FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

Newsome High School, Lithia, FL

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Joe. E. Newsome High School	District Name: Hillsborough County
Principal: Carla Bruning	Superintendent: MaryEllen Elia
SAC Chair: Phyllis Powers	Date of School Board Approval: Pending District 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	Carla Bruning	School principal Educational Leadership Biology 6-12 Health 7-12 Physical Education 6-12	2	18	11-12: A 10/11: A, AYP- No, 77% 09-10: A, AYP-No, 79% 08-09: D, AYP-No, 69% 07-08: B, AYP-No, 69%
Assistant Principal	Tyvan Lindbeck	BS Physical Education MA Educational Leadership	10	12	11-12: A 10/11: A, AYP 90% 09-10: A, AYP, 95% 08-09: A AYP , 92% 07-08: A AYP, 97% 06-07: B, AYP, 97%

Assistant Principal	Paul Lindstrom	BS Physical Education MA Educational Leadership	10	7	11-12: A 10/11: A, AYP 90% 09-10: A, AYP, 95% 08-09: A AYP , 92% 07-08: A AYP, 97% 06-07: B, AYP, 97%
Assistant Principal	Gary Graham	BS Physical Education MA Educational Leadership	7	10	11-12: A 10/11: A, AYP 90% 09-10: A, AYP, 95% 08-09: A AYP , 92% 07-08: A AYP, 97% 06-07: B, AYP, 97%
Assistant Principal	Richard Peacock	Educational Leadership Biology 6-12	5	5	11-12: A 10/11: A, AYP- No, 77% 09-10: A, AYP-No, 79% 08-09: D, AYP-No, 69% 07-08: B, AYP-No, 69%
Assistant Principal	Chera Jones	Master's Business Administration Specialist in Educational Leadership Doctorate in Educational Leadership Educational Leadership Math grades 5-9	1	1	

Highly Qualified Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Kay Quinones	MAT Secondary English Education in progress, English 6-12, ESOL Endorsement, Reading Endorsement	2	2	11-12: A

Highly Qualified Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1. Teacher Interview Day	District Staff	June	
2. Recruitment Fairs	District Staff	June	
3. District Mentor Program	District Mentors	Ongoing	
4. District Peer Program	District Peers	Ongoing	
5. School-based Teacher Recognition System	Principal	Ongoing	
6. School Orientation	Principal	August	
7. Monthly meetings	Assistant Principal	Monthly	
8. School mentors	Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
9. Leadership Opportunities	Principal	Ongoing	
10. Regular time for teacher collaboration	Principal	Ongoing	

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly qualified.	**Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective**
Teachers *5 out of field Subject *7 out of field for ESOL	Depending on the needs of the teacher, one or more of the following strategies are implemented. **Administrators** Meet with the teachers four times per year to discuss progress on: • Preparing and taking the certification exam • Completing classes need for certification • Provide substitute coverage for the teachers to observe other teachers • Discussion of what teachers learned during the observation(s) **Academic Coach** • The coach co-plans, models, co-teaches, observes and conferences with the teacher on a regular basis **Subject Area Leader/PLC** • The teachers will attend PLC meetings for on-going professional development, striving to understand how they as an individual teacher and PLC member can improve learning for all.

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Qualified Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
136	6 4%	39 29%	60 44%	31 23%	45 33%	126 93%	8 6%	8 6%	20 15%

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
Sylvia Ellison ***(District EET Mentor)***	Mackenzie Skole Erin Yonkee Pierre Lagisquet Nathan Charnock Cari Sadler	The district-based mentor is with the EET initiative. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Kay Quinones – Reading Coach ***(school based mentor)***	Brittany Acerra Mackenzie Skole Cari Sadler Rachael Randall Lauren Maya	Mrs. Quinones is the school's reading coach.	On-going co-planning, modeling of lessons and observation with feedback.
Roslyn Brown ***(District EET Mentor)***	Runita Jones Brittany Acerra Sam Creighton Gabrielle Springer Chad Rhod Cynthia Schafer-Vazquez	The district-based mentor is with the EET initiative. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.

Additional Requirements

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team. 1. Carla Bruning-Principal 2. Phyllis Powers—SAC Chair 3. Kay Quinones—Reading Coach 4. Shelli Bauer—Psychologist 5. Amanda Walker—ESE specialist 6. Tyvan Lindbeck—APC 7. Gary Graham—APSA 8. Richard Peacock—APSA

9. Chera Jones—APSA
10. Ron Dyches—Dept Head
11. Patricia Ryans—Social Worker
12. Melissa Wilt—Dept Head
13. Kristin Kitko—Guidance Dept Head
14. Jeffrey Shotwell—Dropout Prevention
15. Matthew Leach—AVID
16. Elizabeth Rodriguez—ELL Representative
17. Angela Bradley—Dept Head

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 core Leadership Team is to:
1. Review school-wide assessment data on an ongoing basis in order to identify instructional needs at all grade levels.
2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels.
3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains.
4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams.

The Leadership team meets regularly. Specific responsibilities include:

- Oversee the multi-layered model of instructional delivery (Tier 1/Core, Tier 2/Supplemental and Tier 3/Intensive)
- Create, manage and update the school resource map
- Ensure the master schedule incorporates allocated time for intervention support at all grade levels.
- Determine scheduling needs, and assist teacher teams in identifying research-based instructional materials and intervention resources at Tiers2/3
- Facilitate the implementation of specific programs (e.g., Extended Learning Programs during and after school) that provide intervention support to students identified through data sorts/chats conducted by the PLCs.
- Determine the school-wide professional development needs of faculty and staff and arrange trainings aligned with the SIP goals
- Organize and support systematic data collection (e.g., district and state assessments; during-the-grading period school assessments/checks for understanding; in-school surveys)
- Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction through the:
    - Implementation and support of PLCs
    - Review of teacher/PLC core curriculum assessments/chapters tests/checks for understanding (data will be collected and analyzed by PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT)
    - Implementation of research-based scientifically validated instructional strategies and/or interventions, as outlined in our SIP.
    - Communication with major stakeholders (e.g., parents, business partners, etc.) regarding student outcomes through data summaries and conferences.
- On a monthly basis, assist in the evaluation of student achievement data collected during the month.
- Work collaboratively with the PLCs in the implementation of the C-CIM (Core Continuous Improvement Model) on core curriculum material.
- Coordinate/collaborate/integrate with other working committees, such as the Literacy Leadership Team (which is charged with developing a plan for

embedding/integrating reading and writing strategies across all other content areas).

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 Leadership Team/PSLT.
- The administration, leadership team, teachers and SAC are involved in the School Improvement Plan development and monitoring throughout the school year.
- The School Improvement Plan is the working document that guides the work of the Leadership Team and all teacher teams. 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.
- The Leadership Team/PSLT and PLCs both use the problem solving process (Problem Identification, Problem Analysis, Intervention Design and Implementation and Evaluation to:
    - Use the problem-solving model when analyzing data:
        1. What is the problem? (Problem Identification)
        2. Why is it occurring? (Problem Analysis and Barrier Identification)
        3. What are we going to do about it? (Action Plan Design and Implementation)
        4. Is it working? (Monitor Progress and Evaluate Action Plan Effectiveness)
    - Identify the problem (based on an analysis of the data disaggregated via data sorts) in multiple areas – curriculum content, behavior, and attendance
    - Develop and test hypotheses about why student/school problems are occurring (changeable barriers).
    - Develop and target interventions based on confirmed hypotheses.
    - Identify appropriate progress monitoring assessments to be administered at regular intervals matched to the intensity of the level of instructional/intervention support provided.
    - Review progress monitoring data at regular intervals 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 intervention and/or enrichment support).
    - Each PLC develops PLC action plan for SIP strategy implementation and monitoring.

