FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: McDonald Elementary School	District Name: Hillsborough
Principal: Gregory Cannella	Superintendent: Mary Ellen Elia
SAC Chair: Patricia Parker	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)

High School Feedback Report

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

Highly Qualified Administrators

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Gregory Cannella	M.Ed., Ed. Leadership School Principal Music K - 12	1	6	11/12 C Reading – 45%, LG - 67 pts., LQG – 85 pts. Math – 50%, LG – 57 pts., LQG – 59 pts. 10/11 B 74% AYP Doby Elementary 09/10 A 92% AYP Doby Elementary 08/09 A 92% AYP Doby Elementary
Assistant Principal	Virginia Maxwell	M.Ed., Ed. Leadership School Principal Elementary Ed. 1 – 6	2	7	11/12 C 11/12 C Reading – 45%, LG - 67 pts., LQG – 85 pts. Math – 50%, LG – 57 pts., LQG – 59 pts.

		Mid. Grades Eng. 5 – 9 ESE VE K – 12 ESOL Endorsed			10/11 B 74% AYP McDonald Elementary School 09/10 C 92% AYP James Elem. – A.I.S 08/09 B 100% AYP James Elem. – Grade 3 teacher

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	Stacy Cervone	Reading K – 12 Elem. Education K-6	5	1	11/12 C Reading – 45%, LG - 67 pts., LQG – 85 pts. Math – 50%, LG – 57 pts., LQG – 59 pts. 10/11 B 74% AYP McDonald Elementary School 09/10 A 95% AYP McDonald Elementary
Math	Ashli Newman	Elem. Education K-6 ESOL Endorsement	0	0	11/12 Trapnell Elementary School 10/11 C 77% AYP Trapnell Elementary School 09/10 C 85% AYP Trapnell Elementary School

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 2012	
2. Performance Pay	General Director of Federal	July 2012	

	Programs		
3. MAP	Supervisor of Data Analysis	July 2012	
4. District Mentor Program	District Mentors	Ongoing	
5. District Peer Program	District Peers	Ongoing	
6. School Orientation	Principal	August	
7. Monthly Meetings	Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
8. School Mentors	Principal/Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
9. Leadership Opportunities	Principal	Ongoing	

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

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

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

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Qualified Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
48	15% (7)	44% (21)	23% (11)	19% (9)	27% (13)	100% (48)	4% (2)	4% (2)	58% (28)

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
Catherine Reed	Emily Ryan	Ms. Reed is a Mentor with EET initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Catherine Reed	Britni Colgan	Ms. Reed is a Mentor with EET initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Catherine Reed	Tracee Bannister	Ms. Reed is a Mentor with EET initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Catherine Reed	Christine Pelphrey	Ms. Reed is a Mentor with EET initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Catherine Reed	Jahee Lin	Ms. Reed is a Mentor with EET initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Catherine Reed	Anna Barber	Ms. Reed is a Mentor with EET initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Catherine Reed	Ashley Donaldson	Ms. Reed is a Mentor with EET initiative.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-

		She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Stacy Cervone	Cathy Michalik	Mrs. Cervone is the school's reading coach and a former EET Peer evaluator. She has strengths in the area of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement which will benefit a teacher new to the district such as Mrs. Michalik.	Weekly meetings to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Stacy Cervone	Jennifer Cucci	Mrs. Cervone is the school's reading coach and a former EET Peer evaluator. She has strengths in the area of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement which will benefit a teacher new to the district such as Ms. Cucci.	Weekly meetings to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Stacy Cervone	Stacey Duncan	Mrs. Cervone is the school's reading coach and a former EET Peer evaluator. She has strengths in the area of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement which will benefit a teacher returning to the district such as Mrs. Duncan.	Weekly meetings to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Heidi Smith	Jana Scherer	Mrs. Smith is the school's Kindergarten Team Leader and SAC co-chair. She has strengths in the area of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement which will benefit a teacher new to the district such as Ms. Scherer.	Weekly meetings to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Heidi Smith	Tracy Green	Mrs. Smith is the school's Kindergarten Team Leader and SAC co-chair. She has strengths in the area of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement which will benefit a teacher returning to the district such as Ms. Green.	Weekly meetings to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

