FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

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

School Name: Lowry Elementary	District Name: Hillsborough
Principal: Michelle Spagnuolo	Superintendent: MaryEllen Elia
SAC Chair: Katarina Arterburn	Date of School Board Approval: Pending school board approval

Student Achievement Data:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

School Grades Trend Data (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)

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	Michelle Spagnuolo	M Ed Leadership BS Elem. Ed, Early Childhood	7	7	11/12: A 09/10: A 95% AYP 08/09: A 97% AYP 07/08: A 95% AYP
Assistant Principal	Jessica Kepa	M Ed Leadership BS Elem. Ed	10	1	11/12: A

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-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	Jeanne Gorecki	Elementary 1-6, ESOL, Reading K-12, Speech 6-12, Gifted	6	14	10/11: A 09/10:A 95% AYP 08/09:A 97% AYP 07/08:A 95% AYP

Highly Qualified Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1. Teacher Interview Day	District staff	June	
2. District Mentor Program	District Mentors	ongoing	
3. District Peer Program	District Peers	ongoing	
4.			

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
14 out of field	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 adult learning, striving to understand how they as an individual teacher and PLC member can improve learning for all.

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Qualified Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
80	4% 3	36% 29	31% 25	29% 23	36% 29	82% 80	3% 2	4% 3	61% 49

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

<u>Teacher Mentoring Program</u>

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
Christina Aponte	Krinstina Jantzen – First Year Teacher	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.
Christina Aponte	Jacqueline Friedman – First Year Teacher	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.
Christina Aponte	Emily Ludwig – Second Year Teacher	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.
Christina Aponte	Briana Rio – Second Year Teacher	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.
Christina Aponte	Christina Forness – Second Year Teacher	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.
Mary Beth Wilt	Sarah Newman – Second Year Teacher	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.
Christina Aponte	Shannon McGregor – Second Year Teacher	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

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

Please describe how federal, state, and local services and programs will be coordinated and integrated in the school. Include other Title programs, Migrant and Homeless, Supplemental Academic Instruction funds, as well as violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, career and technical education, and/or job training, as applicable.

Title I, Part A
Title I, Part C- Migrant
Title I, Part D
Title II
Title III
Title X- Homeless
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Violence Prevention Programs
Nutrition Programs
Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team. PSLT members: • Michelle Spagnuolo Principal, • Jessica Kepa APEI • Marsha Alcorn School Psychologist • Doris Field Guidance Counselor • Jeanne Gorecki Reading Coach • Melissa Thomas ESE Specialist • Michelle Toscani ESE • Katarina Arterburn SAC Chair/AGP • MaryJane Chamberlin Social Worker • Marie Wetzel ELL Resource • Suzanne Livoti Speech/Lang.
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 Leadership team meets monthly. Specific responsibilities include: • The purpose of the PSLT team in our school is to provide high quality instruction and interventions matched to student needs. • The PSLT team functions to address the progress and needs of low performing students. • The team uses a problem-solving model and all decisions are data based driven. • The PSLT team members meet bi-weekly with grade level chairs, as well as other relevant grade level representatives, to discuss the progress of students involved in the process and to offer suggestions for intervention. • Assist and monitor teacher use of SMART goals per unit of instruction. (data will be collected and analyzed by PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT) •

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 School Advisory Chairperson is a member of the RtI team.
• The administration, leadership team, teachers and SAC are involved in the School Improvement Plan development and monitoring throughout the school year.
• One of the main tasks of the RtI team is to monitor student data. Through this process, they will also monitor the effectiveness of the Action Steps in the SIP. The team will suggest modification if needed.
• The Leadership Team/PSLT and PLCs both use the problem solving process (Problem Identification, Problem Analysis, Intervention Design and Implementation and Evaluation to:
   o 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)

- o Identify the problem (based on an analysis of the data disaggregated via data sorts) in multiple areas – curriculum content, behavior, and attendance
- o Develop and test hypotheses about why student/school problems are occurring (changeable barriers).
- o Develop and target interventions based on confirmed hypotheses.
- o Identify appropriate progress monitoring assessments to be administered at regular intervals matched to the intensity of the level of instructional/intervention support provided.
- o Develop grading period or units of instruction//intervention goals that are ambitious, time-bound, and measurable (e.g., SMART goals).
- o 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).
- o Each PLC develops PLC action plan for SIP strategy implementation and monitoring.
- o Assess the implementation of the strategies on the SIP using the following questions:
    1. Does the data show implementation of strategies are resulting in positive student growth?
    2. To what extent are we making progress toward the school's SIP goals?
    3. If we are making progress, what can we do to sustain what is working?
    4. What barriers to implementation are we facing and how will we address them?
    5. What should we do next? What should be our plan of action?