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.

Core Curriculum (Tier 1)

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible
FCAT released tests	School Generated Excel Database	Reading Coach/Math Coach/AP
Baseline and Midyear District Assessments	Scantron Achievement Series Edline	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers
District generated assessments from the Office of	Scantron Achievement Series	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers

Assessment and Accountability--Formatives	Edline	
Subject-specific assessments generated by District-level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Language Arts, Math, Writing and Science—Mid-term and final exams	Scantron Achievement Series Edline PLC Logs	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers
FAIR	Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network Sagebrush	Reading Coach/Reading PLC Facilitator, English teachers
CELLA	Sagebrush (IPT)	ELL PSLT Representative
EOC—Algebra, Biology, Geometry, US History	Sagebrush	Dept heads, Guidance, PLCs, Leaderhsip team
Reports on Demand/Crystal Reports	District Generated Database	Leadership Team/Specialty PSLT
FCAT released tests	School Generated Excel Database	Reading Coach/Math Coach/AP

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) FCIM, CCIM	School Generated Database in Excel	Leadership Team/ ELP Facilitator/Guidance
FAIR	School Generated Database in Excel	Leadership Team/Reading Coach/Guidance
Ongoing assessments within Intensive Courses (Middle/High)	Database provided by course materials (for courses that have one), School Generated Database in Excel	Leadership Team/PLC/Individual Teachers/Guidance
Other Curriculum Based Measurement	School Generated Database in Excel/ READ 180database, Voyagers database	Leadership Team/PLCs/Individual Teachers/Guidance

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The Leadership Team/will continue to work to build consensus with all stakeholders regarding a need for and a focus on school improvement efforts. The Leadership Team will work to align the efforts of other school teams that may be addressing similar identified issues.

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.
- Continue to map resources to further communicate with students, parents, and staff.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Carla Bruning—Principal Kay Quinones—Reading Coach Richard Peacock—APSA Angela Bradley—Science Dept Head Debbie Rhoney—Media Specialist Rachael Randall—Reading Teacher Michelle Haines—FCS Teacher Cari Sadler—Reading/English Teacher Christina Hill—ESE Teacher Lori Eichelberger—CTE Dept Head Matthew Leach—AVID Teacher
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The LLT is a subgroup of the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The team provides leadership for the implementation of the reading goals and strategies identified on the SIP plan. The Principal is the LLT chairperson. The Reading Coach as an integral member provides extensive expertise in data analysis and reading interventions. The reading coach and principal collaborate with the team to ensure that data-driven instructional support is provided to all teachers. The principal and reading coach also ensure 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 goals and strategies across the content areas. • Professional development—school-wide

- Co-planning, modeling and observation of research-based reading strategies within lessons across the content areas
- On-going Data Analysis
- Implementation of the 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, is offered annually through district-provided training. Mandatory follow-up is provided at the school site by the reading coach. Complementing the Project CRISS initiative is the inclusion of close reading lessons in the ELA, reading, and content area classrooms.

The reading coach is required as a part of his/her job description to provide on-site support of the implementation of the Project CRISS Strategic Lesson Plan model and the design and delivery of close reading lessons through professional development opportunities, as well as, coaching opportunities. A yearly action plan is created by the reading coach that outlines what Project CRISS and close reading model lesson professional development will be 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 close reading model lesson 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.

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 should have representation from each content area and is responsible for reporting back to the school their findings and instructional decisions.

Each PLC is responsible for reviewing their students' literacy data and creating lessons that are responsive to identified student needs. PLCs are responsible for the implementation of the Continuous Improvement Model (Plan-Do-Check-Act) with their core curriculum and acting on the data by providing additional instruction where needed. 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 instruction strategies into their content area classrooms.

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.	

*High Schools Only

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

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

Courses and coursework are established in Professional Learning Communities, Career Academies, Career Pathways, Program Completers, and AVID classes to help students see the relationships both cross-curricular and within subjects to establish relevance to a student's future. Many of these programs help guide and establish a student for post secondary readiness (Industry Certifications, College credit, job skills, etc). Our guidance counselors are equipped with programs of study to help guide students to their educational pathway. The Program of Study for High School students maps out the courses and timeline for students to be program completers and successfully transition to post-secondary institutions.

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

Joe E. Newsome High School will annually hold elective fairs with present and incoming students. Based on interest, they will establish Course Selection Sheets and courses offerings to best meet their needs. The Guidance Department, ESE Specialist, AVID Coordinator, Department Heads, teachers and APCs will then articulate with feeder schools and assist students in signing up for courses and programs based on their Automatic Course Requests and their individual interests. Guidance Counselors will visit classes to review the curriculum guide and course descriptions. They will distribute Course Selection Sheets and provide information about selecting courses for the following school year. These Course Selection Sheets are then sent home for parent review and signature. On an annual basis, Joe E. Newsome High School will review new course offerings at the state and district level to continue to offer rigorous and relevant coursework and to meet the State Standards.	

Postsecondary Transition

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

Joe E. Newsome has reflected over our *High School Feedback Report* Trends for the last 3 year. Overall all Joe E. Newsome has consistently exceeded the district and state average in all Pre-Graduation and Post-Graduation Indicators. *District-Level*	

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

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

- **Career Seeking and Investigations -** Provides 8th grade students an opportunity to explore the campus of Hillsborough Community College (HCC) and experience campus life and activities
- **Amazing Race -**Provides 12th grade students an opportunity to gather enrollment requirements, scholarship opportunities and program offerings for incoming college freshmen
- **Hi-Tec Trek -** Provides 11th graders with an opportunity to explore Hillsborough County's postsecondary technical centers career and program opportunities.
- **ESE Career Connection-** Career Connections is a program that our school/area puts on for students that have an IEP and are a Junior or Senior. The week after school gets out, our area transition specialist and some of the ESE Specialists take 50 students to 4 campuses of Hillsborough Community College. We attend classes of each school's major study area (nursing/Plant City, criminal justice/YBOR). The final day, we help enroll seniors into the college with their parents.

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

School-Level

Specifically at Joe E. Newsome , students may participate in the following:

- Saturday PSAT and SAT classes several times during the first semester. Two sessions with 4 Saturdays each session.
- Counselors will meet with all students to encourage students to complete the class and take the test.
- Communication letters on the PSAT will be sent home with students to advertise the PSAT classes and testing dates. Testing information is posted on EdLine for parents and students.
- Newsome is a testing site for both ACT and SAT tests. Using ELP funds, our school will provide Saturday tutorial sessions.
- Using ELP funds, Saturday SAT and ACT prep classes are offered. Counselors will meet with all students to encourage students to complete the class and take the test. Communication letters on the SAT and ACT will be sent home with students to advertise the SAT and ACT prep classes and testing dates.
- College Visits - Various college representatives visit Newsome High School to share information about their specific colleges or universities with students.
- ASVAB - Students interested in possibly enlisting in the military are given an opportunity to take this aptitude test.
- USF Senior Access Day - Disadvantaged and underrepresented students are invited to visit USF and learn about careers in various health professions.
- Ready to Work - Students in 12th grade have the opportunity to complete three assessments in the areas of math, reading and interpreting data on the computer in the Success Center. After completing the assessments students are sent a certificate that indicates their scores and the correlating skills. The students then show this certificate to an employer when applying for a job, which makes them more marketable.
- We offer several parent meetings to our 11th and 12th grade students and parents.
- Senior Night - All seniors are encouraged to attend senior night, where they receive their senior handbook and the counselors share valuable information about their senior year. This includes postsecondary information, a timeline of what seniors should be doing during the course of the year, SAT/ACT test

dates, etc. • Junior Night - Juniors and their parents are given their Junior Handbooks and important information about testing and senior year is shared. This includes postsecondary information, a timeline of what they should be doing during the course of the year, SAT/ACT test dates, etc. • Through the AVID program, students are engaged in on-going college readiness activities. • College nights-the District offers four college nights throughout the county for students so speak directly with over 100 college and university representatives. • All targeted juniors take the PERT. Based on results, students are placed in college readiness coursework provided till graduation.	

