# Florida Department of Education

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

## 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

## PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

| | |
|---|---|
| School Name:  Claywell Elementary School | District Name:  School District of Hillsborough County |
| Principal:  Robert Jones | Superintendent:  MaryEllen Elia |
| SAC Chair:  Linda Swanson | Date of School Board Approval: |

## Student Achievement Data:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

# Highly Qualified Administrators

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

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | Number of Years at Current School | Number of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels,  Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Principal | Robert Jones | Degree(s) B.S. Elementary Education M.S. Educational Leadership Certifications School Principal Educational Leadership | 1 | 6 | 2011 – 2012 – Grade A 2010-2011- Grade A AYP- 72% 2009-2010- Grade A AYP- 92% 2008-2009- Grade A AYP-95% |

| Assistant Principal | Paulette English | Degree(s)<br>B.S. /M.S. Early Childhood Education Endorsement in Educational Leadership Certifications Educational Leadership (All Levels) Primary ed. (K-3) ESOL | 5 | 5 | 2011 – 2012 – Grade A<br><br>2010-2011- Grade A<br><br>AYP- 85%<br><br>2009-2010- Grade A<br><br>AYP- 97%<br><br><br>2008-2009- Grade A<br>AYP-95% |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

# 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 | Rebekah Howard | BA Elem. Ed. 1-6 w/ESOL | 4 | 5 | 2011 – 2012 – Grade A |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 2010-2011- Grade A |
| | | | | | AYP- 85% |
| | | | | | 2009-2010- Grade A |
| | | | | | AYP- 97% |
| | | | | | 2008-2009- Grade A |
| | | | | | AYP-95% |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

## **Highly Qualified Teachers**

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

| Description of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date | Not Applicable (If not, please explain why) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Teacher Interview Day | General Directors | June | |
| 2. Recruitment Fairs | James Goode | June | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3. District Mentor Program | District Mentors | ongoing | |
| 4. District Peer Program | District Peers | ongoing | |
| 5. School-based teacher recognition system | Principal | ongoing | |
| 6. Opportunities for teacher leadership | Principal | ongoing | |
| 7. Regular time for teacher collaboration | Principal | ongoing | |

## **Non-Highly Qualified Instructors**

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

| Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly qualified. | Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective |
|---|---|
| 0 | |

## **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 First-Ye | % of Teachers | % of Teachers | % of Teachers | % of Teachers | % Highly Qu | % Reading En | % National Bo | % ESOL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | |

| of Instructional Staff | ar Teachers | with 1-5 Years of Experience | with 6-14 Years of Experience | with 15+ Years of Experience | with Advanced Degrees | alified Teachers | dorsed Teachers | ard Certified Teachers | Endorsed Teachers |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 60 | 2% (1) | 17% (10) | 40% (24) | 41% (25) | 28% (17) | 100% (60) | 0% 0 | 7% (4) | 65% (39) |

# Teacher Mentoring Program

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

| Mentor Name | Mentee Assigned | Rationale for Pairing | Planned Mentoring Activities |
|---|---|---|---|

| Tiffany Behnke | Katie Larson | Tiffany Behnke is a Mentor with the EET initiative. Her areas of strength include leadership, mentoring, and increasing student's achievement. | Katie receives 90 minutes of observation and mentoring weekly to improve her instruction. Katie attends profes sional develop ment and discusses strategies with Tiffany to implement in her classroom. |
|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

# **Additional Requirements**

## **Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only**

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

| Title I, Part A |
|---|

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

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

| School-Based MTSS/RtI Team |
|---|
| Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.<br><br><br>The school-based leadership team consists of the principal, assistant principal, school psychologist, guidance counselor, reading coach, ESE specialist, speech therapist, ESE representative and K-5 grade-level representatives. |

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

- The purpose of the MTSS team in our school is to provide high quality instruction/intervention matched to student needs and using performance and learning rate over time to make important education decisions to guide instruction. The MTSS team functions to address the progress of low performing students to help students stay in regular education setting and improve long term outcomes. The team uses a problem solving model and all decisions are made with data.

- Our MTSS Team will be called the Problem Solving Team and will meet twice a month to:

    ○ Use the MTSS problem solving model to:

    ○ Oversee a multi-tiered model of service delivery (Core/Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3)

    ○ Determine scheduling needs, curriculum and intervention resources

    ○ Review/interpret student data (Academic and Behavior)

    ○ Organize and support systematic data collection.

    ○ Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction:

        ■ Through the implementation of PLCs

        ■ Through the use of school-based Reinforcement Calendars, Mini Lessons and Mini Assessments

        ■ Through the use of Common Assessments given every 6-9 weeks.

        ■ Through the implementation of research-based, scientifically validated instruction/interventions. This year our RtI team will focus on Differentiated Instruction practices.

- Plan, implement and oversee the supplemental and intensive interventions for student progression in Tier 2 and Tier 3.

- Monitor interventions and data assessment in Tier 2 and Tier 3.

- Work collaboratively with the PLCs in the implementation of the Continuous Improvement Model and progress monitoring

- Coordinate/collaborate with other working committees such as the Reading Leadership Team

- Assist in the implementation and monitoring of the Differentiated Accountability Model

- Identify professional development needs and resources

- *Collect and review grade level assessment data and provide feedback regarding data driven instructional planning and goal setting*

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

- The chair of the MTSS Leadership Team attends SAC meetings as a PSLT representative.

- The MTSS Leadership Team along with the faculty and SAC were involved in School Improvement Plan development activities that were conducted during preplanning for the 12 - 13school year.

