assessments | Scantron Achievement Series <br><br> PLC Logs | PSLT, PLCs, individual teachers |
| Program Generated Assessments | Software | Individual teachers |

| FAIR | Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network | Reading Coach/ Reading PLC Facilitator |
|------|-------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| CELLA | Sagebrush (IPT) | ELL PSLT Representative |
| Teachers' common core curriculum assessments on units of instruction/big ideas.<br><br>● Math<br><br>● Science<br><br>● Reading/Language Arts | Ed-Line<br><br>PLC Database<br><br>PLC logs | Individual Teachers/PLC Facilitators |
| Common Assessments* *(see below)* of chapter/ segment tests using adopted curriculum resources | Subject Area Generated Database | SALS, individual teachers, PSLT |
| Mini-Assessments on specific tested Benchmarks | Subject Area Generated Excel Database | Individual teachers |

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

● Determine if the lesson plans and teaching strategies used to teach the core curriculum were effective or need modification.

● Determine which skills need to be taught using alternative strategies.

● Determine which skills need to be re-taught within the core curriculum and which skills need to be moved to the Reinforcement Instructional Calendar.

● Determine which students need Differentiated Instruction within the classroom and which students might need Supplemental Services.

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

| Data Source | Database | Person (s) Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|
| Extended Learning Program (ELP) * *(see below)* Ongoing Progress Monitoring (mini-assessments and other assessments from adopted curriculum resource materials) | School Generated Database in Excel | PSLT/ ELP Facilitator |
| FAIR OPM | School Generated Database in Excel | PSLT/ Reading Coach |
| Ongoing assessments within Intensive Courses | Database provided by course materials (for courses that have one), School Generated Database in Excel | PSLT/PLC/Individual Teachers |
| Other Curriculum Based Measurement** *(see below)* | School Generated Database in Excel | PSLT/PLCs/Individual Teachers |
| Research-based Computer-assisted Instructional Programs | Assessments included in computer-based programs | PLCs/Individual Teachers |

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

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

- assess the same skills over time

- have multiple equivalent forms

- are sensitive to small amounts of growth over time

---

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

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

---

Describe plan to support MTSS.

Response to Intervention (RtI) has also been described in Florida as a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) for providing high quality instruction and intervention matched to student needs using learning rate over time and level of performance to inform instructional decisions. In order to support MTSS in our schools, we will:

- Consistently promote the shared vision of one system meeting the needs of ALL students with MTSS as the platform for integrating all school initiatives (i.e., PLC, PSLT, Steering, and SAC meetings, lesson study, school-wide behavior management plans).

- Provide designated school personnel with the requisite knowledge and experience to support coordination and implementation of MTSS.

- Provide continued training and support to all school based personnel in problem solving, responding to student data and the use of a systematic method to increase student achievement.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

| School-Based Literacy Leadership Team |
|---|
| Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).<br><br><br>Maribeth Brooks, Principal<br><br>Peter Megara, Assistant Principal for Curriculum<br><br>Brooke Whalen, Reading Coach<br><br>Amy Ryan, Media Specialist<br><br>Reading Teachers<br><br>Subject Area Leaders |

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

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

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

The principal also ensures that the LLT monitors reading data, identifies school-wide and individual teachers' reading-focused instructional strengths and weaknesses, and creates a professional development plan to support identified instructional needs in conjunction with the Problem Solving Leadership team's support plan. Additionally, the principal ensures that time is provided for the LLT to collaborate and share information with all site stakeholders including other administrators, teachers, staff members, parents, and students.

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

- Implementation and evaluation of the SIP reading strategies across the content areas

- Professional Development

- Co-planning, modeling, and observation of research-based reading strategies within lessons across the content areas

- Data analysis (on-going)

- Implement K-12 Reading Plan

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

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

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

Project CRISS, Level 1 training, which is a 12 hour initial training with a mandatory six hour follow-up component, is offered annually by the reading coach at each school site.  Sites that do not have a nationally approved Project CRISS District Trainer on site have the opportunity to send teachers to district-offered Project CRISS, Level 1 trainings throughout the school year.

The reading coach is required in accordance to his/her job description to provide on-site support of the implementation of the Project CRISS Strategic Lesson Plan model through professional development opportunities, as well as, coaching opportunities.  A yearly action plan is created by the reading coach that outlines what Project CRISS professional development will be opportunities offered.  A monthly written update allows the reading supervisor to monitor the progress of each coach's action plan.

Content-specific (mathematics, social studies, science, and language arts) Project CRISS follow-up trainings are offered on request at school sites and as district-offered trainings throughout the school year.

Demonstration classroom opportunities, focusing on the implementation of content-based literacy strategies, are mandated by the K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan at each site.  The reading coach is responsible for scheduling and facilitating pre-observation, during observation, and post-observation activities and discussion. This year Demonstration classrooms will focus on Higher Order Thinking Skills/Costas Level of Questioning and Vocabulary Development.