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/AP
Baseline and Midyear District Assessments	Scantron Achievement Series Data Charts	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers
District generated assessments from the Office of Assessment and Accountability: Reading, Writing, Math and Science	Scantron Achievement Series Data Charts	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers
Subject-specific assessments generated by District-level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Language Arts, Math, Writing and Science • Beginning, Mid, and Year End assessments in Math and Science	Scantron Achievement Series Data Charts PLC Logs	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers

• Monthly writing prompts • DRA/ Running Records		
FAIR	Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network Data Charts	Reading Coach/AP
CELLA	Sagebrush (IPT)	ELL PSLT Representative
Teachers' common core curriculum assessments on units of instruction/big ideas.	PLC Database PLC logs	Individual Teachers/ Team Leaders/ PLC Facilitators/Leadership Team Member
DRA-2	School Generated Excel Database	Individual Teacher
Reports on Demand/Crystal Reports	District Generated Database	Leadership Team/Specialty PSLT
School Wide 30 minute RtI Block	PLC logs Data Charts	PLCs, Individual Teachers

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) • Chapter Assessments (Go Math) • Benchmark Assessments (Treasures) • Easy CBM	School Generated Database in Excel	Leadership Team/ ELP Facilitator
Differentiated mini assessments based on core curriculum assessments.	Individual teacher data base PLC/Department data base	Individual Teachers/PLCs
FAIR OPM	School Generated Database in Excel	Leadership Team/Reading Coach
Research-based Computer-assisted Instructional Programs	Assessments included in computer-based programs	PLCs, Individual Teachers
School Wide 30 minute RtI Block, Intervention groups	PLC logs Data Charts	PLCs, Individual Teachers

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Members of the faculty received overview training over the course of several faculty meetings ,during the 2011-2012 school year and at the beginning of the 2012-2013 school year. PSLT members who received the district level RtI trainings served as consultants to the PLCs to guide the process of data review and interpretation. The PSLT will continue to work to build consensus with all stakeholders regarding a need for and focus on school improvement efforts. The PSLT will work to align the efforts of other school teams that may be addressing similar identified issues.

As new resources and staff development trainings on RtI are developed, these tools and staff development sessions will be conducted with the faculty as they become available. These sessions will be held during Tuesday faculty meetings throughout the school year.

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

Describe plan to support 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 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.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).
- Michelle Spagnuolo Principal,
- Jessica Kepa APEI
- Marsha Alcorn School Psychologist
- Doris Field Guidance Counselor
- Jeanne Gorecki Reading Coach
- Melissa Thomas ESE Specialist
- Michelle Toscani ESE
- Katarina Arterburn SAC Chair/AGP
- Marie Wetzel ELL Resource
- Teresa Seits, Reading Contact/ 5th Grade Reading Teacher

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

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

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5). <u>Reading Goal #1:</u> The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 74% to 76%	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> **74%**	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> **76%**	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 -Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades How -PLCS share their logs with administration 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 common assessment 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 PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -PLC facilitator shares SMART Goal data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	1.1. <u>3x per year</u> - FAIR <u>During the Grading Period</u> - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)
			1.2. Teachers' knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training	1.2. **Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas** Common Core	1.2. Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches	1.2. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future	1.2. 3x per year - FAIR

		for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13. -Training all content area teachers	Questions of all types and levels are necessary to scaffold students' understanding of complex text. Teachers need to understand and use higher-order, text-dependent questions at the word/phrase, sentence, and paragraph/passage levels (Webb's, Bloom, Costas). Student reading comprehension improves when students are required to provide evidence to support their answers to text-dependent questions. Scaffolding of students' grappling with complex text through well-crafted text-dependent question assists students in discovering and achieving deeper understanding of the author's meaning. **All content area teachers are responsible for implementation**. **Action Steps** Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.	*How* -PLCS share their logs with administration after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Reading Coach observations -Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency. -Administrator aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation	instruction. -Teachers use the common assessment 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. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. *Leadership Team Level* -PLC facilitator shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	*During the Grading Period* - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.			2.1.	2.1. See Goals 1, 3, & 4	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Reading Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 45% to 47%	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **45%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **47%**					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.			3.1. 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**	3.1. Who -Principal -AP -PLC Liaisons/ Leadership Team members How PLCS share their logs with administration 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	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 64 points to 66 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **64 points**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **66 points**					