- The MTSS Leadership Team worked collaboratively to write the goals included in this School Improvement Plan.

- The School Improvement Plan is the document that guides the work of the MTSS Leadership Team. The large part of the work of the MTSS Leadership Team is outlined in the Action Steps, Evaluation Process, Evaluation Tool, and Professional Development of the School Improvement Plan.

Since one of the main tasks of the MTSS Leadership Team is to monitor student data, it will monitor the effectiveness of the Action Steps and suggest modifications if needed.

**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 | Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers |
| FAIR | Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network  Data Wall | Reading Coach/ Reading PLC Facilitator |
| CELLA | Sagebrush (IPT) | ELL PSLT Representative |
| Teachers' common core curriculum assessments on units of instruction/big ideas. | *PLC logs* | Individual Teachers/ Team Leaders/ PLC Facilitators/PSLT |
| DRA-2 | School Generated Database | Individual Teacher |

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

| Data Source | Database | Person (s) Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|
| Extended Learning Program (ELP)* *(see below)* Ongoing Progress Monitoring (mini-assessments and other assessments from adopted curriculum resource materials) | School Generated Database in Excel | Leadership Team/ ELP Facilitator |
| FAIR OPM | School Generated Database in Excel | Leadership Team/Reading Coach |
| Other Curriculum Based Measurement | *easyCBM*<br><br>School Generated Database in Excel | Leadership Team/PLCs/*Individual Teachers* |
| *Research-based Computer-assisted Instructional Programs* | *Assessments included in computer-based programs(I-Station)* | *PLCs/Individual Teachers* |

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The Leadership Team/will 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 MTSS Committee develop(s) resources and staff development trainings on MTSS, these tools and staff development sessions will be conducted with staff when they become available. Professional Development sessions, EET evaluation data, will occur during faculty meeting times or rolling faculty meetings. The Leadership Team will send school team representatives to ongoing MTSS trainings/support sessions that are offered district-wide. Our school will invite our area MTSS Facilitator to visit as needed to review our progress in implementation of MTSS 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 MTSS as they become available.

Describe plan to support MTSS.

Multi-tiered System of Supports (MTSS) provides high quality instruction and interventions matched to student needs using learning rate over time and level of performance to inform instructional decisions. In order to support MTSS in our schools, we will:

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

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

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

# Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

| **School-Based Literacy Leadership Team** |
|---|
| Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).<br><br><br>The team is comprised of:<br><br>    ●  Principal<br><br>    ●  Assistant Principal for Curriculum<br><br>    ●  Reading Coach<br><br>    ●  Reading Teachers<br><br>    ●  Media Specialist<br><br><br><br> |

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?

- 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**

# PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

## Reading Goals

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5).** | 1.1.<br><br>Lack of knowledge of Common Core Standards. Teachers' knowledge of Common Core Standards. Training will be implemented during the 2012 – 2013 school year. | 1.1.<br><br>Common core reading strategies across all content areas. Reading comprehension improves when engaged students grapple with complex.<br><br>Teachers will understand how to select and identify complex text and share complex text with all students. | 1.1.<br><br>Who<br><br>-Principal<br><br>-AP<br><br>-Reading Coach<br><br><br>How<br><br>-Reading PLC Log<br><br><br>-PLCS turn their logs into administration monthly.<br><br>-Administration and coach rotate through PLCs looking for complex text discussion.<br><br>-Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis. | 1.1.<br><br>Teacher Level<br><br>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.<br><br><br>PLC Level<br><br>_<br><br>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classrooms.<br><br><br>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. | 1.1.<br><br>3x per year<br><br>- FAIR<br><br><br><br>During the Grading Period<br><br>- Common assessments (running records, pre, post, mid, unit, and intervention checks) | | |

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

| Reading Goal #1: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 71% to 73%. | | | | | | |
| | **71%** | **73%** | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** <br><br> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** <br><br> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | |

| 2. **FCAT 2.0:** Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | - Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques.<br><br>The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' reading skills will improve through participation in **HOT (Higher Order Thinking)** activities. Teachers will analyze data, plan instruction based on data and include HOT questions designed to increase rigor in lesson plans. | The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' reading skills will improve through participation in **HOT (Higher Order Thinking)** activities. Teachers will analyze data, plan instruction based on data and include HOT questions designed to increase rigor in lesson plans.<br><br>Action Steps:<br><br>1. Teachers will provide on-going training in HOT at faculty meetings.<br><br>2. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.)<br><br>3. As a | Principal<br><br>-AP<br><br>-Reading Coach<br><br>-PSLT Team<br><br>How<br><br>-PLC Logs<br><br>-PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach monthly.<br><br>-PLCs receive feedback on their logs.<br><br>Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis.<br><br>-Reading Coach observations and walk-throughs<br><br>-Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency.<br><br>-Administrator and Reading Coach aggregate the | PLCs – Periodic (weekly or bi-weekly) progress monitoring of assessment scores to determine the number of students demonstrating proficiency toward benchmark attainment.<br><br>PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.<br><br>PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. | 3x per year<br><br>- FAIR<br><br><br>During the Grading Period<br><br>- Common assessments (running records, pre, post, mid, unit, and intervention checks) | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers discuss HOT strategies and how they can be implemented in the upcoming lessons.<br><br>4. Teachers implement the targeted higher order questioning strategies in their lessons.<br><br>5. Teachers implement the common assessments and bring common assessment data back to the PLCs. | walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation. | | | | |
| Reading Goal #2:<br><br>In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 48% to 50%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | **48%** | **50%** | | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | |

| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | | |
| **3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.** | 3.1.<br><br>Limited time and materials for explicit instruction of higher order thinking skills. | 3.1.<br><br>Incorporate Kagan Strategies in all instructional areas. | 3.1.<br><br>Principal<br><br>-AP<br><br>-Reading  Coach<br><br>-Peer Evaluator | 3.1.<br><br><br>Classroom Informal Evaluations, Formal Observations, Lesson Plans | 3.1.<br><br>3x per year<br><br>- FAIR<br><br><br><br>During the Grading Period<br><br>- Common assessments (running records, pre, post, mid, unit, and intervention checks) | | |