A Reading Leadership Team is mandated by the K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan at each site.  The principal is the chairperson of the committee and the reading coach is an integral member, guiding the data review, creation of an action plan, progress monitoring of the plan and evaluation of the plan each school year.  The RLT has representation from each content area and is responsible for reporting back to the school their findings and instructional decisions.

Each Subject Area PLC is responsible for reviewing their students' literacy data and creating lessons that are responsive to identified student needs.  PLCs are responsible for the creation and implementation of the Florida Continuous Improvement Model Reinforcement Instructional Calendars, Mini-Lessons, Mini-Assessments and re-teach lessons based on the on-going collection of student data.  Common assessments on chapter tests are used to identify effective reading

strategies and guide instruction for re-teach or enrichment.

Reading coaches are responsible for assisting content teachers with the integration of differentiated instructional strategies into their content area classrooms. Reading coaches co-plan, co-teach, observe and provides feedback to content teachers.

All costs incurred for reading professional development at the school sites (stipends, consultant contracts, substitutes, materials) are paid for by the K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan funds.

# PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

## Reading Goals

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

| 1. **FCAT 2.0:** **Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5).** | 1.1.<br><br>-Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction.<br><br>-Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze curriculum assessments.<br><br>-Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices.<br><br>- Need additional training to implement effective PLCs.<br><br>- Teachers | 1.1.<br><br>Strategy<br><br>**Tier 1** - The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum (instruction in reading skills/ standards). Students' reading comprehension will improve through teachers using the **Core Continuous Improvement Model** **(C-CIM)** with core curriculum and providing **Differentiated Instruction (DI)** as a result of the problem-solving model.<br><br><br>Action Steps<br><br>1. As a | 1.1.<br><br>Who<br><br>-Principal<br><br>-APC<br><br>-Reading Coach<br><br>-Subject Area<br><br> Leaders<br><br>___<br><br>How<br><br>-PLC logs turned into administration; Administration provides feedback.<br><br>-Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.<br><br>-Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.<br><br>___<br><br>First Nine Week Check | 1.1.<br><br>PLCs will review unit assessments bi-monthly and discuss which strategies were successful in remediation or enrichment.<br><br>The PLC facilitator will record the DI strategies discussed in the PLC log.<br><br>Teachers will chart their students' individual progress and identify students in need of DI intervention.<br><br>First Nine Week Check | 1.1.<br><br>3x per year<br><br>- FAIR On-going Progress Monitoring in comprehension<br><br>During the nine weeks<br><br>- Course unit assessments | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | at varying levels of impleme ntation of Differentiate d Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students.) | Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling researched-based best-practice strategies.<br><br>2. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions.<br><br>3.  At the end of the unit, teachers give an assessment and bring assessment data back to the PLCs.<br><br>4. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that | Second Nine Week Check<br><br>Third Nine Week Check | Second Nine Week Check<br><br>Third Nine Week Check | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | were effective.<br><br>5. Based on the data, teachers a.) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b.) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class and c.) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students.<br><br>6. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment).<br><br>7. PLCs record their work in logs. | | | | | |

| Reading Goal #1: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The Percentage of students scoring a level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 64% to 67%. | **64%** | **67%** | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| | | 1.2.<br><br>-Not all teachers know how to identify student needs from assessment data.<br><br>-Lack of common planning time to analyze data and create student reports | 1.2.<br><br>Strategy<br><br>Tier 1 – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Student reading comprehension will improve through the use of student- teacher **data chats.**<br><br><br><br>Action Steps<br><br>  1. After FAIR AP1, the reading coach will model student – teacher data chats.<br><br>  2. After AP2 and AP3<br><br>   teachers will conduct student – | 1.2.<br><br>Who<br><br>-Reading Coach<br><br>-AP<br><br><br><br>How<br><br>-Reading Coach oversees the data chat process<br><br><br><br>-Administrative walkthroughs will be used to monitor the implementation of this strategy.<br><br><br><br>First Nine Week Check<br><br><br><br>Second Nine Week Check<br><br><br><br>Third Nine | 1.2.<br><br>The reading coach and teachers will have student-centered coaching sessions to review the FAIR data to determine the percentage of students showing an increase of percentile rank/scores once per assessment period.<br><br><br><br>First Nine Week Check<br><br><br><br>Second Nine Week Check<br><br><br><br>Third Nine Week Check | 1.2.<br><br>3x Per Year<br><br>FAIR Progress Monitoring in comprehension | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | teacher data chats. | | | | |