				-Grade level 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.	basis.			
				3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
				3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3..3.	3.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4.1. -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.	4.1. 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	4.1. Who Administrators How Monitored Administrators will review the communication logs and data collection used between teachers and ELP teachers outlining skills that need remediation	4.1. Supplemental data shared with leadership and classroom teachers who have students.	4.1. Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM) *(From District RtI/Problem Solving Facilitators.)*
Reading Goal #4: Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 60 points to 62 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **60 points**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **62 points**					

			back to the regular classroom teacher. -When the students have mastered the specific skill, they are exited from the ELP program.				
			4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.
			4.3	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target			**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**

5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Reading Goal #5:							
5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**			5A.1.	5A.1. See Goals 1, 3, & 4	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.
Reading Goal #5A: The percentage of White students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 75% to 78%. The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 78% to 80%. The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White: 75% Black: 78% Hispanic: 68% Asian: AMO target goal met American Indian: NA	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White: 78% Black: 80% Hispanic: 71% Asian: NA American Indian: NA					
			5A.2.	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2

from 68% to 71%.						
		5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.		5B.1.	5B.1. See Goals 1, 3, & 4	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.
Reading Goal #5B: The percentage of FRL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 60% to 64%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **60%** / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **64%**					
		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. -Lack of understanding teachers can provide ELL accommodations beyond FCAT testing. -Bilingual Education Paraprofessionals at varying levels of expertise in providing support. -Allocation of Bilingual Education Paraprofessional	5C.1. ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/standards improves through participation in the following **day-to-day accommodations on core content and district assessments across** Reading, LA, Math, Science, and Social Studies: 1. Extended time (lesson and assessments)	5C.1 **Who** -School based Administrators -ESOL Resource Teachers **How** -Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the walk-throughs look for Committee Meeting Recommendations. In	5C.1. Analyze core curriculum and district level assessments for ELL students. Correlate to accommodations to determine the most effective approach for individual students.	5C.1 During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests .
Reading Goal #5C: The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 63% to 66%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **63%** / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **66%**					

			dependent on number of ELLs. -Administrators at varying levels of expertise in being familiar with the ELL guidelines and job responsibilities of ERT and Bilingual paraprofessional.	2. Small group testing 3. Para support (lesson and assessments) 4. Use of heritage language dictionary (lesson and assessments)	addition, tools from the RtI Handbook and ELL RtI Checklist, and ESOL Strategies Checklist can be used as walk-through forms.	
			5C.2. -Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our school is of high priority. -The majority of the teachers are unfamiliar with this strategy. To address this barrier, the school will schedule professional development delivered by the school's ERT. -Teachers implementation of A+ Rise is not consistent across core courses. -Administrators at varying skill levels regarding use of A+ Rise in order to effectively conduct an A+ Rise fidelity check walk-through	5C.2. ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/standards increases in reading, language arts, math, science and social studies through the use of the district's on-line program **A+Rise** located on IDEAS under Programs for ELL. **Action Steps** -ESOL Resource Teacher (ERT) provides professional development to all content area teachers on how to access and use A+ Rise Strategies for ELLs at http://arises2s.com/s2s/ into core content lessons. -ERT models lessons using A+ Rise Strategies for ELLs. -ERT observes content area teachers using A+Rise and provides feedback, coaching and support. -District Resource Teachers (DRTs) provide professional development to all administrators on how to conduct walk-through fidelity checks for use of A+	5C.2. Who -School based Administrators -ESOL Resource Teachers -PLC Facilitators How PLC logs (with specific ELL information) for like courses/grades.	5C.2. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual ELL SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -ERTs meet with Reading, Language Arts, Social Studies and Science PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the ELL SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares ELL SMART Goal	5C.2. -FAIR -CELLA During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for ELL performance