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

| Reading Goal #3:<br><br>Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 70 Points to 72 Points. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **70** | **72** | | | | |
| | | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. |
| | | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3..3. | 3.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | |

| 4. **FCAT 2.0:** Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. | 4.1. | 4.1. | 4.1. | 4.1. | 4.1. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Differentiated instruction not being provided daily for individual students' needs. | Teachers will collaborate during PLC meetings monthly to share effective differentiating instruction strategies.<br><br>Action Steps<br><br>1. Through data analysis of FCAT, FAIR, baseline data, classroom assessments and student performance, PLCs identify essential tested benchmarks for their students that need reinforcement and/or remediation.<br><br>2. Facilitate the identification, selection, development of rigorous core curriculum common assessments<br><br>3. Plan for interventions and the intentional grouping of the students. | Who<br><br>-Reading Coach<br><br>-AP<br><br>-Principal<br><br>-Teacher<br><br><br>How<br><br>-PLC notes turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.<br><br>-Classroom walk-through observing this strategy.<br><br>-Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-through. | PLC Logs | 3x per year<br><br>- FAIR<br><br><br>During the Grading Period<br><br>- Common assessments (running records, pre, post, mid, unit, and intervention checks) | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reading Goal #4:<br><br>Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 72 points to 75 Points. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | **72** | **75** | | | | | |
| | | 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**<br><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | | |

| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.** | | | | | | | |
| Reading Goal #5: | | | | | | | |
| **5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity** (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.** | 5A.1.<br><br>White:<br><br>Black:<br><br>Hispanic:<br><br>Asian:<br><br>American Indian: | 5A.1.<br><br>See Goals 1, 2, 3, & 4 | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | | |

| Reading Goal #5A: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The percentage of White students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Reading will increase from 78% to 80%. | | | | | | |
| The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Reading will increase from 61% to 65%. | | | | | | |
| | White:78% Black Hispanic: 61% Asian: American Indian: | White: 80% Black: Hispanic:65% Asian: American Indian: | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 5A.2. | 5A.2 | 5A.2 | 5A.2 | 5A.2 |
| | | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | |
| **5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.** | 5B.1. | 5B.1.<br><br>See Goals 1, 2, 3, & 4 | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | |

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

| Reading Goal #5B: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Reading will increase from 58% to 62%. | | | | | | |
| | **58%** | **62%** | | | | |
| | | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. |
| | | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** <br><br> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** <br><br> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | |

| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. | 1.1.<br><br>-Lack of understanding teachers can provide ELL accommodations beyond FCAT testing.<br><br>-Bilingual Education Paraprofessionals at varying levels of expertise in providing support. | 1.1.<br><br>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:<br><br>1.  Extended time (lesson and assessments)<br><br>2.  Small group testing<br><br>3.  Para support (lesson and assessments)<br><br>4.  Use of heritage language dictionary (lesson and assessments) | 1.1.<br><br>Who<br><br>-School based Administrators<br><br>-ESOL Resource Teacher<br><br><br>How<br><br>-Administrative walk-through | 1.1.<br><br>Analyze core curriculum and district level assessments for ELL students.  Correlate to accommodations to determine the most effective approach for individual students | 5C.1.<br><br>3x per year<br><br>- FAIR<br><br><br><br>During the Grading Period<br><br>- Common assessments (running records, pre, post, mid, unit, and intervention checks) | | |

| Reading Goal #5C: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Reading will increase from 42% to 48%. | | | | | | |
| | **42%** | **48%** | | | | |
| | — | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. |
| | | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.** | 5D.1.<br><br>Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs by both the general education and ESE teacher. | 5D.1.<br><br>**Strategy**<br><br>SWD student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations.<br><br>-Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity.<br><br>-Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/ SWD strategies and modifications into lessons. | 5D.1.<br><br>Who<br><br>Principal, Site Administrator, Assistance Principal<br><br>ESE Specialist<br><br>How<br><br>IEP Progress Reports reviewed | 5D.1.<br><br>Teacher Level<br><br>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.<br><br>PLC Level<br><br>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses.<br><br>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.<br><br>Leadership Team<br><br>Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. | 5D.1.<br><br>3x per year<br><br>- FAIR<br><br>During the Grading Period<br><br>- Common assessments (running records, pre, post, mid, unit, and intervention checks) | | |

| Reading Goal #5D: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 51% to 56%. | | | | | | |
| | **51%** | **56%** | | | | |
| | | 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.