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5).			1.1. -Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13. -Training all content area teachers	1.1. **Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas** Reading comprehension improves when **students are engaged in grappling with complex text**. Teachers need to understand how to **select/identify** complex text, **shift** the amount of informational text used in the content curricula, and **share** complex texts with all students. **All content area teachers are responsible for implementation.** **Action Steps** Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.	1.1. Who -Principal -AP -Instructional Coach -Dept Heads -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How -PLC Logs -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -Administration and coach rotate through PLCs looking for complex text discussion. -Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis.	1.1. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Leadership Team.	1.1. 3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments FAIR, EOC, first semester exams as base with second semester exams showing advancement on Achievement Series
Reading Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 73% to 76%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **73%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **76%**					

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

			<u>are responsible for implementation</u>. **<u>Action Steps</u>** Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.		teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	
		1.3. -Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13. -Training all content area teachers	1.3. **<u>Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas</u>** Teachers need to understand how to **design** and **deliver** a **<u>close reading</u>** lesson. Student reading comprehension improves when students are engaged in close reading instruction using complex text. Specific close reading strategies include: 1) multiple readings of a passage 2) asking higher-order, text-dependent questions, 3) writing in response to reading and 4) engaging in text-based class discussion. **<u>All content area teachers are responsible for implementation.</u>** **<u>Action Steps</u>** Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.	1.3. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Instructional Coaches -Dep.t heads -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses <u>How</u> -PLC Logs -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis. -Reading Coach observations and walk-throughs -Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency.	1.3. <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal. <u>PLC Level</u> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department	1.3 <u>3x per year</u> - FAIR <u>During the Grading Period</u> - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)

<table>
<tr><td></td><td colspan="2"></td><td></td><td>-Administrator and Reading Coach aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation.</td><td>Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.
-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">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:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Fidelity Check
Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</td><td>Strategy Data Check
How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</td><td>Student Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.</td><td>2.1.</td><td>2.1
See Goals 1, 3, & 4</td><td>2.1.</td><td>2.1.</td><td>2.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Reading Goal #2:

The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 45% to 48%.</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*
45%</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*
48%</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>2.2.</td><td>2.2.</td><td>2.2.</td><td>2.2.</td><td>2.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>2.3</td><td>2.3</td><td>2.3</td><td>2.3</td><td>2.3</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">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:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Fidelity Check
Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</td><td>Strategy Data Check
How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the</td><td>Student Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
</table>

						effectiveness of strategy?	
3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.			3.1. -PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum conversations and data analysis to deepen their leaning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act "Instructional Unit" log.	3.1. **Strategy** Student achievement improves through **teachers working collaboratively** to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act** model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: 1. What is it we expect them to learn? 2. How will we if they have learned it? 3. How will we respond if they don't learn? 4. How will we respond if they already know it? **Actions/Details** -Grade level/like-course PLCs use a **Plan-Do-Check-Act "Unit of Instruction" log** to guide their discussion and way of work. Discussions are summarized on log. -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.	3.1. Who -Principal -AP -Instructional Coach -Dept. Heads -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.	3.1. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team.	3.1. 3x per year FAIR During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)
Reading Goal #3: Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 73 points to 76 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **73 points**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **76 points**					

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

			protocol, identify students who need re-teaching/interventions and how that instruction will be provided. (*Questions are listed in the 2012-2013 Technical Assistance Document under the Differentiation Cross Content strategy).* -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLCs.		instruction.	
		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3..3.	3.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.		4.1. -Scheduling time for the principal/APC to meet with the academic coach on a regular basis. -Teachers willingness to accept support from the coach.	4.1. **Strategy Across all Content Areas** **Strategy/Task** Student achievement improves through **teachers' collaboration with the academic coach** in all content areas. **Actions/Details** ***Academic Coach*** -The academic coach and administration conducts one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the teacher's student past and/or present data. -The academic coach rotates through all subjects' PLCs to: --Facilitate lesson planning	4.1. Who Administration How- -Review of coach's log -Review of coach's log of support to targeted teachers. -Administrative walk-throughs of coaches working with teachers (either in classrooms, PLCs or planning sessions)	4.1. -Tracking of coach's participation in PLCs. -Tracking of coach's interactions with teachers (planning, co-teaching, modeling, de-debriefing, professional development, and walk throughs) -Administrator-Instructional Coach meetings to review log and discuss action plan for coach for the upcoming two weeks	4.1. 3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)
Reading Goal #4: Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 71 points to 74 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **71 points**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **74 points**				

				that embeds rigorous tasks --Facilitate development, writing, selection of higher-order, text-dependent questions/activities, with an emphasis on Webb's Depth of Knowledge question hierarchy --Facilitate the identification, selection, development of rigorous core curriculum common assessments --Facilitate core curriculum assessment data analysis --Facilitate the planning for interventions and the intentional grouping of the students. -Using walk-through data, the academic coach and administration identify teachers for support in co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing and debriefing. -The academic coach trains each subject area PLC on how to facilitate their own PLC using structured protocols. -Throughout the school year, the academic coach/administration conducts one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the data gathered from walk-through tools. This data is used for future professional development, both individually and as a department. ***Leadership Team and Coach***			

				-The academic coach meets with the principal/APC to map out a high-level summary plan of action for the school year. -Every two weeks, the academic coach meets with the principal/APC to: --Review log and work accomplished and --Develop a detailed plan of action for the next two weeks.			
			4.2 -The Extended Learning Program (ELP) does not always target the specific skill weaknesses of the students or collect data on an ongoing basis. -Not always a direct correlation between what the students is missing in the regular classroom and the instruction received during ELP. -Minimal communication between regular and ELP teachers.	4.2 Strategy Students' reading comprehension improves through receiving **ELP supplemental instruction on targeted skills** that are not at the mastery level. **Action Steps** -Classroom teachers communicate with the ELP teachers regarding specific skills that students have not mastered. -ELP teachers identify lessons for students that target specific skills that are not at the mastery level. -Students attend ELP sessions. -Progress monitoring data collected by the ELP teacher on a weekly or biweekly basis and communicated back to the regular classroom teacher. -When the students have mastered the specific skill, they are exited from the ELP program.	4.2 Who Administrators How Monitored Administrators will review the communication logs and data collection used between teachers and ELP teachers outlining skills that need remediation.	4.2 Supplemental data shared with leadership and classroom teachers who have students.	4.2 Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM) *(From District RtI/Problem Solving Facilitators.)*

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>4.3</td><td>4.3.</td><td>4.3.</td><td>4.3.</td><td colspan="2">4.3.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">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:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Fidelity Check
Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</td><td>Strategy Data Check
How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</td><td colspan="2">Student Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target</td><td>2011-2012</td><td>2012-2013</td><td>2013-2014</td><td>2014-2015</td><td>2015-2016</td><td>2016-2017</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.
<u>Reading Goal #5:</u></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td colspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</td><td>5A.1.
White:
Black:
Hispanic:
Asian:
American Indian:</td><td>5A.1.
See Goals 1, 3, & 4</td><td>5A.1.</td><td>5A.1.</td><td colspan="2">5A.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="4"><u>Reading Goal #5A:</u>

The percentage of White students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 77% to 79%.