					Rise strategies for ELLs.		data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. -ERTs meet with RtI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs)	
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5D.1. -Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs by both the general education and ESE teacher. To address this barrier, the APC will put a system in place for this school year.	5D.1. **Strategy** SWD student achievement improves through the effective and **consistent implementation of students' IEP** goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations. -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons.	5D.1. Who -School based Administrators -ESOL Resource Teachers How -Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the CRISS walkthrough form	5D.1. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental	5D.1. -FAIR During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for SWD performance	
Reading Goal #5D: The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 31% to 38%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **31%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **38%**						

| | | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. |
| | | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 |

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
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
PLC Professional Development	K-5	Area 2 RtI Representatives	School Wide	September	Administrator will review PLC logs to monitor effectiveness of PLC meetings and RtI interventions.	Principal and Leadership Team
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-5	Reading Teacher Representative	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team
ELL Strategies	K-5	English Language Learner Resource Teacher (ERT)	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team
A+ Rise	K-5	English Language Learner Resource Teacher (ERT	All teachers Faculty Professional Development	November, Faculty Meeting	ERT and Administrators will review PLC Logs	ERT and Administration Team

Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in mathematics (Level 3-5). Mathematics Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 75% to 76%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **75%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **76%**	1.1. -Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques. -PLC meetings need to focus on identifying and writing higher order questions to deliver during the lessons. -Finding time to conduct Webb's Depth of Knowledge walk-throughs is sometimes challenging.	1.1. **Strategy/Task** Students math achievement improves through frequent participation in **higher order questions/discussion activities** to deepen and extend student knowledge. These quality questions/prompts and discussion techniques promote thinking by students, assisting them to arrive at new understandings of complex material. **Actions/Details** *Within PLCs* -Teachers work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively use higher order questions/activities. -Teachers plan higher order questions/activities for upcoming lessons to increase the lessons' rigor and promote student achievement. -Teachers plan for scaffolding questions and activities to meet the differentiated needs of students. -After the lessons, teachers examine student work samples and classroom	1.1. -Principal -APEI How Monitored -PLCS turn their logs into administration after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their Logs. -Classroom walk-throughs using Webb's Depth of Knowledge wheel as a higher order walk-through form. They look for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency -Administrator aggregates the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation	1.1. PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 75% mastery on units of instruction. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends.	1.1. 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During the Grading Period -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, interventions etc.)

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

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

				During the lessons, students: -Have opportunities to formulate many of the high-level questions based on the text/content. -Have time to reflect on classroom discussion to increase their understanding (and without teacher mediation). School Leadership -The administrator collects higher order questioning walk-through data using Webb's Depth of Knowledge wheel. -School leaders conduct one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the data gathered from walk-through tools. This teacher data/chats guides the leadership's team professional development plan (both individually and whole faculty).			
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics.			2.1.	2.1. See Goals 1, 3, & 4	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Mathematics Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 49% to 51%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **49%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **50%**					

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

				Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check	Strategy Data Check	Student Evaluation Tool
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**

3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making learning gains in mathematics.

| Mathematics Goal #3:

Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 73 points to 74 points. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*

73 Points | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*

74 Points | 3.1.
-Not all teachers are aware of how to increase the depth and rigor necessary to meet the NGSSS and/or CCCSM | 3.1.
Strategy/Task
Students' math skills will improve through participation in lesson designed to increase knowledge of depth and rigor of content. Teachers will also us the DOE links to the NGSS and CCSSM highlighting the depth and rigor of each benchmark.

Actions/Details
-Show teachers how to access www.floridastandards.org link
-Model for teachers how to use the website.
-PLCs write SMART goals based on each Grading Period of material. (For example, during the first Grading Period, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction)
-As Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers discuss specific benchmarks being addressed in class and how to increase the rigor of the benchmark in classroom. Teachers will also use the DOE links to the NGSSS and CCSSM highlighting the depth and rigor of each of the benchmarks.
-Teachers implement the lessons with depth and rigor strategies discussed in their | 3.1.
-Teacher
-Principal
-AP

How
-Classroom walk-throughs observing lessons designed with rigor and depth
-Elementary Mathematics Walk-through forms
-PLC Logs | 3.1.
PLC- biweekly progress monitoring of assessment scores, daily teacher observations, and response through modification of lesson plans based on data are reviewed to determine the number of students demonstrating proficiency toward benchmark attainment.

PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.

District Math Team-Monthly meetings to support progress is discussed at Curriculum Vertical Team Meetings

Individual site support is provided as needed based on data | 3.1.
4x per year
District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing

Form 1
Form2
NGSS (optional)

EOY test

During the Grading Period
-Chapter Tests
-Benchmark mini assessments
-Go Math! BOY Test
-Go Math! MOY Test
-Go Math! EOY Test |

				PLCs. -Using the data, teachers discuss the effectiveness of the rigor and depth strategies that were implemented -Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of rigor and depth lesson planning. -PLCs record their work in PCL logs -Teachers will attend district math content trainings to increase their knowledge of math content.			
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3..3.	3.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4.1. -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.	4.1. 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	4.1. Who Administrators How Monitored Administrators will review the communication logs and data collection used between teachers and ELP teachers outlining skills that need remediation.	4.1. Supplemental data shared with leadership and classroom teachers who have students.	4.1. Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM) *(From District RtI/Problem Solving Facilitators.)*
Mathematics Goal #4: Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 73 points to 74 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **73 Points**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **74 Points**					

			back to the regular classroom teacher. -When the students have mastered the specific skill, they are exited from the ELP program.				
			4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.
			4.3	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target			**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Math Goal #5:								
5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics**			5A.1.	5A.1. See Goals 1, 3, & 4	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.	
Math Goal #5A: The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 53% to 84%. The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 65% to 66%	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White: AMO target goal met Black: 53% Hispanic: 65% Asian:AMO target goal met American Indian: NA	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White: NA Black: 58% Hispanic: 66% Asian: NA American Indian: NA						
			5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	

			5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5B.1.	5B.1. See Goals 1, 3, & 4	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.
Mathematics Goal #5B: The percentage of FRL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 59% to 63%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **59%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **63%**					
			5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.							
Mathematics Goal #5C: AMO target met: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **AMO target Met**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **NA**					
			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. Student with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			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/Task** SWD student achievement improves through **teachers' implementation of the Plan-Do-Check-Act model** in order to plan/carry out lessons/assessments with appropriate strategies and modifications. **Actions** *Plan* For an upcoming unit of instruction determine the following: -What do we want our SWD to learn by the end of the unit? -What are standards that our SWD need to learn? -How will we assess these skills/standards for our SWD? -What does mastery look like? -What is the SMART goal for this unit of instruction for our SWD? *Plan for the "Do"* What do teachers need to do in order to meet the SWD SMART goal? -What resources do we need? -How will the lessons be designed to maximize the learning of SWD? -What checks-for-understanding will we implement for our SWD? -What teaching	5D.1. Who -School based Administrators -PLC Facilitators How PLC logs (with specific SWD information) for like courses/grades.	5D.1. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SWD SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SWD SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SWD SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator share SWD SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	5D.1. During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for SWD performance
Mathematics Goal #5D: The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 59% to 63%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **59%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **63%**					

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

				-How do we take what we have learned and apply it to future lessons? ***Reflect/Check – Analyze Data*** Discuss one or more of the following: -What is the SWD data? -What is the data telling us as individual teachers? -What is the data telling us as a grade level/PLC/department? -What are SWD not learning? Why is this occurring? -Which SWD are learning? **Act on the Data** After data analysis, develop a plan to act on the data. -What are we going to do about SWD not learning? -What are the skills/concepts/standards that need re-teaching/interventions (either to individual SWD or small groups)? -How are we going to re-teach the skill differently? -How we will know that our re-teaching/interventions are working?				
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3

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

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
Problem Solving	K-5	Math Contact PLC Facilitators	Grade-level PLC	Bi-Weekly PLC meetings	Administrator will conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor problem solving implementation	Administration Team
Variety of Math Content Training related to NGSS	K-5	Math Contact PLC Facilitators	Grade-level PLC	Bi-Weekly PLC meetings	Administrator will conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor problem solving implementation	Administration Team