| 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| -Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction.<br><br>-Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze curriculum assessments.<br><br>-Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices.<br><br>- Need additional training to implement effective PLCs. | Strategy<br><br>**Tier 1** - The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum (instruction in reading skills/ standards) within Social Studies classes. Students' reading comprehension will improve through teachers using the **Comprehension Instructional Sequence (CIS) Model** with core curriculum.<br><br>‗<br><br>Action Steps<br><br>1. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and | Who<br><br>-Principal<br><br>-APC<br><br>-Reading Coach<br><br>-Subject Area<br><br> Leaders<br><br>‗<br><br>How<br><br>-PLC logs turned into administration; Administration provides feedback.<br><br>-Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.<br><br>‗<br><br>‗<br><br>First Nine Week Check<br><br>Second Nine Week Check<br><br>‗ | PLCs will review unit assessments bi-quarterly and discuss students strengths and weaknesses within the CIS.<br><br><br>The PLC facilitator will record the strengths and weaknesses discussed in the PLC log.<br><br><br>Teachers will track their students' individual progress and identify students in need of intervention.<br><br>First Nine Week Check<br><br>Second Nine Week Check | 3x per year<br><br>- FAIR On-going Progress Monitoring in comprehension<br><br><br>During the nine weeks<br><br>-teacher created comprehension assessments | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | modeling researched-based best-practice strategies. | Third Nine Week Check | Third Nine Week Check | | |
| | | | 2. PLC teachers instruct students using the CIS Model. | | | | |
| | | | 3.  At the end of the unit, teachers give an assessment and bring assessment data back to the PLCs. | | | | |
| | | | 4. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective. | | | | |
| | | | 5. Based on the data, teachers will decide what skills need to be focused on when doing the next CIS model. | | | | |
| | | | 6. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment). | | | | |

| | | | 7. PLCs record their work in logs. | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | | |
| **2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.**<br><br>See 1.1 | 2.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 2.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 2.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 2.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 2.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | | |
| Reading Goal #2:<br><br>The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 34% to 37%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |

| | **34%** | **37%** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 2.2.<br><br>See 1.2 | 2.2.<br><br>See 1.2 | 2.2.<br><br>See 1.2 | 2.2.<br><br>See 1.2 | 2.2.<br><br>See 1.2 | |
| | | 2.3<br><br>See 1.3 | 2.3<br><br>See 1.3 | 2.3<br><br>See 1.3 | 2.3<br><br>See 1.3 | 2.3<br><br>See 1.3 | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | | |
| **3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.** | 3.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 3.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 3.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 3.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 3.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | | |

| Reading Goal #3: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 68 points to 71 points. | | | | | | |
| | **68** | **71** | | | | |
| | | 3.2.<br><br>See 1.2 | 3.2.<br><br>See 1.2 | 3.2.<br><br>See 1.2 | 3.2.<br><br>See 1.2 | 3.2.<br><br>See 1.2 |
| | | 3.3.<br><br>See 1.3 | 3.3.<br><br>See 1.3 | 3.3.<br><br>See 1.3 | 3..3.<br><br>See 1.3 | 3.3.<br><br>See 1.3 |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check<br><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check<br><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.** | 4.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 4.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 4.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 4.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 4.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | | |
| Reading Goal #4:<br><br>Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 64 points to 67 points. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | **64** | **67** | | | | | |

| | | 4.2. See 1.2 | 4.2. See 1.2 | 4.2. See 1.2 | 4.2. See 1.2 | 4.2. See 1.2 | |
| | | 4.3 See 1.3 | 4.3. See 1.3 | 4.3. See 1.3 | 4.3. See 1.3 | 4.3. See 1.3 | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | | |
| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target | **2011-2012** | **2012-2013** | **2013-2014** | **2014-2015** | **2015-2016** | **2016-2017** | |
| **5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.** | | | | | | | |
| Reading Goal #5: | | | | | | | |

| 5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.** | 5A.1.<br><br>White:<br><br>Black:<br><br>Hispanic:<br><br>Asian:<br><br>American Indian: | 5A.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 5A.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 5A.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 5A.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| Reading Goal #5A:<br><br>The percentage of White students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 71% to 74%.<br><br><br>The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 51% to 56%.<br><br><br>The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 52% to 57%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | White: 71%<br><br>Black: 51%<br><br>Hispanic: 52%<br><br>Asian: Y<br><br>American Indian: NA | White: 74%<br><br>Black: 56%<br><br>Hispanic: 57%<br><br>Asian:<br><br>American Indian: NA | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 5A.2.<br><br><br>See 1.2 | 5A.2<br><br><br>See 1.2 | 5A.2<br><br><br>See 1.2 | 5A.2<br><br><br>See 1.2 | 5A.2<br><br><br>See 1.2 | |
| | | 5A.3.<br><br><br>See 1.3 | 5A.3.<br><br><br>See 1.3 | 5A.3.<br><br><br>See 1.3 | 5A.3.<br><br><br>See 1.3 | 5A.3.<br><br><br>See 1.3 | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | | |
| **5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.** | 5B.1. | 5B.1.<br><br><br>See 1.1 | 5B.1.<br><br><br>See 1.1 | 5B.1.<br><br><br>See 1.1 | 5B.1.<br><br><br>See 1.1 | | |