Title 1, Part A Services are provided to ensure students who need additional remediation are provided support through after school and summer programs, quality teachers through professional development, content resource teachers and mentors.
Title I, Part C- Migrant The migrant advocate provides services and support to students and parents. The advocate works with teachers and other programs to ensure that the migrant students' needs are being met.
Title I, Part D The district receives funds to support the Alternative Education Program which provides transition services from alternative education to school of choice.
Title II The district receives funds for staff development to increase student achievement through teacher training. In addition, the funds are utilized in the Salary Differential Program at Renaissance Schools.
Title III Services are provided through the district for educational materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners.
Title X- Homeless The district receives funds to provide resources for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school, reading coaches, and extended learning opportunity programs.
Violence Prevention Programs NA
Nutrition Programs NA

Housing Programs
NA
Head Start
We utilize information from students in Head Start to transition into kindergarten.
Adult Education
NA
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.

Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.

- Principal
- Assistant Principal
- Guidance Counselor
- School Psychologist
- Social Worker
- Academic Coaches (Reading Coach, Math Resource)
- ESE teacher
- Representatives from the PLCs for each grade level, K-5
- SAC Chair
- ELP Coordinator
- ELL Representative

(Note that not all members attend every meeting, but are invited based on the goals for the meeting)

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

The MTSS LEADERSHIP TEAM is considered the main leadership team in our school. The MTSS LEADERSHIP TEAM will meet 2-4 times monthly and use the problem solving process to:
- Oversee the multi-layered model of service delivery (Tier 1/Core, Tier 2/Supplemental and Tier 3/Intensive)
- Based on student data, recommend, coordinate and implement supplemental services (Tiers 2 and 3) that match students' non-mastery of skills through:
  - Tutoring during the day in small group pull-outs in reading, math and science
  - Extended Learning Programs during and after school (based on availability of funds)
  - Designated intervention block

- Create, manage and update the school resource map
- Determine scheduling needs, curriculum materials and intervention resources based on identified needs derived from data analysis
- Determine the school-wide professional development needs of faculty and staff and arrange trainings aligned with the SIP goals
- Review and interpret student data (academic, behavior and attendance) at the school and grade levels
- Organize and support systematic data collection as needed
- Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction through the:
  - Implementation and support of PLCs
  - Use of school-based *Reinforcement Instructional Calendars*
  - Use of *Common Core Assessments* at the end of segments/chapters (data will be collected by PLCs and entered and compiled for analysis by members of the MTSS LEADERSHIP TEAM)
  - Implementation of research-based, scientifically validated instructional strategies and/or interventions (e.g., Differentiated Instruction)
  - Communication with major stakeholders (e.g., parents, business partners, etc.) regarding student outcomes through data summaries and conferences
- At the end of each Grading Period, assist in the evaluation of teacher fidelity data and student achievement data collected during the Grading Period.
- Assist with planning, implementing, and evaluating the outcomes of supplemental and intensive interventions in conjunction with PLCs.
- Work collaboratively with the PLCs in the implementation of the C-CIM (Core Continuous Improvement Model) and F-CIM (Florida Continuous Improvement Model on specific tested benchmarks) and progress monitoring.
- Coordinate/collaborate/integrate with other working committees, such as the Literacy Leadership Team (which is charged with developing a plan for embedding/integrating reading and writing strategies across all other content areas).
- Use intervention planning forms to communicate initiatives between the MTSS LEADERSHIP TEAM and PLCs.