The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 46% to 51%.

The percentage of Asian students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 76% to 78%.

The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 62% to 66%.
.</td><td><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>
White:77%
Black:46%
Hispanic:62
Asian: 76%
American Indian: NA</td><td><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>
White:79%
Black: 51%
Hispanic: 66
Asian: 78%
American Indian: NA</td><td colspan="5"></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>5A.2.</td><td>5A.2</td><td>5A.2</td><td>5A.2</td><td colspan="2">5A.2</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>5A.3.</td><td>5A.3.</td><td>5A.3.</td><td>5A.3.</td><td colspan="2">5A.3.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">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:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Fidelity Check
Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</td><td>Strategy Data Check
How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the</td><td colspan="2">Student Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
</table>

					effectiveness of strategy?	
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.		5B.1.	5B.1 See Goals 1, 3, & 4	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.
Reading Goal #5B: The percentage of economically disadvantaged students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 54% to 59%. .	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **54%** / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **59%**	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.		5C.1.	5C.1. **N/A**	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
Reading Goal #5C: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **Y** / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5D.1. -Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs by both the general education and ESE teacher. To address this barrier, the APC will put a system in place for this school year.	5D.1. **Strategy** SWD student achievement improves through the effective and **consistent implementation of students' IEP** goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations. -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons.	5D.1. -Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs by both the general education and ESE teacher. To address this barrier, the APC will put a system in place for this school year.	5D.1. **Strategy** SWD student achievement improves through the effective and **consistent implementation of students' IEP** goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations. -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons.	5D.1. -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.
Reading Goal #5D: The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 44% to 50%	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **44%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **50%**					
			5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Differentiated Instruction	9-12	Course specific PLC Facilitators -Reading Coach	All teachers Faculty Professional Development	-On-going -Demonstration classrooms	Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations	Administration Team Instructional Coaches Subject Area Leaders

			and on-going PLCs			
The 3 S's of Complex Text: Selecting /Identifying Complex Text, Shifting to Increased Use of Informational Text, and Sharing of Complex Text with All Students (K-12)	9-12	Reading Coach and Subject Area Leaders	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team Instructional Coaches Subject Area Leaders
Identifying and Creating Text-Dependent Questions to Deepen Reading Comprehension (K-12)	9-12	Reading Coach and Subject Area Leaders	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team Instructional Coaches Subject Area Leaders
Designing and Delivering a Close Reading Lesson Using in-Depth Questioning (K-12)	9-12	Reading Coach and Subject Area Leaders	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team Instructional Coaches Subject Area Leaders
IEP Training	9-12	ESE Teachers	ESE Teachers General Ed Teachers PLCs	On-going	Case Manager	ESE Specialist
SWD Co-Teaching	9-12	DRT	ESE Teachers General Ed Teachers PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team DRT
PLC training, Plan-check-do-act training	9-12	Reading coach, District PLC trainer, Dept head	School-wide	Ongoing	Classroom walk-throughs	Administration Team

End of Reading Goals

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

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

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">Algebra EOC Goals</th><th colspan="5">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="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:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Fidelity Check
Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</td><td>Strategy Data Check
How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</td><td>Student Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Alg1. Students scoring proficient in Algebra (Levels 3-5).</td><td rowspan="2">1.1
- Lack of understanding of how to implement the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM with the core curriculum), as the emphasis has been placed on F-CIM for targeted mini lessons and NOT on the core curriculum.
-Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction.
-Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments.
-Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices.
- Need additional training to implement effective PLCs.
- Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing</td><td rowspan="2">Strategy
Students' comprehension of course content/standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Specially, teachers use C-CIM (Core Continuous Improvement Model) with core curriculum and provide Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the common assessments to ensure the mastery of essential skills.</td><td rowspan="2">Who
-Administration
-Peer/Mentor
-Teachers
-Dept head

How
-Formal Observation
-Log of lessons</td><td rowspan="2">-Teachers will collect and analyze end of instructional cycle assessment course data for the Algebra I and Honors and Geometry 1 and Honors
-submit to Department Head to analyze
- Department Heads will disseminate their assessment of school-wide end of instructional cycle assessment course data to administration and PSLT.</td><td rowspan="2">9-weeks

-End of Instructional Cycle/Unit Assessment
-Chapter Test
-9-weeks grades
-Semester grades</td></tr>
<tr><td>Algebra Goal #1:

The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013Algebra EOC will increase from 41% to 44%.</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*
41%</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*
44%</td></tr>
</table>

			students).				
			1.2. -Teachers tend to only differentiate after the lesson is taught instead of planning how to differentiate the lesson when new content is presented. -Teachers are at varying levels of using Differentiated Instruction strategies. -Teachers tend to give all students the same lesson, handouts, etc.	1.2. **Strategy/Task** Students' math achievement improves when teachers use on-going student data to **differentiate instruction**. **Actions/Details** ***Within PLCs Before Instruction and During Instruction of New Content*** -Using data from previous assessments and daily classroom performance/work, teachers plan Differentiated Instruction groupings and activities for the delivery of new content in upcoming lessons. ***In the classroom*** -During the lessons, **students** are involved in flexible grouping techniques ***PLCs After Instruction*** -Teachers reflect and discuss the outcome of their DI lessons. -Use student data to identify successful DI techniques for future implementation. -Using a problem-solving question protocol, identify students who need re-teaching/interventions and how that instruction will be provided. (*Questions are listed in the 2012-2013 Technical Assistance Document under the Differentiation Cross Content strategy).*	1.2. Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How	1.2. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	1.2. -Teachers tend to only differentiate after the lesson is taught instead of planning how to differentiate the lesson when new content is presented. -Teachers are at varying levels of using Differentiated Instruction strategies. -Teachers tend to give all students the same lesson, handouts, etc.

			-Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLCs.			
		1.3.	1.3 -The Extended Learning Program (ELP) does not always target the specific skill weaknesses of the students or collect data on an ongoing basis. -Not always a direct correlation between what the students is missing in the regular classroom and the instruction received during ELP. -Minimal communication between regular and ELP teachers.	1.3 Strategy Students' math achievement improves through receiving **ELP supplemental instruction on targeted skills** that are not at the mastery level. **Action Steps** -Classroom teachers communicate with the ELP teachers regarding specific skills that students have not mastered. -ELP teachers identify lessons for students that target specific skills that are not at the mastery level. - Students attend ELP sessions. - Progress monitoring data collected by the ELP teacher on a weekly or biweekly basis and communicated back to the regular classroom teacher. -When the students have mastered the specific skill, they are exited from the ELP program.	1.3 Who Administrators How Monitored Administrators will review the communication logs and data collection used between teachers and ELP teachers outlining skills that need remediation.	1.3 Supplemental data shared with leadership and classroom teachers who have students.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
Alg2. Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in Algebra.		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.

Algebra Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or 5 on the 2013Algebra EOC will increase from 2% to 5%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **2%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **5%**		**See Goals 1, 2**			
			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

High School AMO Mathematics Goals

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**						
HS Mathematics Goal A:							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</td><td>3B.1.
White:
Black:
Hispanic:
Asian:
American Indian:</td><td>3B.1.