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Student Engagement | K - 5 | PLC Facilitators | School-wide | -PLCs: On-going<br><br>-Demonstration Classrooms<br><br>-Book Study on *The Energy Bus* | Classroom walk-through | Administration Team |
| ELL Strategies | K-5 | English Language Learner Resource Teacher (ERT) | PLC Meetings | On-going | Classroom walkthroughs | Administration Team |

*End of Reading Goals*

# Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

| 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<br><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check<br><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1. FCAT 2.0:  Students scoring proficient in mathematics (Level 3-5).** | -Lack of Planning time<br><br>-Lack of materials | Students' math achievements improve through the use of hands on activities to implement the Common Core State Standards.<br><br><u>Action Steps</u><br><br>-PLCs use their core curriculum information to learn more about hands-on activities. | <u>Who</u><br><br>- Principal<br><br>-Assistant Principal<br><br><u>How Monitored</u><br><br>-PLCS turn their logs into administration monthly.<br><br>-PLCs receive feedback on their logs.<br><br>-Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.<br><br>-Administrator aggregates the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation. | PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 75% mastery on units of instruction.<br><br>PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends. | 1.1.<br><br>Core Curriculum Assessments<br><br>(pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, interventions etc.) | | |
| Mathematics Goal #1:<br><br><br><br>In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum Students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2012 FCAT math will increase from 64% to 67%. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |

| | 64% | 67% | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | |

| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques.<br><br>-PLC meetings need to focus on identifying and writing higher order questions to deliver during the lessons. | Students' math achievement improves through frequent participation in <u>higher order questions/ discussion activities</u> to deepen and extend student knowledge. These quality questions/prompts and discussion techniques promotes thinking by students, assisting them to arrive at new understandings of complex material.<br><br><br><br>Actions/Details<br><br>*Within PLCs*<br><br>-Teachers work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively use higher order questions/ activities.<br><br>-Teachers plan higher order questions/ activities for upcoming lessons to increase the lessons' rigor and promote student achievement.<br><br>-Teachers plan for scaffolding questions | -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete.<br><br>-PLCs receive feedback on their<br><br>Logs. | PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 75% mastery on units of instruction.<br><br><br><br>PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.  The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends. | Core Curriculum Assessments<br><br>(pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, interventions etc.) | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | and activities to meet the differentiated needs of students.<br><br>-Use student data to identify successful higher order questioning techniques for future implementation.<br><br>During the lessons, teachers:<br><br>-Ask questions and/or provides activities that require students to engage in frequent higher order thinking.<br><br>-Have students describe how they arrive at an answer.<br><br>-Encourage discussion by using open ended questions.<br><br>-Scaffold questions to help students with incorrect answers.<br><br>-Engage all students | | | | |

| | | | in the discussion and ensure that all voices are heard. | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | | |

| 2. **FCAT 2.0:** Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics. | 2.1.<br><br>**See Goals 1 & 2** | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| Mathematics Goal #2: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 37% to 39%. | | | | | | | |
| | **37% (128)** | **39% (135)** | | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | |
| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | | |

| 3. **FCAT 2.0:** Points for students making learning gains in mathematics. | 3.1. | 3.1. | 3.1. | 3.1. | 3.1. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum and data analysis discussion to deepen their leaning. | Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions:<br><br>1. What is it we expect them to learn?<br><br>2. How will we know if they have learned it?<br><br>3. How will we respond if they don't learn?<br><br>4. How will we respond if they already know it?<br><br>Actions Prior to the Lesson Teachers will:<br><br>Generate and Identify Assessments<br><br>Complete Backward Lesson Plan template | Who<br><br>-Principal<br><br>-AP<br><br>-PLC Facilitators<br><br><br>How<br><br>PLCS turn their logs into administration monthly.<br><br>-PLCs receive feedback on their logs.<br><br>-Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings.<br><br>-Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team<br><br>-Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency.<br><br>-Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis. | PLC logs will determine if SMART goal has been met. | Core Curriculum Assessments<br><br>(pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, interventions etc.) | | |

| Mathematics Goal #3:<br><br>Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 77 points to 79 points. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **77 pts** | **79 pts** | | | | | |
| | | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | |
| | | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3..3. | 3.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | | |

| 4. **FCAT 2.0:** Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. | 4.1.<br><br>Current levels of academic performance. | 4.1.<br><br>Students will receive daily intensive remedial instruction from their teacher, while students of average and above average abilities participate in enrichment activities. | 4.1.<br><br>Teachers' PLC logs will be reviewed by Administration on an ongoing basis to determine effectiveness of instruction. | 4.1.<br><br>Administrators will review the ELP data for each group on a monthly basis and present this information to the PSLT.<br><br>-Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency. | 4.1.<br><br>Core Curriculum Assessments<br><br>(pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, interventions etc.) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mathematics Goal #4:<br><br>Points earned from students in lowest 25% making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 65 points to 68 points. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | **65 pts** | **68 pts** | | | | | |

| | | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Difficulty allotting additional time for small group and individual instruction during the school day. | Students are invited to the Extended Learning Program to receive additional academic support. | Teachers' PLC logs will be reviewed by an Administrator on an ongoing basis to determine effectiveness of instruction. | Administrators will review the ELP data for each group on a monthly basis and present this information to the PSLT. | Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, interventions etc.) | |
| | | 4.3 Difficulty allotting additional time for small group and individual instruction during the school day. | 4.3. Additional time has been built into the Master schedule to allow for MTSS time. The purpose of this time is to remediate and enrich students based on performance data. | 4.3. Teachers' PLC logs will be reviewed by an Administrator on an ongoing basis to determine effectiveness of instruction. | 4.3. -Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency. | 4.3. Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, interventions etc.) | |
| 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.<br><br>Lack of common planning time | 5A.1.<br><br>Plan and provide targeted interventions for each targeted subgroup student to improve student achievement. | 5A.1.<br><br>Who<br><br>-Principal<br><br>-AP<br><br>-PLC Facilitators<br><br><br>How<br><br>PLCS turn their logs into administration monthly.<br><br>-PLCs receive feedback on their logs.<br><br>-Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings.<br><br>-Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team<br><br>-Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis. | 5A.1.<br><br>PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of subgroup students reaching at least 75% mastery on units of instruction.<br><br><br>PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends. | 5A.1.<br><br>Core Curriculum Assessments<br><br>(pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, interventions etc.) | | |