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science. Science Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 57% to 59%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **57%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **59%**	1.1. -Not all teachers are able to attend available science trainings on dates available by the district -Not all teachers are knowledgeable of the strategies of inquiry-based instruction such as engaging the students, explore time, accountable talk, higher order questioning, etc. - Not all PLC meetings include regular discussion of student data and /or the implementation of the inquiry model.	1.1. **Strategy** Students science skills will increase through participation in regular inquiry based instruction (such as student engagement, explore time, accountable talk, and higher order questioning). Students will develop problem-solving and creative thinking skills while construction new knowledge. **Action Steps** -Teachers will attend District Science training and share information with their PLC's and Vertical Curriculum	1.1. Who Teacher Principal AP Teacher/Contact How Monitored -Classroom walk-throughs observing inquiry based instruction. -Elementary Science Classroom Walk-Through Form	1.1. Science Vertical Team Meetings PLC data Chats Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use their knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC or individual SMART Goal. -PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal	1.1. 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)

				Team -PLCs rite SMART goals for units of instruction. -As a Professional Development activity in their PCLs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling inquiry based instruction strategies. -Teachers use checks for understanding and common core curriculum and inquiry passed instruction strategies -Teachers use checks for understanding and common core curriculum assessments. -Teachers bring assessment data back to the PCLs -Based on the data, teachers discuss inquiry based instruction strategies that were effective in order to drive future instruction.		Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction	
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science. <u>Science Goal #2:</u> The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 23% to 25%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> **23%**	<u>2013Expected Level of Performance:*</u> **25%**	2.1. -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.	2.1. <u>Strategy</u> 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? <u>Actions/Details</u> *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	2.1. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP <u>How</u> -PLC logs shared with administration provides feedback -Administrators attended targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.	2.1. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration	2.1. <u>2x per year</u> District-level baseline and mid-year tests Semester Exams <u>During the Grading Period</u> -Unit assessments

				to understand, know, and do. --Plan for checks for understanding during the unit. --Plan for the End-of-Unit Assessment --Plan upcoming lessons/units using the 5E Instructional Model. --Reflect on the outcome of lessons taught --Analyze checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments. --Act on the core curriculum data by planning interventions for the whole class or small group. -PLCs will generate SMART goals for upcoming units of instruction. -PLCs will report SMART goal data through their logs. -PLC, share action plans 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.				
				2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
				2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

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

Science 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
HOTS	K-5	Grade-level PLC Facilitator/ Science Contact	Grade-level PCL	Bi-Weekly Meeting	Administrators will conduct target walk-throughs to monitor HOTS implementation	Administration Team
Inquiry ad the 5E Instructional Model	1-5	Grade-level PLC Facilitator/ Science Contact	Grade-level PCL	Bi-Weekly Meeting	Administrators will conduct target walk-throughs to monitor HOTS implementation	Administration Team

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. Writing/LA Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring Level 3.0 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes will increase from 96% to 97%. .	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **96%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **97%**	1.1. -Not all teachers know how to plan and execute writing lessons with a focus on mode-based writing. -Not all teachers know how to review student writing to determine trends and needs in order to drive instruction. -All teachers need training to score student writing accurately during the 2012-2013 school year using information provided by the state.	1.1. **Strategy** Students' use of mode-specific writing will improve through use of Writers' Workshop/daily instruction with a focus on mode-specific writing. **Action Steps** -Based on baseline data, PLCs write SMART goals for each Grading Period. (For example, during the first Grading Period, 50% of the students will score 4.0 or above on the end-of-the Grading Period writing prompt.) *Plan:* -Professional Development for updated rubric courses	1.1. Who Principal AP 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	1.1. See "Check" & "Act" action steps in the strategies column	1.1. -Student monthly demand writes/formative assessments -Student daily drafts -Student revisions -Student portfolios

				-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 -Daily/ongoing conferencing				
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Writing/Language Arts Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Writing Holistic Scoring Training	2-5	Teacher Writing Contact PCL Facilitators	PLC grade level and Vertical Curriculum Team	On-going	Trends seen in monthly scoring accuracy-PLC ad district writing review meetings	Teacher, Wring Contact, APEI, District Supervisor
Mode-based Writing Training	K - 5	PLC facilitators	PLC grade level and Vertical Curriculum Team	On-going	-Administration walk-throughs -PLC logs shared with administration	Principal APEI