N/A</td><td>3B.1.</td><td>3B.1.</td><td>3B.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">HS Mathematics Goal B:</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td>White: Y
Black: Y
Hispanic: Y
Asian: NA
American Indian: NA</td><td>White:
Black:
Hispanic:
Asian: NA
American Indian: NA</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2" rowspan="2"></td><td>3B.2.</td><td>3B.2.</td><td>3B.2.</td><td>3B.2.</td><td>3B.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td>3B.3.</td><td>3B.3.</td><td>3B.3.</td><td>3B.3.</td><td>3B.3.</td></tr>
</table>

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.
HS Mathematics Goal C:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Y						
			3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.
			3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.
HS Mathematics Goal D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Y						

		3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Differentiated Instruction	9-12	-Math Dept head/Coach	Math Departmental and course-specific PLCs	PLC Meetings every two weeks	Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-through to monitor DI implementation	Administration Team
Analyzing first semester exams	9-12	-Math dept head	Math Departmental and course-specific PLCs	After the administration of the test	PLC logs	APC

End of Mathematics Goals

Writing/Language Arts Goals

Writing/Language Arts Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing.			-Not all teachers know how to plan and execute writing lessons with a focus on mode-based writing. -Not all teachers know how to review student writing to determine trends and needs in order to drive instruction. -All teachers need training to score student writing accurately during the 2012-2013 school year using information provided by the state.	**Strategy** Students' use of mode-specific writing will improve through use of Writers' Workshop/daily instruction with a focus on mode-specific writing. **Action Steps** -Based on baseline data, PLCs write SMART goals for each Grading Period. (For example, during the first Grading Period, 50% of the students will score 4.0 or above on the end-of-the Grading Period writing prompt.) ***Plan:*** -Professional Development for updated rubric courses -Professional Development for instructional delivery of mode-specific writing -Training to facilitate data-driven PLCs -Using data to identify trends and drive instruction -Lesson planning based on the needs of students ***Do:*** -Daily/ongoing models and application of appropriate mode-specific writing based on teaching points	Who Principal APC SAL District (Writing Team, Supervisors, Writing Resources, Academic Coaches, and DRTs) How Monitored -PLC logs -Classroom walk-throughs Observation Form -Conferencing while writing walk-through tool (for coaches)	See "Check" & "Act" action steps in the strategies column	-Not all teachers know how to plan and execute writing lessons with a focus on mode-based writing. -Not all teachers know how to review student writing to determine trends and needs in order to drive instruction. -All teachers need training to score student writing accurately during the 2012-2013 school year using information provided by the state.
Writing/LA Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring **Level 3.0** or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes will increase from 91% to 94%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **91%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **94%**					

				-Daily/ongoing conferencing ***Check:*** Review of daily drafts and scoring monthly demand writes -PLC discussions and analysis of student writing to determine trends and needs ***Act:*** -Receive additional professional development in areas of need -Seek additional professional knowledge through book studies/research -Spread the use of effective practices across the school based on evidence shown in the best practice of others -Use what is learned to begin the cycle again, revise as needed, increase scale if possible, etc. -Plan ongoing monitoring of the solution(s)			
		1.2. -Improve the teaching of reading skills of Language Arts teachers. -Become more proficient at pacing and teaching Springboard lessons.	1.2 **Strategy** **Students' reading, writing, language, and listening /speaking skills improves through engagement in college and career preparatory lessons/activities/tasks that promote high levels of thinking.** **Action Steps** ***Within PLCs*** Before the unit -Create norms. -Unpack an assessment and	1.2. Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive	1.2. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the	1.2. -Improve the teaching of reading skills of Language Arts teachers. -Become more proficient at pacing and teaching Springboard lessons.

			rubric. -Set SMART goals for the unit of instruction. -Decide on a way to pre-assess the skills and knowledge of students. (What pre-assessment will we all use?) -Choose the anchor activities teachers will use to assess students' understanding along the way to the assessment. -Reflect on barriers and successes from the year before. -Look at student assessment exemplars (previous students' assessments if available). -Visit the pacing guide and determine the pacing for the unit. -Decide on common terminology to use with students and during PLC discussions. -Look at the grammar instruction opportunities provided in the unit and determine their potential usage. -Decide on which vocabulary terms need to be taught during the unit. -Discuss the student's curriculum checklist. -Determine how the PLC would like to grade the assessments in order for there to be consistency among grade levels. <u>During the unit</u> -Determine: --What is working? --Is there a need to enrich the	feedback on their logs. -Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis. -Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency. -Administrator and coach aggregates the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation monthly. -Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis.	SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	

			instruction? How? --What isn't working? --Is there a need to supplemen the instruction? How? --Are the needs of our ELL/SWD being met? --How can civics be added int instruction? --Is there a need for a demonstration classroom and/or teacher swap? -Conduct a pacing check. -Bring anchor activities (artifacts) to assess student understanding. -Discuss effective student placement (If plausible discus how classroom environment might help a student that is struggling in a class. Could a change of class period or teacher help?) -Plan strategies to differentiat -Plan higher order thinking questions. -Discuss portfolio implementation (Success/Barriers). -Discuss baseline date/data from anchor activities/data from EAs. -Determine whether teachers want to add additional criteria to the EA rubric. -Discuss additions to the writer's checklists. <u>During the assessment</u> -Agree upon a date when all assessments need to be completed. -Discuss successes and challenges. <u>After the assessment</u> Participate in an assessment			

			Norming session (Data to be discussed after EAs are all scored). <u>After all assessments have been scored</u> -Reflect on the unit. -Reflect on the effectiveness of the PLC (survey). -Revisit portfolios. -Identify the skills students struggled with and determine which activities in further lessons will readdress the skills needing to be re-taught or strengthened. -Recognize successes and celebrate. ***In the classroom*** <u>During the lessons, **teachers**</u>: -Post essential questions and daily objectives. -Explicitly reference connections between the following: essential questions, daily objective, and assessment. -Select learning strategies as needed. -Group students appropriately. -Scaffold instruction building towards higher complexity. -Model and provide opportunities for guided and independent practice of skills aligned with the assessment. -Select academic vocabulary from text to be used during a unit of instruction. -Use multiple types of formative assessment and provide consistent checks for student understanding. -Use data during the lesson			

			and after the assessment to inform instruction. <u>During the lessons, students:</u> -Understand the criteria which will be used to evaluate their work. -Understand the purpose of the lesson and its connection to the assessment. -Think critically and creatively. -Actively draw upon prior knowledge and use that knowledge to connect with lesson goals. -Know when, why, and how to use strategies when appropriate free of teacher support. -Collaborate within structured grouping. -Self assess understanding of content. -Use academic vocabulary in written and oral responses. <u>After the lessons, **teachers**:</u> -Post exemplars of student work. -Self reflect on lessons.			
		1.3. -PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum and data analysis discussion to deepen their leaning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act "Instructional Unit" log.	1.3. **<u>Strategy</u>** Student achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions:	1.3. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses <u>How</u> PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a	1.3 School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team.	1.3. -PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum and data analysis discussion to deepen their leaning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act "Instructional Unit" log.

			1. What is it we expect them to learn? 2. How will we know if they have learned it? 3. How will we respond if they don't learn? 4. How will we respond if they already know it? **Actions/Details** -Grade level/like-course PLCs use a **Plan-Do-Check-Act "Unit of Instruction" log** to guide their discussion and way of work. Discussions are summarized on log. -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.	unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.		