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

| Mathematics Goal #5A: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The percentage of White students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Math will increase from 68% to 71%. | | | | | | | |
| The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Math will increase from 50% to 55%. | | | | | | | |
| The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Math will increase from 60% to 64%. | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | White:68% | White:71% | | | | |
| | Black: 50% | Black:55% | | | | |
| | Hispanic:60% | Hispanic:64% | | | | |
| | Asian: | Asian: | | | | |
| | American Indian: | American Indian: | | | | |
| | | 5A.2.<br><br>Lack of time to analyze data and apply differentiated instructional strategies | 5A.2.<br><br>Differentiate instruction to meet all learners' needs. | 5A.2.<br><br>Who<br><br>-Principal<br><br>-AP<br><br>-PLC Facilitators<br><br>How<br><br>PLCS turn their logs into administration monthly.<br><br>-PLCs receive feedback on their logs.<br><br>-Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings.<br><br>-Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team<br><br>-Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis. | 5A.2.<br><br>PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of subgroup students reaching at least 75% mastery on units of instruction.<br><br>PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.  The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends. | 5A.2.<br><br>Core Curriculum Assessments<br><br>(pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, interventions etc.) | |

| | | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | | |
| **5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.** | 5B.1.<br><br>See Goal 5A.1 | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | | |
| Mathematics Goal #5B:<br><br><br><br>The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Math will increase from 57% to 61%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |

| | **57%** | **61%** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | |
| | | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | | |

| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. | 5C.1.  See Goal 5A.1 | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| Mathematics Goal #5C: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Math will increase from 42% to 48%. | | | | | | |
| | **42%** | **48%** | | | | |
| | | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. |
| | | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5D. Student with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.** | 5D.1.<br><br>Collecting data with fidelity<br><br>-Understanding data and the students' disability to make instructional decisions<br><br>-For general education teachers, understanding the IEP and instructional accommodations<br><br>-Teachers at varying skill levels<br><br>-Lack of common planning time | 5D.1.<br><br>Strategy:<br><br>Strategy<br><br>SWDs math skills will improve by connecting individual needs to instruction as outlined in the IEP.<br><br><br>Actions Steps<br><br>1. General Ed. and/ or SWD teachers will familiarizing themselves with each student's IEP goals, strategies and accommodations.<br><br>2. Every nine weeks the General Ed and/or SWD teacher reviews students' IEPs to ensure that all students' IEP goals, strategies and accommodations are being implemented with fidelity.<br><br>3. Using student data, every nine weeks (along with the report card) SWD students | 5D.1.<br><br>Who<br><br>Principal, Site Administrator, Assistance Principal<br><br><br>How<br><br>IEP Progress Reports reviewed by Administration | 5D.1.<br><br>PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of SWD students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.<br><br><br>PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team/Math Committee will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks | 5D.1.<br><br>2-3x Per Year<br><br>3x per year<br><br>Go Math Chapter Tests<br><br><br>During the nine weeks<br><br>- Unit assessments for SWD students | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | will receive an Individual Education Plan Progress Report to inform parents of the students' progress toward mastering their IEP goals and strategies.<br><br>6. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers discussing implementation of IEP strategies and modifications.<br><br>7. PLC teachers instruct students implementing IEP strategies and accommodations.<br><br>7.  At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material.<br><br>8. Teachers bring SWD assessment data back to the PLCs.<br><br>9. Based on the data, teachers discuss techniques that were effective for SWD students. | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 10. Based on the data, teachers decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students using DI techniques.<br><br>11. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment).<br><br>12. PLCs record their work in logs. | | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #5D:<br><br><br><br>The percentage of Students with Disabilities students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 51% to53%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | **51%** | **53%** | | | | | |

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

*End of Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals*

# 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Higher Order Thinking | K-5 | PLC facilitators | Math | -PLCs: On-going | Classroom walk-throughs | Administration Team |
| | | | | -Demonstration Classrooms | Optional peer teacher observations | |
| Differentiated Instruction | K-5 | PLC facilitators | Math | -PLCs: On-going | Classroom walk-throughs | Administration Team |
| | | | | -Demonstration | | |
| Identification of common assessments | K-5 | PLC facilitators | Math | PLCs: On-going | Classroom walk-throughs | Administration Team |

| IEP Accommodations and Modifications | K-5 | Math | PLCs: On-going | Classroom walk-throughs | Administration Team |
| | PLC facilitators | | | | |