Attendance Goal(s)

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			1.1. -Students are absent and parents are not contacting the school. -There is no system to reinforce parents for facilitation improvement in attendance	1.1. **<u>Tier 1</u>** The school will establish an attendance committee comprised of Administrators, guidance counselors, teachers and other relevant personnel to review the school's attendance plan and discuss school wide interventions to address needs relevant to current attendance data. The attendance committee will also maintain a database of students with significant attendance problems and implement and monitor interventions to be documented on the attendance intervention form (SB 90710) The attendance committee meets every two weeks.	1.1. Attendance committee will keep a log and notes that will be reviewed by the Principal on a monthly basis and shared with faculty.	1.1. Attendance committee will monitor the attendance data from the targeted group of students.	1.1. Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/Tardy data Ed Connect
Attendance Goal #1: 1. The attendance rate will increase from 96% in 2011-2012 to 97% in 2012-2013 2. The attendance rate will increase from 96% in 2011-2012 to 97% in 2012-2013. The number of students who have 10 or more **unexcused** absences throughout the school year will decrease by 10%	2012 Current Attendance Rate:* **96%** 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) **49** 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) **0**	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* **97%** 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) **45** 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) **0**					
			1.2. There is no system to reinforce parents for facilitating improvement in attendance.	1.2. Beginning at the 5th unexcused absence, the Attendance Committee (which is a subgroup of the Leadership Team) collaborate to ensure that a letter is sent home to parents outlining the state statute that requires parents send students to school. If a student's attendance	1.2. Social Worker Guidance Counselor PSLT	1.2. The attendance committee (which is a subset of the leadership Team) will disaggregate attendance data for the "Tier 2" group along with the guidance counselor and maintain communication about these children.	1.2. Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/Tardy data

			improves (no absences in a 20 day period) a positive letter is sent home to the parent regarding the increase in their child's attendance.			
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
EdLine	K-5	AP	School-wide	September and then an as needed basis	Random check of EdLine postings	AP

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 Suspension Goal #1: Suspension Goal #1: 1. The total number of In-School Suspensions will decrease by 100%. 2. The total number of students receiving In-School Suspension throughout the school year will decrease by 100%. 3. The total number of	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions **1** 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School **1** 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions **0** 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School **0** 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	1.1. There needs to be common school-wide expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior.	1.1. Tier 1 -Positive Behavior Support (PBS) will be implemented to address school-wide expectations and rules, set these through staff survey, discipline data, and provide training to staff in methods for teaching and reinforcing the school-wide rules and expectations. -Providing teachers with resources for continued teaching and reinforcement of school expectations and	1.1. Who -PSLT Behavior Committee -Leadership Team -Administration	1.1. - PSLT /Behavior Committee will review data on Office Discipline Referrals ODRs and out of school suspensions, ATOSS data monthly.	1.1. UNTIE , EASI ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data

				rules.				
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%.	**9** 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School **9**	**8** 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School **8**		-Leadership team conducts walkthroughs using a PBS walk-through form (generated by the district RtI facilitators). -The data is shared with faculty at a monthly meeting, tracking the overall improvement of the faculty. -Where needed, administration conducts individual teacher walk-through data chats.				
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or 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
Positive Behavior Support (PBS)	K-5	Discipline Committee PSLT	School-wide	Bi-monthly	Administration, district RtI facilitator and guidance	Administration, district RtI facilitator and guidance
Character Education	K-5	Guidance Counselor, PLC Facilitator	All Teachers School-Wide	Bi-weekly PLC meetings	PLCs will review monthly writing prompts and refer any notable responses to Guidance.	Administration, Guidance

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 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 69% on the Pretest to 79% on the Posttest.	2012 Current Level :* **69%**	2013 Expected Level :* **79%**	1.1.	1.1. Elementary students will engage in 150 minutes of physical education per week in grades kindergarten through 5.	1.1. -Principal	1.1. -Classroom walk-throughs -Class schedules	1.1. Classroom teachers document in their lessons plans the ninety minutes of "Teacher Directed" physical education that students have per week. Physical Educations teachers' schedules reflect the remaining sixty minutes of the mandated 150 minutes of Elementary Physical Education. This is also reflected in the Master Schedule.
			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
NA						