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
Writing Holistic Scoring Training	9-12	LA Dept head PLC facilitators Academic Coach	Language Arts Teachers PLC-grade level and vertical teams	On-going	PLC logs turned into administration	Principal APC SAL PLC Facilitators
Mode-based Writing Training	9-12	LA Dept head PLC facilitators Academic Coach	Language Arts Teachers PLC-grade level and vertical teams	On-going	-Administration or Coach walk-throughs -PLC logs turned into administration	Principal APC SAL PLC Facilitators
Springboard Pacing	9-12	LA Dept head PLC facilitators Academic Coach	Language Arts Teachers PLC-grade level and vertical teams	On-going	-Administration or Coach walk-throughs -PLC logs turned into administration	Principal APC SAL PLC Facilitators

Higher Order Thinking	9-12	LA Dept head -Course specific PLC facilitators	School-wide	-PLCs: On-going -Demonstration Classrooms	Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations	Administration Team
PLC	9-12	Reading coach, District PLC trainer, Dept head	School-wide	Ongoing	Classroom walk-throughs	Administration Team

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">Attendance Goal(s)</th><th colspan="5">Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Fidelity Check
Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</td><td>Strategy Data Check
How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</td><td>Student Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">1. Attendance</td><td rowspan="5">Parents are not aware that their student is absent.</td><td rowspan="5"><u>Tier 1</u>
All teachers will post their attendance to EASI on a regular basis, allowing parents to be notified of their child’s attendance.</td><td rowspan="5">Assistant Principal/Team leaders/ Department Heads will monitor use</td><td rowspan="5">APSA will use
EASI reports to evaluate teachers adherence to policy</td><td rowspan="5">EASI Reports</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="8">Attendance Goal #1:

1. The attendance rate will increase from 95.16% in 2011-2012 to 98% in 2012-2013.

2. The number of students who have 10 or more <u>unexcused</u> absences throughout the school year will decrease by 10%

3.T he number of students who have 10 or more <u>unexcused</u> tardies to school throughout the school year will</td><td><u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u></td><td><u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u></td></tr>
<tr><td>95.16%</td><td>98%</td></tr>
<tr><td><u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Unexcused Absences (10 or more)</u></td><td><u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Unexcused Absences (10 or more)</u></td></tr>
<tr><td>116</td><td>104</td></tr>
<tr><td><u>2012 Current Number of Students with Unexcused Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u></td><td><u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Unexcused Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u></td></tr>
<tr><td>40</td><td>36</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2" rowspan="3"></td><td>1.2
Students do not respond to school attendance interventions</td><td>1.2
<u>Tier 2/3</u>
Schools will report to the Department of Safety and Motor Vehicles the names, dates, birth, sex and social security of minors who accumulate 15 unexcused absences in a period of ninety calendar days.</td><td>1.2
Administration will monitor the list of students with 15 absences and verify that they have been reported to DMV</td><td>1.2
Compare data from DOE to prior year data.</td><td>1.2
Dropout Data from DOE</td></tr>
<tr><td>1.3
Most students with significant unexcused</td><td>1.3
<u>Tier 3</u>
An attendance referral is</td><td>1.3
Social Worker
Other PSLT members</td><td>1.3
Social Worker/PSLT review data monthly on Tier 3 students</td><td>1.3
Instructional Planning Tool
Attendance/Tardy data</td></tr>
</table>

		absences (10 or more) have serious personal or family issues that are impacting attendance.	generated. The social worker and Dropout prevention specialist along with others (e.g., guidance counselor, school psychologist, SRO) communicates with the family to create an Attendance Improvement Plan.	as needed School Security - SRO	(provided by social worker)	

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
Attendance Monitoring Training	9-12	Administration	School Wide	When Available	Administration review EASI	AP, Principal
EASI training "Train the Trainer"	K-12	District trainer	School trainer	Preplanning	Train the Faculty to use EASI	AP

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)			**Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension**				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
1. Suspension			1.1 Data indicates that there is a wide variation of ODRs generated across classrooms.	1.1 PSLT will review data and make recommendations for additional training in classroom management for teachers and/or PLCs.	1.1 PSLT	1.1' PSLT will review data on Office Discipline Referrals (ODRs) ATOSS and out of School suspensions monthly in targeted areas.	1.1 EASI ODR and suspension data
Suspension Goal #1: Suspension Goal #1: 1. The total number of In-School Suspensions will	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions **747** 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions **672** 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					

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%.	**357** 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions **164** 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School **114**	**321** 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions **148** 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School **103**					
			1.2. 1.3.	1.2. 1.3.	1.2. 1.3.	1.2. 1.3.	1.2. 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 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
ODR, ATOSS	9-12	District trainer, SAO AP	PSLT	Ongoing	Track number of ODRs, ATOSS, OSS to determine if training is effective	Administration

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">Dropout Prevention Goal(s)</th><th colspan="4">Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Fidelity Check
Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</td><td>Strategy Data Check
How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</td><td>Student Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">1. Dropout Prevention
<u>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</u>
*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</td><td rowspan="3">Data to be determined by state—haven't received yet, 11/2012</td><td rowspan="3">TBD</td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="5">The dropout rate will maintain or decrease from ___% in 2011-2012 to ___% or less in 2012-2013

-The graduation rate will maintain or increase from ___% in 2011-2012 to ___% or higher in 2012-2013</td><td><u>2012 Current Dropout Rate:*</u></td><td><u>2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*</u></td></tr>
<tr><td>2%</td><td>2%</td></tr>
<tr><td><u>2012 Current Graduation Rate:*</u></td><td><u>2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*</u></td></tr>
<tr><td>98%</td><td>98%</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic	Grade	PD Facilitator	PD Participants	Target Dates and Schedules	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for

and/or PLC Focus	Level/Subject	and/or PLC Leader	(e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	(e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)		Monitoring
TBD						

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Health and Fitness Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)			**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
1. Health and Fitness Goal			1.1.	1.1. Health and physical activity initiatives developed and implemented by the school's Physical education team.	1.1. Physical education team.	1.1. Physical education team notes/agendas	1.1. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.
Health and Fitness Goal #1: During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students scoring in the "Healthy Fitness Zone" (HFZ) on the Pacer for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular health will increase from 56% on the Pretest to 66% on the Posttest.	2012 Current Level :* **56% pretest**	2013 Expected Level :* **66% post-test**					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Health and Fitness Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Health & Physical activities training	9-12	Dept head, PLC leader, District trainer	Physical education dept	Ongoing	Notes/Logs, increase in Students in the HFZ zone of the Pacer test.	Dept head, PLC facilitator

Continuous Improvement Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)			**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
1. Continuous Improvement Goal			1.1 -There is still confusion on how to conduct PLCs that are focused on deepening the knowledge base of teachers and improving student performance by the implementation of the Plan-Do-Check-Act model. -Still confusion on how the Plan-Do-Check-Act model works. -Still some resistance to staff members attending PLCs and/or arriving on time to meetings.	1.1 The leadership team will become trained on the use of the PLC "Unit of Instruction" log that follows the Plan-Do-Check-Act model. Subject Area Leader and/or PLC facilitators will guide their PLCs through the Plan-Do-Check-Act model for units of instruction. The work will be recorded on PLC logs that are reviewed by the Leadership Team.	1.1 Who Principal Leadership Team Subject Area Leaders PLC facilitators	1.1 "Quick" PLC informal surveys will be administered during the school year every two months. The Leadership Team will aggregate the data and share outcomes of the school-wide results with their PLCs. The data will provide direction for future PLC training.	1.1 PLC Survey materials
Continuous Improvement Goal #1:	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
The percentage of teachers who strongly agree with the indicator that " The teachers that I work with use research-based instructional strategies, innovations, and activities to meet the needs of all students. (under Teaching and Learning)" will increase from 35% in	**35%**	**55%**					

2012 to 55% in 2013.			-Teachers asking for more PLC collaboration time. Possibility of waiver will be explored.				
			1.3. -PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum and data analysis discussion to deepen their leaning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act "Instructional Unit" log.	1.3. **Strategy** Student achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: 5. What is it we expect them to learn? 6. How will we know if they have learned it? 7. How will we respond if they don't learn? 8. How will we respond if they already know it? **Actions/Details** -Grade level/like-course PLCs use a **Plan-Do-Check-Act "Unit of Instruction" log** to guide their discussion and way of work. Discussions are summarized on log. -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.	1.3. Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.	1.3 School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team.	1.3. -PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum and data analysis discussion to deepen their leaning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act "Instructional Unit" log.
			1.3.				

Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PLCs	9-12 All teachers	Dept head/ PLC leaders, Reading Coach, Administration	School-wide	Ongoing	Walk-throughs, PLC logs	Leadership Team
Plan-Do-Check-Act Model	9-12 All teachers	Leadership Team Subject Area Leaders PLC Facilitators	School-wide	PLCs meet every three weeks for Plan-Do-Check-Act PLCs.	Administrator and leadership team walk-throughs Administrator and leadership attendance at PLC meetings PLC Survey data	Leadership Team

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** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking.		1.1.	1.1. These students are integrated in the mainstream…SEE Reading Goals, 1-4	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
CELLA Goal #C: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from 59% to 62%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: **59%**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
D. Students scoring proficient in Reading.		2.1.	2.1. These students are integrated in the mainstream…SEE Reading Goals, 1-4	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
CELLA Goal #D: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase from 18% to 21%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading : **18%**					

		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
E. Students scoring proficient in Writing.		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
CELLA Goal #E: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA will increase from 55% to 58%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : **55%**		These students are integrated in the mainstream…See Writing Goals, 1-3			
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

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

Geometry EOC Goals			**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
H. Students scoring in the middle or upper third (proficient) in Geometry.			1.1 - Lack of understanding of how to implement the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM with the core curriculum), as the emphasis has been placed on F-CIM for targeted mini lessons and NOT on the core	Strategy Students' comprehension of course content/standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Specially, teachers use **C-CIM (Core Continuous Improvement Model)** with core curriculum and provide **Differentiated Instruction (DI)** as a result of the	Who -Administration -Peer/Mentor -Teachers -Dept head How -Formal Observation -Log of lessons	-Teachers will collect and analyze end of instructional cycle assessment course data for the Algebra I and Honors and Geometry 1 and Honors -submit to Department Head to analyze - Department Heads will disseminate their assessment of school-wide end of instructional cycle assessment	9-weeks -End of Instructional Cycle/Unit Assessment -Chapter Test -9-weeks grades -Semester grades
Geometry Goal H: The percentage of students scoring in the middle or upper third on the 2013 End-of-Course Geometry Exam will	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **83%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **85%**					

increase from 83% to 85%.			curriculum. -Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. -Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments. -Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices. - Need additional training to implement effective PLCs. - Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students).	common assessments to ensure the mastery of essential skills.		course data to administration and PSLT.	
			1.2. -Teachers tend to only differentiate after the lesson is taught instead of planning how to differentiate the lesson when new content is presented. -Teachers are at varying levels of using Differentiated Instruction strategies. -Teachers tend to give all students the same lesson, handouts, etc.	1.2. **Strategy/Task** Students' math achievement improves when teachers use on-going student data to **differentiate instruction**. **Actions/Details** ***Within PLCs Before Instruction and During Instruction of New Content*** -Using data from previous assessments and daily classroom performance/work, teachers plan Differentiated Instruction groupings and activities for the delivery of new content in upcoming lessons.	1.2. Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How	1.2. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all	1.2. -Teachers tend to only differentiate after the lesson is taught instead of planning how to differentiate the lesson when new content is presented. -Teachers are at varying levels of using Differentiated Instruction strategies. -Teachers tend to give all students the same lesson, handouts, etc.

			In the classroom -During the lessons, **students** are involved in flexible grouping techniques ***PLCs <u>After</u> Instruction*** -Teachers reflect and discuss the outcome of their DI lessons. -Use student data to identify successful DI techniques for future implementation. -Using a problem-solving question protocol, identify students who need re-teaching/interventions and how that instruction will be provided. (*Questions are listed in the 2012-2013 Technical Assistance Document under the Differentiation Cross Content strategy).* -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLCs.		classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
I. Students scoring in the upper third on Geometry.		2.1.	2.1. **See Goals 1, 2**	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
<u>Geometry Goal I:</u> The percentage of students scoring in the upper third on the 2013 End-of-Course Geometry Exam will increase from 54% to 57%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> **54%**	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> **57%**				
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.

		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

End of Geometry EOC Goals

NEW Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Biology EOC Goals			**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
K. Students scoring in the middle or upper third (proficient) in Biology.			1.1 -Teachers are at varying skill levels in the use of inquiry and the 5E lesson plan model. -Lack of common planning time to facilitate and hold PLCs for like courses.	1.1 **Strategy** Students' science skills will improve through participation in the **5E instructional model.** **Action Steps** -Teachers will attend District Science training and share 5 E Instructional Model information with their PLCs. -PLCs write SMART goals based for units of instruction. -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time collaboratively building 5E Instructional Model for upcoming lessons. -PLC teachers instruct students using the 5E Instructional Model.	1.1 Who Principal APC Science Coach (where available) Science Dept head How Monitored -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.	1.1 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject	1.1 2x per year District-level baseline and mid-year tests Semester Exams During the Grading Period -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, intervention checks, etc.)
Biology Goal K: The percentage of students scoring in the middle and upper third on the 2013 End-of-Course Biology Exam will increase from 87% to 90%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **87%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **90%**					

				-At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. -Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. -Based on the data, teachers discuss effectiveness of the 5E Lesson Plans to drive future instruction.		Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	
			1.2. -PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum conversations and data analysis to deepen their leaning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act "Instructional Unit" log.	1.2. Strategy Student achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning using the 5E Instructional Model. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act model** to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for unit of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: 1. What is it we expect them to learn? 2. How will we know if they have learned it? 3. How will we respond if they don't learn? 4. How will we respond if they already know it?	1.2 Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How -PLC logs turned into administration/coaches provides feedback -Administrators attended targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff	1.2. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team.	1.2. -PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum conversations and data analysis to deepen their leaning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act "Instructional Unit" log.

			Actions/Details *Within PLCs:* -PLCs will use a PLC log to monitor the following: --Guide their Plan-Do-Check-Act conversations and way of work. --Monitor the frequency of meetings. All grade level/subject area PLCs collaborate _____ times per month for curriculum planning, reflection, and data analysis.) -Working with the core curriculum, within grade level PLCs teachers will: --Unpack the benchmark and identify what students need to understand, know, and do. --Plan for checks for understanding during the unit. --Plan for the End-of-Unit Assessment --Plan upcoming lessons/units using the 5E Instructional Model. --Reflect on the outcome of lessons taught --Analyze checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments. --Act on the core curriculum data by planning interventions for the whole class or small group. -PLCs will generate SMART goals for	on a monthly basis.		