*End of Mathematics Goals*

## Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

| 1. **FCAT 2.0:** Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science. | 1.1.<br><br>Need for additional hands-on inquiry based activities. | 1.1.<br><br>The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students will develop problem-solving and creative thinking skills while constructing new knowledge. To achieve this goal, science teachers will increase the number of **inquiry based instruction** (such as student engagement, explore time, accountable talk and higher order questioning) per unit of instruction.<br><br>Action Steps<br><br><br>1. Teachers will attend District Science training | 1.1.<br><br>Who<br><br>-Principal<br><br>-Assistant Principal<br><br>-Teacher<br><br><br>How<br><br>-PLC notes turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.<br><br>-Classroom walk-through observing this strategy.<br><br>-Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-through. | 1.1.<br><br>PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 75% mastery on units of instruction.<br><br><br>PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends. | 1.1.<br><br>Core Curriculum Assessments<br><br>(pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, interventions etc.) | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | and share information with their PLCs.<br><br>2. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, and researching, inquiry based instruction strategies.<br><br>3. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum and inquiry based instruction strategies.<br><br>4. Based on the data, teachers discuss inquiry based instruction strategies that were effective.<br><br>5. Based on the data, teachers discuss inquiry based instruction strategies that were effective. | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Science Goal #1:<br><br>In grade 5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 70% to 72%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | **70%** | **72%** | | | | | |

| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through teachers using the **FCIM** strategy on identified tested benchmarks<br><br>Action Steps<br><br>1. Through data analysis of FCAT, baseline data, classroom assessments and student performance, PLCs identify essential tested benchmarks for their students that need reinforcement and/or remediation.<br><br>2. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs.<br><br>3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers use the mini assessment data and classroom assessments to adjust the timeline/ calendar. | Who<br><br>-Principal<br><br>-Assistant Principal<br><br>-Teacher<br><br>How<br><br>-PLC notes turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.<br><br>-Classroom walk-through observing this strategy.<br><br>-Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-through. | PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 75% mastery on units of instruction.<br><br>PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends. | Core Curriculum Assessments<br><br>(pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, interventions etc.) | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2. FCAT 2.0:** Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science. | 2.1. <br><br> Lack of common planning time to develop/ identify PLC based mini lessons and mini assessments (using curriculum based materials) geared toward on-going progress monitoring. <br><br> - Lack of common planning time to analyze mini lesson data. | 2.1. <br><br> Strategy **Tier 1** – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students will develop problem-solving and creative thinking skills while constructing new knowledge. To achieve this goal, science teachers will increase the number of **inquiry based instruction** (such as student engagement, explore time, accountable talk and higher order questioning) per unit of instruction. <br><br><br><br> Action Steps | 2.1. <br><br> Who <br><br> Teacher <br><br> Principal <br><br> AP <br><br> PLC Facilitator <br><br><br> How <br><br> 1. Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-through. <br><br> 2.PLC notes | 2.1. <br><br> PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 75% mastery on units of instruction. <br><br><br> PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends. | 2.1. <br><br> Core Curriculum Assessments <br><br> (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, interventions etc.) | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1. Through data analysis of FCAT, baseline data, classroom assessments and student performance, PLCs identify essential tested benchmarks for their students that need reinforcement and/or remediation.<br><br>2. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs.<br><br>3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers use the mini assessment data and classroom assessments to adjust the timeline/ calendar. | | | | |

| Science Goal #2:  In grade 5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 32% to 34%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **32%** | **34%** | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | |
| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | |

## Science Professional Development

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

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ongoing Science Investigations | K - 5 | PLC facilitators | Science | -PLCs: On-going<br><br>-Demonstration Classrooms | Classroom walk-throughs | Administration Team |
| Student Engagement | K-5 | PLC facilitators | Science | -PLCs: On-going<br><br>-Demonstration Classrooms | Classroom walk-throughs | Administration Team |
| Higher Order Thinking | K-5 | PLC facilitators | Science | -PLCs: On-going<br><br>-Demonstration Classrooms | Classroom walk-throughs | Administration Team |

*End of Science Goals*

## Writing/Language Arts Goals

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

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

| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | -Not all teachers know how to plan and execute writing lessons with a focus on mode-based writing.<br><br>-Not all teachers know how to review student writing to determine trends and needs in order to drive instruction.<br><br>-All teachers need training to score student writing accurately during the 2012-2013 school year using information provided by the state. | **Strategy**<br><br>Students' use of mode-specific writing will improve through use of Writers' Workshop/daily instruction with a focus on mode-specific writing.<br><br>**Action Steps**<br><br>-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.)<br><br>***Plan:***<br><br>-Professional Development for updated rubric courses<br><br>-Training to facilitate data- | Who<br><br>Principal<br><br>Assistant Principal<br><br>How Monitored<br><br>-PLC logs<br><br>-Classroom walk-throughs<br><br>Observation Form | -PLC logs<br><br>-Classroom walk-throughs<br><br>Observation Form | -Student monthly demand writes/ formative assessments<br><br>-Student daily drafts<br><br>-Student revisions<br><br>-Student portfolios | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | driven PLCs<br><br>-Using data to identify trends and drive instruction<br><br>***Do:***<br><br>-Daily/ongoing models and application of appropriate mode-specific writing based on teaching points<br><br>-Daily/ongoing conferencing | | | | |
| Writing/LA Goal #1:<br><br>In grades 4, the percentage of All Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writing will increase from 92% to 94%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |

| | | 92% | 94% | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | | |

## Writing/Language Arts Professional Development

| **Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity**<br><br>Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.<br>PD Content /Topic<br><br>and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator<br><br>and/or<br><br>PLC Leader | PD Participants<br><br>(e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules<br><br>(e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2 - 5 | PLC facilitators | Language Arts Teachers | On-going | | |
| | | | | | PLC logs turned into administration | Principal |
| | | | | | | Assistant Principal |
| Writing Holistic Scoring Training | | | | | | PLC Facilitators |