| Reading Goal #5B: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 50% to 55%. | | | | | | | |
| | **50%** | **55%** | | | | | |
| | | 5B.2. | 5B.2.<br><br>See 1.2 | 5B.2.<br><br>See 1.2 | 5B.2.<br><br>See 1.2 | 5B.2.<br><br>See 1.2 | |

| | | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | See 1.3 | See 1.3 | See 1.3 | See 1.3 | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | | |
| **5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.** | 5C.1.<br><br> | 5C.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 5C.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 5C.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 5C.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | | |

| Reading Goal #5C: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 18% to 26%. | | | | | | |
| | **18%** | **26%** | | | | |
| | – | 5C.2. | 5C.2.<br><br>See 1.2 | 5C.2.<br><br>See 1.2 | 5C.2.<br><br>See 1.2 | 5C.2.<br><br>See 1.2 |
| | | 5C.3. | 5C.3.<br><br>See 1.3 | 5C.3.<br><br>See 1.3 | 5C.3.<br><br>See 1.3 | 5C.3.<br><br>See 1.3 |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | |

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

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reading Goal #5D:<br><br>The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 28% to 35%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | **28%** | **35%** | | | | | |
| | | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | |
| | | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | |

# Reading Professional Development

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

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Differentiated Instruction | Grades 6-8 | -Reading Coach  -Subject Area Leaders and/ or course-specific Facilitators | -All teachers school-wide  -PLCs | -PLCs: Ongoing | Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor DI implementation.  EET formal and informal observations will be administered. | Principal and Administrative Team  Reading Coach |
| Kagan | Grades 6-8 | District Level Trainers | Offered school wide, but only those who have not been trained already will attend. | -5 Day training | Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs | Principal and Administrative Team |

*End of Reading Goals*

## Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

| | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in mathematics (Level 3-5).** | -Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction.<br><br>-Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments.<br><br>-Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices.<br><br>- Need additional training to implement effective PLCs.<br><br>- Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated | **Tier 1** - The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through teachers using the **Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM)** with core curriculum and providing **Differentiated Instruction (DI)** as a result of the problem-solving model.<br><br>_<br><br>Action Steps<br><br>1.  PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material.  (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of | Who<br><br>-Principal<br><br>-APC<br><br>-Subject Area<br><br> Leaders<br><br>_<br><br>How<br><br>-PLC logs turned into administration; Administration provides feedback.<br><br>-Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.<br><br>-Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.<br><br>_<br><br>First Nine Week Check<br><br>Second Nine Week Check | PLCs will review unit assessments and chart/ discuss the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.<br><br><br>PLC facilitator will share data with the Administrative/SAL Leadership Team.  The Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.<br><br><br>First Nine Week Check<br><br><br>Second Nine Week Check<br><br>.<br><br>Third Nine Week Check | 2x per year<br><br>Formatives A and B<br><br>_<br><br>Semester Exams<br><br>_<br><br>FCAT Practice Test<br><br>_<br><br>During the Nine Weeks<br><br>-Chapter Tests<br><br>-Benchmark mini assessments | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students). | instruction.)<br><br>2. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling researched-based DI best-practice strategies.<br>In addition, math teachers visit math demonstration classrooms where DI is emphasized.<br><br>3. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions.<br><br>4. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. | <u>Third Nine Week Check</u> | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs.<br><br>6. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective.<br><br>7. Based on the data, teachers a.) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b.) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class and c.) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students.<br><br>8. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment).<br><br>9. PLCs record their work in logs. | | | | | |

| | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mathematics Goal #1:<br><br>The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 69% to 72%. | **69%** | **72%** | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |

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

| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | | |
| **2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics.** | 2.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 2.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 2.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 2.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 2.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | | |

| Mathematics Goal #2: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 33% to 36%. | | | | | | |
| | **33%** | **36%** | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | |
| **3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making learning gains in mathematics.** | 3.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 3.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 3.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 3.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 3.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | |

| Mathematics Goal #3: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 70 points to 73 points. | | | | | | |
| | **70** | **73** | | | | |
| | | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. |
| | | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3..3. | 3.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** <br><br> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** <br><br> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | |

| 4. **FCAT 2.0:** Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. | 4.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 4.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 4.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 4.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 4.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mathematics Goal #4:<br><br>Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 66 points to 69 points. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | **66** | **69** | | | | | |
| | | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | |
| | | 4.3 | 4.3. | 4.3. | 4.3. | 4.3. | |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check<br><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check<br><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | |
| **5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.** | | | | | | | |
| Math Goal #5: | | | | | | | |
| **5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity** (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics** | 5A.1.<br><br>White:<br><br>Black:<br><br>Hispanic:<br><br>Asian:<br><br>American Indian: | 5A.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 5A.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 5A.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 5A.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | | |

| Mathematics Goal #5A: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The percentage of White students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 74% to 77%. | | | | | | | |
| The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 59% to 63%. | | | | | | | |
| The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 58% to 62%. | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | White: 74%<br><br>Black: 59%<br><br>Hispanic: 58%<br><br>Asian: Y<br><br>American Indian: NA | White: 77%<br><br>Black: 63%<br><br>Hispanic: 62%<br><br>Asian:<br><br>American Indian: NA | | | | |
| | | 5A.2. | 5A.2. | 5A.2. | 5A.2. | 5A.2. |
| | | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | |
| **5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.** | 5B.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 5B.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 5B.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 5B.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 5B.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | |

| Mathematics Goal #5B:<br><br>The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 57% to 61%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **57%** | **61%** | | | | |
| | | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. |
| | | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check<br><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check<br><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.** | 5C.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 5C.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 5C.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 5C.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 5C.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | | |

| Mathematics Goal #5C:<br><br>The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 31% to 38%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **31%** | **38%** | | | | |
| | | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. |
| | | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | |

| 5D. Student with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | -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. | **Strategy** <br><br> SWD student achievement improves through the **effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals**, strategies, modifications, and accommodations. <br><br> -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. <br><br> -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. | Who <br><br> Principal, Site Administrator, Assistance Principal <br><br><br> How <br><br> IEP Progress Reports reviewed by APC | Teacher Level <br><br> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. <br><br> -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SWD SMART Goal. <br><br> PLC Level <br><br> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SWD SMART goal data across all classes/courses. <br><br> -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. <br><br> -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SWD SMART Goal. <br><br> Leadership Team Level <br><br> -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. <br><br> -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. | 2x per year <br><br> District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing <br><br><br> Semester Exams <br><br><br> During the Grading Period <br><br> Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit) | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mathematics Goal #5D:<br><br>The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 32% to 39%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | **32%** | **39%** | | | | | |
| | | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | |
| | | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | |

*End of Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals*

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

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

| Algebra EOC Goals | Problem-Solving | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

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

| Alg1. Students scoring proficient in Algebra (Levels 3-5). | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | -Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction.<br><br>-Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments.<br><br>-Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices.<br><br>- Need additional training to implement effective PLCs.<br><br>- Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated | **Tier 1** - The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through teachers using the **Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM)** with core curriculum and providing **Differentiated Instruction (DI)** as a result of the problem-solving model.<br><br><u>Action Steps</u><br><br>1. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of | <u>Who</u><br><br>-Principal<br><br>-APC<br><br>-Subject Area Leaders<br><br>_<br><br><u>How</u><br><br>-PLC logs turned into administration; Administration provides feedback.<br><br>-Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.<br><br>-Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.<br><br>_<br><br><u>First Nine Week Check</u><br><br>_<br><br><u>Second Nine Week Check</u> | PLCs will review unit assessments and chart/ discuss the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.<br><br><br>PLC facilitator will share data with the Administrative/SAL Leadership Team. The Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.<br><br><u>First Nine Week Check</u><br><br><u>Second Nine Week Check</u><br><br>.<br><br><u>Third Nine Week Check</u><br><br>_ | <u>2x per year</u><br><br>Formatives A and B<br><br>_<br><br><u>Semester Exams</u><br><br>_<br><br><u>FCAT Practice Test</u><br><br>_<br><br><u>During the Nine Weeks</u><br><br>-Chapter Tests<br><br>-Benchmark mini assessments | | |

| | Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students). | instruction.)<br><br>2. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling researched-based DI best-practice strategies.<br>In addition, math teachers visit math demonstration classrooms where DI is emphasized.<br><br>3. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions.<br><br>4. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. | <u>Third Nine Week Check</u> | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs.<br><br>6. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective.<br><br>7. Based on the data, teachers a.) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b.) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class and c.) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students.<br><br>8. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment).<br><br>9. PLCs record their work in logs. | | | | | |

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

| Algebra Goal #1: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013Algebra EOC will increase from 89% to 92%. | | | | | | | |

| | **89%** | **92%** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | | |
| **Alg2.  Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in Algebra.**<br><br>See 1.1 | 2.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 2.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 2.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 2.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | 2.1.<br><br>See 1.1 | | |

| Algebra Goal #2: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or 5 on the 2013Algebra EOC will increase from 34% to 37%. | | | | | | | |
| | **34%** | **37%** | | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | |
| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | |

*End of Algebra EOC Goals*

## Mathematics Professional Development

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

Please note that each

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject and/or PLC Leader | PD Facilitator | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| | 6-8 | District Trainers | Math Teachers | Summer 2012 and ongoing throughout school year | PLC Logs, Classroom walkthroughs and observations | Administrative Team |
| Springboard Training | Grades 6-8 | District Level Trainers | Offered school wide, but only those who have not been trained already will attend. | -5 Day training | Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs | Principal and Administrative Team |
| Kagan | | | | | | |
| Common Core Unit M/J2 Advanced Math | 7 | District Trainers | 7th Grade Math Teachers | Fall 2012 and ongoing throughout school year | PLC Logs, Classroom walkthroughs and observations | Administrative Team |