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

<u>Continuous Improvement Goal(s)</u>

* 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 Continuous Improvement Goal #1: The percentage of teachers who strongly agree with the indicator that "teachers meet on a regular basis to discuss their students' learning, share best practices, problem solve and develop lessons/assessments that improve student performance (under Teaching and Learning)" will increase from 78% in 2012 to 88% in 2013.	2012 Current Level :* **78%**	2013 Expected Level :* **88%**	1.1. -There is still confusion on how to conduct PLCs that are focused on deepening the knowledge base of teachers and improving student performance by the implementation of the Plan-Do-Check-Act model. -Still confusion on how the Plan-Do-Check-Act model works. -Still some resistance to staff members attending PLCs and/or arriving on time to meetings. -Teachers asking for more PLC collaboration time.	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 <u>Who</u> Principal Leadership Team Subject Area Leaders PLC facilitators .	1.1. "Quick" PLC informal surveys will be administered during the school year. 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
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
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
Plan-Do-Check-Act Model	Leadership Team All teachers	Leadership Team PLC Facilitators	School-wide	PLCs monthly for Plan-Do-Check-Act PLCs.	Administrator and leadership team walk-throughs Administrator and leadership attendance at PLC meetings PLC Survey data	Leadership Team

Hillsborough 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised July, 2012

NEW Reading Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

A. **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Students scoring proficient in reading (Levels 4-9).			A.1.	A.1.	A.1.	A.1.	A.1.
Reading Goal A: **NA**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	**NA**				
			A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	A.2.
			A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	A.3.
B. **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.			B.1.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.
Reading Goal B: **NA**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	**NA**				
			B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.
			B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.

NEW Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
C. **Students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking.**		1.1.	1.1. **See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1 & 5C.2 and PD**	1.1. Who	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.	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 39% to 42%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading : **39%**		**See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1 & 5C.2 and PD**			
		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 38% to 40%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : **38%**		**See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1 & 5C.2 and PD**			

		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

NEW Math Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
F. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at in mathematics (Levels 4-9).			F.1.	F.1.	F.1.	F.1.	F.1.
Mathematics Goal F: **NA**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	**NA**				
			F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.
			F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.
G. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.			G.1.	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.
Mathematics Goal G: **NA**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	**NA**				
			G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	G.2.
			G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	G.3.

NEW Science Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
J. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at proficient in science (Levels 4-9).			J.1.	J.1.	J.1.	J.1.	J.1.
Science Goal J: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	NA				
			J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	J.2.
			J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	J.3.

NEW Writing Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
M. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing (Levels 4-9).			M.1.	M.1.	M.1.	M.1.	M.1.
Writing Goal M: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	NA				
			M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	M.2.
			M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	M.3.

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
STEM Goal #1: Implement/expand project/problem-based learning in math, science 5E model	1.1 Need common planning time for math, science, ELA and other STEM teachers	1.1 -Explicit direction for STEM professional learning communities to be established. -Documentation of planning of units and outcomes of units in logs. -Increase effectiveness of lessons through lesson study and district metrics, etc.	1.1 PLC or grade level lead -Subject Area Leaders	1.1 Administrative	1.1 Logging number of project-based learning in math, science and CTE/STEM per nine week. Share data with teachers.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Project-based learning	K-5	SALs	Science, math, ELA and technology teachers PLCs	On-going	Administrator walk-throughs	Administration

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 student interest in career opportunities and program selection prior to middle school. The school will increase the frequency of career exposure activities/events from 3 events in 2011-2011 to 5 events 2012-2013	1.1.	1.1. Provide field trips to local businesses or CTE student competitions	1.1.	1.1.	1.1. Log of CTE field trips
	1.2.	1.2. Implement special speakers to visit and share with students about CTE careers throughout the year and during the Great American Teach-In	1.2.	1.2.	1.2. Log of special speakers
	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
NA						

Differentiated Accountability

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
☒Priority	☐Focus	☐Prevent

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

Yes   **X** No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.
The school will continue to work towards balancing both the ethnicity and non-school board employees of the School Advisory Council to reach compliance.

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
	AIMS Grade Level Science Modules 3-5	$630.00	$630.00
Final Amount Spent			$2473.20