*End of Writing Goals*

## Attendance Goal(s)

| Attendance Goal(s) | Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** <br><br> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** <br><br> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | | |
| 1.  Attendance | 1.1. <br><br> Students may not be motivated to attend school at the goal rate | 1.1. <br><br> Incentive program for students that have perfect attendance for the quarter. | 1.1. <br><br> Monitored by Guidance Counselor and Social Worker. | 1.1. <br><br> Percent attendance will be calculated each 9 weeks as well as a list of all students with perfect attendance for that grading period. | 1.1. <br><br> Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/ Tardy  data | | |

| Attendance Goal #1: | 2012 Current Attendance Rate:* | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The attendance rate will increase from 95.65% in 2011-2012 to 96% in 2012-2013.<br><br>The number of students who have 10 or more **unexcused** absences throughout the school year will decrease from 63 in 2011-2012 to 58 in 2012-2013.<br><br>The number of students who have 10 or more **unexcused** tardies to school throughout the school year will decrease from 152 in 2011-2012 to 143 in 2012-2013. | | | | | | | |
| | **95.65%** | **96%** | | | | | |

| | 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences<br><br>(10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences<br><br>(10 or more) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **63** | **58** | | | | | |
| | 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of<br><br>Students with Excessive Tardies<br><br>(10 or more) | | | | | |
| | **152** | **143** | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

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

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

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

*End of Attendance Goals*

## Suspension Goal(s)

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

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

| 1. **Suspension** | 1.1. Students with two or more suspensions are more likely to accrue future suspensions, which decreases the effectiveness of suspension as a form of discipline and results in a significant loss in instructional time for that student. | 1.1. The "Check and Connect" program will be implemented to support students who receive two or more suspensions in one semester. | 1.1. Guidance Counselor  Social Worker  PSLT | 1.1. Guidance Counselor and Social worker will work with PSLT review suspension data and determine the percent of student with two or more suspensions. The Team will review suspension data biweekly and report progress to PSLT monthly. | 1.1. Biweekly Suspension Data | | |

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

| Suspension Goal #1: | 2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The total number of In-School Suspensions will decrease from 4 in 2011-2012 to 3 in 2012- 2013. | | | | | | | |
| The total number of students receiving In-School Suspension will decrease from 4 in 2011-2012 to 3 in 2012-2013. | | | | | | | |
| The total number of Out-of-Suspensions (including ATOSS) will decrease from 6 in 2011-2012 to 5 in 2012-2013. | | | | | | | |
| The total number of students receiving Out-of-School Suspension will decrease from 5 in 2011-2012 to 4 in 2012- 2013. | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **4** | **3** | | | | | |
| | 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In –School | | | | | |
| | **4** | **3** | | | | | |
| | 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | | | | | |
| | **6** | **5** | | | | | |
| | 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School | | | | | |
| | **5** | **4** | | | | | |
| | | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*End of Suspension Goals*

# Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

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

| 1. **Dropout Prevention**<br><br>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:<br><br>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year*. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **N/A** | 2012 Current Dropout Rate:* | 2013 Expected Dropout Rate:* | | | | | |
| | 2012 Current Graduation Rate:* | 2013 Expected Graduation Rate:* | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

**Dropout Prevention Professional Development**

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

*End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)*

## Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

| **Parent Involvement Goal(s)** | **Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement** |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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

| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check<br><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check<br><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1. Parent Involvement**<br><br>Parent Involvement Goal #1: | 1.1.<br><br>Parents signing up for Listerv<br><br>Parents checking or having access to internet | 1.1.<br><br>Increase the opportunities of school events being shared with the parents through the use of school/ classroom websites and Listerv | 1.1.<br><br>Counter of webpage, # of parents signed up for Listerv | 1.1<br><br>Increased satisfaction as measured by the SCIP survey. | 1.1. | | |
| Based on the *School Climate and Perception Survey for Parents,* the percentage of parents who strongly agree with the indicators under Communication will increase from 62% to 65% in 2013. | 2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:* | 2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:* | | | | | |

**Hillsborough 2012**
**Rule 6A-1.099811**
**Revised April 18, 2013**

| | **62%** | **65%** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | Parents are not aware of enrichment opportunities such as peer mediators, ensemble, chorus, KIDS crew, and safety patrol, fairy tale bowl, Battle of the Books, Math Bowl, Science Olympics, and Tropicana Speech contest. | Increase awareness of enrichments opportunities by writing article in the school newsletter making parents aware of the many enrichment opportunities at our school. | SAC<br><br>Newsletter article | SCIP | | | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |
| **Parent Involvement Goal(s)** | **Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement** | | | | | | |

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

# Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

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

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

# Health and Fitness Goal(s)

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

| Additional Goal(s) | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** 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** | |

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

| 1. Health and Fitness Goal | 1.1. | 1.1 | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Lack of Time | Elementary students will engage in 150 minutes of physical education per week in grades kindergarten through 5. | Principal | Classroom walk-through<br><br>Class schedules | Pacer for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular health | | |
| Health and Fitness Goal #1:<br><br>During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students scoring in the "Healthy Fitness Zone" (HFZ) on the Pacer for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular health will increase from 75% to 85%. | 2012 Current Level :* | 2013 Expected Level :* | | | | | |
| | **75%** | **85%** | | | | | |
| | | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | |

## Continuous Improvement Goal(s)

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

| **Additional Goal(s)** | **Problem-Solving Process to Increase** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | |

| | **Student Achievement** | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | | |
| **1. Continuous Improvement Goal** | 1.1. Time to check and post and update events | 1.1. SAC, Administrators, and teachers will utilize phone link, web pages, Ed-Line, school marquee, PTA newsletter to increase information about school events | 1.1. Principal, SAC. Counter on school website | 1.1. Administration and SAC will regular check different medians for content and updates. | 1.1. School Climate and Perception Survey | | |

| Continuous Improvement Goal #1: | 2012 Current Level :* | 2013 Expected Level :* | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The percentage of **parents** who strongly agree with the indicator under **Communication- # 10** Information about how the school is doing (e.g., school grades, new staff, projects) is shared with me, on the *School Climate and Perception Survey for Parents* will increase from 47% in 2012 to 50% in 2013. | | | | | | | |
| | **47%** | **50%** | | | | | |
| | | 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 |