*End of Mathematics Goals*

# Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

| 1. **FCAT 2.0:** Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | - Teachers are at varying skill levels with Costas (higher order questioning techniques). <br><br> - PLC meetings do not focus on higher order questioning strategies for upcoming lessons. <br><br> - Administrators are at varying skill levels with identification of HOTS/ Costas level questioning. | **Tier 1** – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' science skills will improve through participation in **Costa's Level Questioning**. As a result, there will be increased use of higher level questions versus lower level questions for both teachers and students. <br><br> Action Steps <br><br> 1. AVID | Who <br><br> -Administration Team <br><br> -AVID Coordinator <br><br> -Science SAL <br><br><br><br> How <br><br> -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. <br><br> -Evidence of strategy seen during administration walk-throughs. <br><br><br> First Nine Week Check | PLCs examine student work and data from the Costas quizzes and other assessments with HOTS questions. Data from review of unit assessments will be analyzed at PLC meetings. <br><br><br> PLC facilitator will share data with the Administration /SAL Leadership Team and will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. <br><br><br><br> First Nine Week Check <br><br><br> Second Nine Week Check <br><br> Third Nine Week Check | 2x per year <br><br> District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing <br><br><br> Semester Exams <br><br><br> During the nine weeks <br><br> -Student work <br><br> -Chapter tests | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | site team designs and plans Costas training for staff. Demon stration classrooms are identified and training schedule designed for staff.<br><br>2. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.)<br><br>3. As a Professional | Second Nine Week Check<br><br><br>Third Nine Week Check | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Developme nt activity in their PLCs, teachers discuss Costa's/ HOT strategies and how they can be implemented in the upcoming lessons. 4. Teachers implement the targeted higher order questioning strategies in their lessons. 5. Teachers implement the common assessments. 6. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 7. PLCs study students' | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | responses to the higher order questions to assess students' higher order thinking processes.<br><br>8. Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of higher order strategy implementation.<br><br>9. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs. | | | | | |

| Science Goal #1: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 56% to 59%. | **56%** | **59%** | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | |

| 2. **FCAT 2.0:** Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science. | 2.1. See 1.1 | 2.1. See 1.1 | 2.1. See 1.1 | 2.1. See 1.1 | 2.1. See 1.1 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Science Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 11% to 14%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | **11%** | **14%** | | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | |
| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | |

## Science Professional Development

**Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning**

**Community (PLC)**
   **or PD Activity**

| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kagan | Grades 6-8 | District Level Trainers | Offered school wide, but only those who have not been trained already will attend. | -5 Day training | Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs | Principal and Administrative Team |

*Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.*

*End of Science Goals*

## Writing/Language Arts Goals

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

| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | - Teachers lack skill and understanding regarding the FCAT Writing Assessment and Scoring Rubric.<br><br>- Teachers new to Language Arts may not have FCAT Writing training.<br><br>- Teachers do not have confidence using holistic scoring methods.<br><br>- Teachers lack sufficient time to score student papers.<br><br>- Teachers lack common planning time to meet in PLCs to discuss common deficiencies in writing<br><br>- Teachers lack class time to hold one-on-one conferences with students. | Strategy<br><br>**Tier 1** – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' writing skills will improve through participation of best practices for teaching writing. Best practices include **instructional calendars, Differentiated Instruction, and effective holistic scoring methods**.<br><br>Action Steps<br><br>1. As a Professional Development activity, teachers participate in assessment and rubric refresher | Who<br><br>Principal<br><br>APC<br><br>LA SAL<br><br>LA PLC<br><br>How<br><br>- Evidence of strategy seen during administration walk-throughs.<br><br>- Mini-assessment data will be reviewed every nine weeks.<br><br>- Springboard Walk-Through Observation Form.<br><br>First Nine Week Check<br><br>Second Nine Week Check | -PLC review of scheduled mini- assessments to determine number and percent of students scoring above proficiency as determined by the assignment rubric.<br><br>-SAL will chart the increase in the number of students reaching 4.0 or above on the scheduled writing prompts and share data with the LA Department teachers.<br><br>- All PLC members will review assessment data for positive trends and areas needing improvement.<br><br>-PLCs will participate in rubric norming sessions to identify teacher barriers impeding effective holistic scoring.<br><br><br>First Nine Week Check<br><br><br>Second Nine Week Check | 6x Per Year<br><br>Student scheduled demand writes/ mini-assessments, student daily drafts, conferencing notes, and Springboard writing assignments.<br><br><br>During Nine Weeks | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | courses. | Third Nine Week Check | | | |
| | | 2. As a Professional Development activity, PLC discussions by grade level draw teachers to a consensus regarding student trends, needs, and scores based on connecting student writing with state anchor papers. | | Third Nine Week Check | | |
| | | 3. Teachers will incorporate mini lessons on mechanics, grammar, spelling, and vocab for students to become proficient in these areas. | | | | |
| | | 3. PLCs review mini-assessment data and student needs.  PLCs will then share ideas/writing lessons that focus on higher | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | level craft.<br><br>4. PLCs record their essay results from the scheduled timed mini-assessments.<br><br>5. Teachers provide one-on-one conferences with students to promote elaboration and revision techniques to moved schedules assessment scores to 4.0 or above.<br><br>6. Teachers will keep portfolios of students' work/writing to assess growth when conferencing with students.<br><br>7. Springboard teachers will use writing prompts provided by the district to correlate | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | FCAT writing skills being taught with the Springboard curriculum. | | | | |
| Writing/LA Goal #1:<br><br>The percentage of students scoring **Level 4.0** or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes will increase from 53% to 56%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>**53%** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>**56%** | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