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 MTSS LEADERSHIP TEAM and SAC were involved in the School Improvement Plan development that was initiated prior to the end of the 2011-12 school year and during preplanning for the 2012-13 school year.
- The School Improvement Plan is the working document that guides the work of the MTSS LEADERSHIP TEAM. The large part of the work of the team is outlined in the Expected Improvements/Problem Solving Process sections (and related professional development plans) for school-wide goals in Reading, Math, Writing, Science, Attendance and Suspension/Behavior.
- Given that one of the main tasks is to monitor student data related to instruction and interventions, the MTSS LEADERSHIP TEAM will monitor the effectiveness of the strategies developed in problem solving plans by reviewing student data as well as data related to various levels of fidelity. Using data gathered from PLCs, the team will monitor the data and make progress statements on the School Improvement Plan at the end of the first, second and third Grading Period. The MTSS LEADERSHIP TEAM will use the following rubric to evaluate Strategy Fidelity of Implementation and Strategy Effectiveness:

Indicator	Strategy Fidelity Check	Strategy Data Check
Not Evident	Teacher monitoring indicates strategy implementation has not begun.	Student data indicate that strategy implementation is showing no positive effect on student achievement.
Emerging	Some (25-75%) of the intended teachers are implementing the strategy with fidelity. Evidence indicates early or preliminary stages of implementation.	Student data indicate that strategy implementation is showing minimal or poor effect on student achievement.
Operational	Most (>75%) of the intended teachers are implementing the strategy with fidelity. Evidence indicates active implementation.	Student data indicate that strategy implementation is mostly showing a positive effect on student achievement.
Highly Functional	Teacher monitoring indicates that all of the intended teachers are implementing the strategy with fidelity. Evidence exists that the strategy is fully integrated and effectively/consistently implemented.	Student data indicate that strategy implementation is showing a significant positive effect on student achievement.

- The MTSS LEADERSHIP TEAM will communicate with and support the PLCs in implementing the proposed strategies by assigning MTSS LEADERSHIP TEAM members as consultants to the PLCs to facilitate planning and implementation. Once strategies are put in place, PLCs will periodically report on their efforts and student outcomes to the larger MTSS LEADERSHIP TEAM through the grade level MTSS LEADERSHIP TEAM representatives.
- The MTSS LEADERSHIP TEAM and PLCs both use the problem solving process: Problem Identification, Problem Analysis, Intervention Design and Implementation and Evaluation to:
  - review and analyze screening and collateral data
  - develop and test hypotheses about why student/school problems are occurring (changeable barriers)
  - develop and target interventions based on confirmed hypotheses
  - establish methods to track students' progress with appropriate progress monitoring assessments at intervals matched to the intensity of the interventions and/or enrichment

- o develop progress monitoring goals to determine when student(s) need more or less support (e.g., frequency, duration, intensity) to meet established class, grade, and/or school goals (e.g., use of data-based decision-making to fade, maintain, modify or intensify interventions and/or enrichments)
- o review goal statements to ensure they are ambitious, time-bound and meaningful (e.g., SMART goals)
- o assess the fidelity of instruction/intervention implementation and other MTSS processes

MTSS Implementation

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

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

Core Curriculum (Tier 1)

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible
FCAT released test	School Generated Excel Database	Reading Coach/Math Coach/AP
Baseline and Midyear District Assessments	Scantron Achievement Series Electronic Data Wall	MTSSLT, PLCs, individual teachers
District generated assessments from the Office of Assessment and Accountability	Scantron Achievement Series Electronic Data Wall	MTSSLT, PLCs, individual teachers
Subject-specific assessments generated by District-level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Math, Writing and Science	Scantron Achievement Series Electronic Data Wall	MTSSLT, PLCs, individual teachers
FAIR	Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network Electronic Data Wall	Reading Coach/ Reading PLC Facilitator
CELLA	Sagebrush (IPT)	ELL MTSSLT Representative
Common Assessments* *(see below)* of chapter/segments tests using adopted curriculum resources	School Generated Database	Team Leaders/ PLC Facilitators/MTSSLT Member
Running Records	School Generated Database	Reading Coach/ Reading PLC Facilitator/ Classroom Teacher
DRA-2	School Generated Excel Database	Individual Teacher
Assessments on specific tested Benchmarks	School Generated Excel Database	Individual Teacher

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

- Determine if the lesson plans and teaching strategies used to teach the core curriculum were effective or need to be modified.
- Determine which skills need to be taught with alternative strategies.