*End of Additional Goal(s)*

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

## NEW Reading Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

| A. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring proficient in reading (Levels 4-9). | A.1. | A.1. See Reading Goal 5d | A.1. | A.1. | A.1. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reading Goal A: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | N/A | | | | | | |

| | | 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. **See Reading Goal 5d** | B.1. | B.1. | B.1. | | |

| Reading Goal B: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%. | | | | | | |
| | **N/A** | | | | | |
| | | 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<br><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check<br><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/ Speaking.** | 1.1. | 1.1. **See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4** | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | |
| <u>CELLA Goal #C:</u><br><br><br><br><br><br>The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from 60% to 63%. | <u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</u> | | | | | |

| | **60%** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>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.<br><br>**See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4** | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | |

| CELLA Goal #D: | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading : | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase from 33% to 35%. | **33%** | | | | | |
| | | 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**<br><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | |

| E. Students scoring proficient in Writing. | 2.1. | 2.1.<br><br>**See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4** | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CELLA Goal #E:<br><br><br>The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA will increase from 27% to 30%. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : | | | | | |

|  | **27%** |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  | 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**<br><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **F. Florida Alternate Assessment:** **Students scoring at in mathematics (Levels 4-9).** | F.1. | F.1.<br><br>**See Math Goal 5d** | F.1. | F.1. | F.1. |  |  |

| Mathematics Goal F: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%. | | | | | | |
| | **100%** | **100%** | | | | |
| | | 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. See Math Goal 5d | G.1. | G.1. | G.1. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mathematics Goal G: The percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |

| | **100%** | **100%** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 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 <mark>and High</mark> 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** <br><br> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** <br><br> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | | |

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

| | | IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Science Goal J:<br><br><br>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:* | | | | | |
| | **100%** | **100%** | | | | | |
| | | 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**<br><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** | | |

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

| 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:* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **100%** | **100%** | | | | |
| | | 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** |

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

| STEM Goal #1:<br><br>Implement/expand project/problem-based learning in math and science. | 1.1<br><br>Need common planning time for math and science. | 1.1<br><br>-Explicit direction for STEM professional learning communities to be established.<br><br>-Documentation of planning of units and outcomes of units in logs.<br><br>-Increase effectiveness of lessons through lesson study and district metrics, etc. | 1.1<br><br>PLC or grade level Leaders | 1.1<br><br>Administrative walk-throughs | 1.1<br><br>Logging number of project-based learning in math and science 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**<br><br>Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.<br>PD Content /Topic<br><br>and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator<br><br>and/or<br><br>PLC Leader | PD Participants<br><br>(e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules<br><br>(e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Hillsborough 2012**
**Rule 6A-1.099811**
**Revised April 18, 2013**                    111

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Project-based learning | K-5 | PLC Facilitator | Science, math, and technology teachers PLCs | On-going | Administrator walk-throughs | Administration |

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

# <mark>NEW</mark> Goal(s) For the 2012-2013 School Year

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

| CTE Goal #1: | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 1 in 2011-2012 to 2 in 2012-2013. | Some schools have materials that they have picked up on their own about careers – fireman/policeman etc… no courses offered, we do not provided resources (maybe through the guidance department) | Use of workbooks, videos, and activities.<br><br>Administer career surveys to the students to see interest areas of focus. | More research needed, add for 2012-13 SIP. | Aggregate and analyze the data every quarter to develop next steps | Career survey Data<br><br>Log of CTE special speakers. |

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

# CTE Professional Development

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

| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| Integration of career opportunities in core academic areas | K - 5 | PLC facilitators | School Wide | Teachers | Classroom walk-throughs | Administration Team |

| Availability of career coursework at the Feeder Middle Schools | Grade 5 | PLC facilitators | School Wide | Guidance Counselors District staff | Classroom walk-throughs | Administration Team |
| Availability of career coursework at the Magnet and Choice Schools | K-5 | PLC facilitators | School Wide | Guidance Counselors District staff | Classroom walk-throughs | Administration Team |

*End of CTE Goal(s)*

# **Differentiated Accountability**

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

| School Differentiated Accountability Status | | |
|---|---|---|
| Priority | Focus | Prevent |

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

## **School Advisory Council (SAC)**

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

Yes          No

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

| **Describe the use of SAC funds**. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Name and Number of Strategy from the School Improvement Plan | Description of Resources that improves student achievement or student engagement | Projected Amount | Final Amount |
| Reading Goal 1.1 | BrainPop Educational Animated Website | $800.00 | $800.00 |
| Math Goal 2.1 | Spirit Sticks for SAC Math Night at SweetBay to motivate students to apply math skills to real world application | $70.00 | $70.00 |
| Reading Goals 1, 2, 3, 4, 5  Math Goals 1,2 3, 4, 5  Science Goals 1,2 | Video truck to motivate students to perform well on the FCAT and use their higher order thinking strategies | $399.00 | |
| Reading Goals 1, 2, 3, 4, 5  Math Goals 1,2 3, 4, 5  Science Goals 1,2 | School Improvement Coordinator Position | $854.99 | $854.99 |
| Final Amount Spent | | | |