			upcoming units of instruction. -PLCs will report SMART goal data through their logs. As a Science Department -PLC, share action plan successes and challenges of the grade levels courses. -PLCs will adjust action plans based on teacher/coach walk-through data, PLC collaboration, and student data.			
		1.3 -Teachers are at varying skill levels in using appropriate instructional, scientific and laboratory technology (animations, probeware, digital microscopy) -Administrators are at varying skill levels in using appropriate instructional, scientific and laboratory technology (animations, probeware, digital microscopy)	1.3 **Strategy** Student understanding of the nature of science and scientific inquiry improves when students are intellectually active in learning important and challenging science content through the use of appropriate instructional methods, **scientific processes**, **laboratory experiences, and uses of technology** (animations, probeware, digital microscopy). **Action Steps** -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling technology and hands-on	1.3 Who Principal APC Science Resource Teachers (where available) Science Department Chairperson How Monitored -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.	1.3 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level	1.3 2x per year District-level baseline and mid-year tests Semester Exams During the Grading Period -Unit assessments

			strategies. -Within PLCs, teachers plan for engaging exploration of science content using hands-on learning experiences, inquiry, labs, technology (such as probeware, simulations and animations) within the 5E Instructional Model. -Teachers implement the 5E Instructional Model to promote learning experiences that cause students to think, make connections, formulate and test hypotheses and draw conclusions. -Teachers facilitate student-centered learning through the use of the 5E Instructional Model. -Common Core Literacy Standards for both Reading and Writing are appropriately embedded throughout the 5E Instruction Model. -Each teacher maintains a record of the number of occurrences of engagement tasks (hands-on-learning experiences, labs, and technology) per week. This data is then reported on the Science PLC log. -Monthly, school leaders conduct one-on-one data chats with individual		-PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	

			teachers using the data gathered from walk-through tools and engagement task records. These teacher data/chats guide the leadership's team professional development plan (both individually and whole faculty).			
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
L. Students scoring in upper third in Biology.			2.1 -Not all teachers have received the CCLS for Science overview. -Not all teachers understand how to integrate close reading with the 5E instructional model. -Not all PLCs routinely look at curriculum materials beyond those posted on the curriculum guide	2.1 **Strategy** Students' comprehension of science text improves when students are engaged in close reading techniques using on-grade-level content-based text (textbooks and other supplemental texts). Science teachers engage students in the **close reading model** (appropriately placed within the 5E instructional model) using their textbooks or other appropriate high-Lexile, complex supplemental texts at least _____ times per nine weeks. **Action Steps** ***Professional Development*** -The Reading Coach along with the Departmental	2.1 Who Principal AP Science Coach Reading Coach Reading Leadership Team CCLS Science Team Science SAL/DH How Monitored Administration, Coach, SAL walk-throughs -PLC logs turned into administration. -Administration provides feedback.	Science PLC Resource meetings Reading Leadership Team PLCs will track achievement on the benchmark attached to the Close Reading passage comparing baseline achievement level to 80% mastery using the proximal evaluation tool.	3x-per year District level baseline, mid-year, and pre-EOC administration Semester Exams During the Grading Period -mini-assessments -unit assessments
Biology Goal L: The percentage of students scoring in the upper third on the 2013 End-of-Course Biology Exam will increase from 59% to 62%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **59%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **62%**					

				Leaders/Coach/SAL conduct small group departmental trainings to develop teachers' ability to use the close reading model. -The Reading Coach attends science departmental PLCs to co-plan with teachers, developing lessons using the close reading model. -Teachers within departments attend professional development provided by the district/school on text complexity and close reading models that are most applicable to science classrooms and support the 5E instructional model. ***In PLCs/Department*** -Teachers work in their PLCs to locate, discuss, and disseminate appropriate texts to supplement their textbooks. -PLCs review Close Reading Selections to determine word count and high-Lexile. -PLCs assign appropriate NGSSS benchmark to Close Reading passage -To increase stamina, teachers select high-Lexile, complex and			

				rigorous texts that are shorter and progress throughout the year to longer texts that are high-Lexile, complex and rigorous - Teachers debrief lesson implementation to determine effectiveness and level of student comprehension and retention of the text. Teachers use this information to build future close reading lessons. ***During the lessons, teachers:*** -Guide students through text without reading or explaining the meaning of the text using the following: --Introducing critical vocabulary to ensure comprehension of text. --Stating an essential question prior to reading --Using questions to check for understanding. --Using question to engage students in discussion. --Requiring oral and written responses to text. -Ask text-based questions that require close reading of the text and multiple reads of the text. ***During the lessons,***			

				students: -Grapple with complex text. -Re-read for a second purpose and to increase comprehension. -Engage in discussion to answer essential question using textual evidence. -Write in response to essential question using textual evidence.			
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

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

STEM Goal(s)	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
STEM Goal #1: Implement/expand project/problem based learning in STEM classes.	1.1. Common planning time for STEM teachers	1.1. Explicit direction for STEM PLC's to be established Documentation of planning units, lessons and outcomes inc. technologies	1.1. PLC, Dept heads, administration	1.1.	1.1 PLC logs, logging number of project/problem based learning activities in STEM classes
	1.2. Teachers lack training in the use of these technologies	1.2. Expand use of appropriate technologies such as GIZMOS and smart clickers.	1.2. STEM dept heads or PLC leaders	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3

		Increase the number of and participation in STEM competitions and events including STEM fair, Math and Science Bowls, Science Fair, Brain Bowl,. Mu Alpha Theta, etc.	PLC monitored		Log of student participation .

STEM Professional Development

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Gizmos training	9-12	District PD Facilitator	Subject or grade level	As scheduled by district and PLC leaders along with STEM dept heads	Walkthroughs and PLC logs, in-service records	STEM dept heads or PLC leaders
Smart clicker training	9-12	District PD facilitator	PLC	As scheduled by district and PLC leaders along with STEM dept heads	Walkthroughs and PLC logs, in-service records	STEM dept heads or PLC leaders
PLC STEM focus	9-12	Math, Science, CTE dept heads	STEM teachers	Ongoing	Walkthroughs and PLC Logs	STEM dept heads, PLC leaders and Admin
Attend Competition workshops	9-12	STEM Fair teachers	STEM fair teachers	Ongoing	Work with STEM Dept heads, teachers sponsor to ensure students projects are progressing and necessary documentation is provided	STEM teachers

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
CTE Goal #1: Increase the number of students earning an industry certification from the funded list: Adobe Photoshop 60% in 2011-2012 to 67% in 2012-2013. Adobe Flash 93% in 2011-2012 to 96% in 2012-2013. Adobe Dreamweaver 106% in 2011-2012 to 100% in 2012-2013. Microsoft Word 55% in 2011-2012 to 57% in 2012-2013. Microsoft PowerPoint 58% in 2011-2012 to 60% in 2012-2013. Microsoft Excel 2% in 2011-2012 to 5% in 2012-2013. Microsoft Outlook 20% in 2011-2012 to 22% in 2012-2013.	1.1.	1.1. Increase student participation in CTSO competitions/events	1.1. CTE PLC CTE department head	1.1. Logs, signups for testing	1.1. Log of certifications
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Industry certifications	9-12?	CTE Dept head, District trainer, PLC leader	CTE teachers	Ongoing	Log of certifications	CTE dept head, PLC leader

End of CTE Goal(s)

Differentiated Accountability

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
☐ Priority	☐ Focus	☐ Prevent

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

x☐ Yes ☐ No

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

Describe the use of SAC funds.			
Name and Number of Strategy from the School Improvement Plan	Description of Resources that improves student achievement or student engagement	Projected Amount	Final Amount
Parental Involvement Plan	Edline	$1500	$1500
SIP Coordinator (Kay Quinones)		$689.43	$689.43
Cross Content Goal	Mini-grant – computer upgrade – Mr Sharpe	$390.00	$390.00
Continuous Improvement	Mini-grants	$3438.40	
SIP Coordinator (15 hours)		$413.57	
Final Amount Spent			