## Writing/Language Arts Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD 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 |
| Kagan | Grades 6-8 | District Level Trainers | Offered school wide, but only those who have not been trained already will attend. | 5 Day training | Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs | Principal and Administrative Team |
| FCAT Writes 2013 | Grade 8 | District Level Trainers | Only those who have not been trained already will attend. | Fall 2012 | PLC Logs, Classroom walkthroughs and observations | Principal and Administrative Team |

| | Grade 6 | | Only those who have not been trained already will attend. | Fall 2012 | | PLC Logs, Classroom walkthroughs and observations | Principal and Administrative Team |

6th Grade Language
Arts Writing Rubric

District Level
Trainers

*End of Writing Goals*

## Attendance Goal(s)

| Attendance Goal(s) | Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** <br><br> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** <br><br> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | | |

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

| 1. Attendance | 1.1.<br><br>Most students with significant unexcused absences (10 or more) have serious personal or family issues that are impacting attendance.<br><br><br>-Lack of time to focus on attendance. | 1.1.<br><br>Teachers contact parents after the 5th unexcused absence. Teachers document parent contact and fill out an attendance intervention form to turn into guidance counselors for review. Guidance and social work collaborate to provide intervention when students reach 10 unexcused absences. The student affairs secretary will send a letter home when students reach 5 cumulative absences and 10 unexcused absences in a 9 week period. | 1.1.<br><br>Guidance Counselors will run monthly attendance meetings with Social Worker<br><br>Team Leaders.<br><br><br>First Nine Week Check<br><br><br>Second Nine Week Check | 1.1.<br><br>The attendance team will disaggregate attendance data. on a bi-monthly basis.<br><br><br>First Nine Week Check<br><br><br>Second Nine Week Check | 1.1.<br><br>Attendance report<br><br>Tardy report | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

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

| Attendance Goal #1: | 2012 Current Attendance Rate:* | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The attendance rate will increase from 95% in 2011-2012 to 96% in 2012-2013. | | | | | | | |
| 2. The number of students who have 10 or more **unexcused** absences throughout the school year will decrease by 10% | | | | | | | |
| 3.The number of students who have 10 or more **unexcused** tardies to school throughout the school year will decrease by 10%. | | | | | | | |
| | **95%** | **96%** | | | | | |

| | 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences  (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences  (10 or more) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **94** | **84** | | | | |
| | 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of  Students with Excessive Tardies  (10 or more) | | | | |
| | **0** | **0** | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

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

| PD Content /Topic | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator | PD Participants | Target Dates and Schedules | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| and/or PLC Focus | | and/or PLC Leader | (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | | |

*End of Attendance Goals*

## Suspension Goal(s)

| Suspension Goal(s) | Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | |

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

| 1. Suspension | 1.1.<br><br>Few opportunities exist for students to connect and establish mentoring relationships with adults at school. | 1.1.<br><br>Mentoring program will be implemented to support students who accrue more than 10 suspension days in one semester. | 1.1.<br><br>Guidance<br><br>Social worker<br><br>School psychologist<br><br>Mentors<br><br><br>First Nine Week Check<br><br><br>Second  Nine Week Check | 1.1.<br><br>A subgroup of the Problem Solving Leadership Team will review suspension data and determine the percent of students with 10 or more suspensions per semester. The team will review suspension data weekly and report to the PSLT monthly.<br><br><br>First Nine Week Check<br><br><br>Second Nine Week Check | 1.1.<br><br>Weekly Suspension Data | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

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

| Suspension Goal #1: | 2012 Total Number of<br><br>In –School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of<br><br>In- School Suspensions | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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%. | | | | | | | |
| | **504** | **453** | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended ____ <br><br> In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended ____ <br><br> In -School | | | | |
| | **222** | **199** | | | | |
| | 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of ____ <br><br> Out-of-School Suspensions | | | | |
| | **190** | **171** | | | | |
| | 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended ____ <br><br> Out- of- School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended ____ <br><br> Out- of-School ____ | | | | |
| | **117** | **105** | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

## Suspension Professional Development

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or

**Hillsborough 2012**
**Rule 6A-1.099811**
**Revised July, 2012**

| PLC activity.<br>PD Content /Topic<br><br>and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/<br>Subject<br><br>and/or<br><br>PLC Leader | PD Facilitator | PD Participants<br><br>(e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or<br>school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules<br><br>(e.g. , Early Release) and<br>Schedules (e.g., frequency of<br>meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for<br>Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | |

*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<br><br>areas in need of improvement: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | | |

| 1. Health and Fitness Goal | 1.1. | 1.1. Middle School students will engage in the equivalent of one class period per day of physical education for one semester of each year in grades 6 through 8 | 1.1. APC<br><br>Guidance | 1.1. Checking student schedules | 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 41% on the Pretest to 51% on the Posttest.<br><br>*Schools will enter the data after the Pretest and Posttest. Make sure there is at least a 10% between the Pretest and Posttest.* | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. Health and physical activity initiatives developed and implemented by the Principal's designee. | 1.2. Principal's designee. | 1.2. Data on the number of students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ) | 1.2. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health. | |

**Hillsborough 2012**
**Rule 6A-1.099811**
**Revised July, 2012**

| | | 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. | |

## Health and Fitness Goals Professional Development

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

## Continuous Improvement Goal(s)

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

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

| 1. Continuous Improvement Goal | 1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | - Not enough time to meet<br><br>- Teacher attendance issues | PLCs will meet twice a month on Tuesday mornings at 8:05. | Who<br><br>Administration<br><br>How<br><br>- Administration will review PLCs logs and provide feedback. | PLST will examine the feedback from all PLCs and determine next steps in the PLC process. | PLC Facilitators will provide feedback to PLST team on progress of their PLC. | | |

| Continuous Improvement Goal #1: | 2012 Current Level :* | 2013 Expected Level :* | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The percentage of **teachers** who **strongly** agree with the indicator that **"teachers meet on a regular basis to discuss their student's learning, share best practices, problem solve and develop lessons/assessments that improve student performance** will increase from 77% in 2011 to 80% in 2013. | | | | | | | |

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

| | | 2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | - Not all staff is trained in PLCs.<br><br>- PLC Facilitators/ Subject Area Leaders are not all trained to lead PLCs.<br><br>- Difficulty making the transition to keeping meetings curriculum and student focused. | Key staff will provide training on PLCs to the Problem-Solving Leadership Team. PSLT members will implement skills learned within the department PLCs. | Who<br><br>Principal and trained staff members<br><br><br>How<br><br>- Administration will review PLCs logs and provide feedback. | PLST will examine the feedback from all PLCs and determine next steps in the PLC process. | PLC Facilitators will provide feedback to PLST team on progress of their PLC. | |

| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | - PLCs do not always have a clear focus<br><br>- PLCs not sure what they should be doing in the meetings. | PLCs will use the Action Steps of the Goals as a guide for PLC discussion and PLC work. | <u>Who</u><br><br>Administration,<br><br>Teachers who have received District training in PLC Facilitation<br><br><u>How</u><br><br>- Administration will review PLCs logs. | PLST will examine the feedback from all PLCs and determine next steps in the PLC process. | PLC Facilitators will provide feedback to PLST team on progress of their PLC. | |

## 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.

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

| PD Content /Topic | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator | PD Participants | Target Dates and Schedules | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| and/or PLC Focus | | and/or PLC Leader | (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | | |

*End of Additional Goal(s)*

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

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

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

| C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/ Speaking. | 1.1. | 1. All instructional staff members will be in compliance with state ESOL requirements. | 1. Who – Principal and APC How – Monitoring the ESOL Compliance Report | 1.1.Any staff members that have not completed required ESOL coursework will be informed of their status and will be advised of the proper course of action. | 1.1. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CELLA Goal #C:<br><br>The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from 80% to 83%. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: | | | | | |
| | **80%** | | | | | |

|  |  | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |  |
| **D.  Students scoring proficient in Reading.** | 2.1.<br><br>See Reading Goal 1.1 | 2.1.<br><br>See Reading Goal 1.1 | 2.1.<br><br>See Reading Goal 1.1 | 2.1.<br><br>See Reading Goal 1.1 | 2.1.<br><br>See Reading Goal 1.1 |  |
| CELLA Goal #D:<br><br><br>The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase from 19% to 22%. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading : |  |  |  |  |  |

| | **19%** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 2.2. See Reading Goal 1.2 | 2.2. See Reading Goal 1.2 | 2.2. See Reading Goal 1.2 | 2.2. See Reading Goal 1.2 | 2.2. See Reading Goal 1.2 |
| | | 2.3 See Reading Goal 1.3 | 2.3 See Reading Goal 1.3 | 2.3 See Reading Goal 1.3 | 2.3 See Reading Goal 1.3 | 2.3 See Reading Goal 1.3 |
| Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | |
| **E. Students scoring proficient in Writing.** | 2.1. See writing strategy 1.1. | 2.1. See writing strategy 1.1. | 2.1. See writing strategy 1.1. | 2.1. See writing strategy 1.1. | 2.1. See writing strategy 1.1. | |

| CELLA Goal #E: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA will increase from 29% to 32%. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **29%** | | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |

# 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 |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Final Amount Spent | | | |