- Determine which skills need to be re-taught within the core curriculum and which skills need to be moved to the Reinforcement Instructional Calendar.
- Determine which students need Differentiated Instruction within the classroom and which students might need Supplemental Services.

Supplemental/Intensive Instruction (Tiers 2 and 3)

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible for Monitoring
Extended Learning Program (ELP)* *(see below)* Ongoing Progress Monitoring (mini-assessments and other assessments from adopted curriculum resource materials)	School Generated Database in Excel	MTSSLT/ ELP Facilitator
FAIR OPM	School Generated Database in Excel	MTSSLT/ Reading Coach
Other Curriculum Based Measurement** *(see below)*	School Generated Database in Excel	MTSSLT/PLCs
EASI CBM	School Generated Database in Excel	MTSSLT/Reading Coach/PLCs/Individual Teacher

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

** In addition to Core assessments, progress monitoring the outcomes of intensive interventions requires additional Curriculum Based Measures (CBM) that:
- assess the same skills over time
- have multiple equivalent forms
- are sensitive to small amounts of growth over time.

The FAIR Toolkit Ongoing Progress Monitoring measures are one example of this type of assessment that can be used frequently to track student progress in Tiers 2 and 3. The MTSSLT will work to develop an Excel database to be used by interventionists to enter data from FAIR OPMs and other CBM data for ongoing analysis of outcome data for supplementary and intensive supports. The PLCs (with support from MTSSLT consultants) will determine how often students will be assessed using CBM during the course of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, but in general CBM progress monitoring will occur at least once per month for instruction at Tier 2 and weekly to bi-monthly for Tier 3. These assessments will provide more immediate feedback to determine if the alternative teaching strategies are working so that decisions can be made concerning continuing, fading or modifying intervention strategies.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

MTSS PSLT members who attend the district level MTSS trainings will serve as consultants to the PLCs to guide the process of data review and interpretation. The MTSS Leadership Team will continue to work to build consensus with all stakeholders regarding a need for and a focus on school improvement efforts. The MTSS 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 develops 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, as identified by teacher needs assessment and/or EET evaluation data, will occur during faculty meeting times or rolling faculty meetings. Our school will invite our area MTSS Facilitator to visit quarterly to review our progress in implementation of MTSS and provide on-site coaching and support to our MTSS PSLT/PLCs. New staff will be directed to participate in trainings relevant to PLCs and MTSS as they become available.

Describe plan to support MTSS.

Response to Intervention (RtI) has also been described in Florida as a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) for providing high quality instruction and intervention matched to student needs using learning rate over time and level of performance to inform instructional decisions. In order to support MTSS in our schools, we will:
•   Consistently promote the shared vision of one system meeting the needs of ALL students with MTSS as the platform for integrating all school initiatives (i.e., PLC, PSLT, Steering, and SAC meetings, lesson study, school-wide behavior management plans).
•   Provide designated school personnel with the requisite knowledge and experience to support coordination and implementation of MTSS.
•   Provide continued training and support to all school based personnel in problem solving, responding to student data and the use of a systematic method to increase student achievement.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).

The Literacy Leadership Team serves as the school's literacy Professional Learning Community. The team is comprised of:
- Principal
- Assistant Principal for Curriculum
- Reading Coach
- Intermediate Reading Contact Teacher
- Media Specialist
- Classroom Teacher Liaison

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

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

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

The principal also ensures that the LLT monitors reading data, identifies school-wide and individual teachers' reading-focused instructional strengths and weaknesses, and creates a professional development plan to support identified instructional needs in conjunction with the MTSS 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**

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

In Hillsborough County Public schools, all kindergarten children are assessed for Kindergarten Readiness using the FLKRS (Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screener.) This state-selected assessment contains a subset of the Early Childhood Observation System and the first two measures of the Florida Assessments in Reading (FAIR). The instruments used in the screening are based upon the Florida Voluntary Prekindergarten (VPK) Education Standards. Parents are provided with a letter from the Commissioner of Education, explaining the assessments. Teachers will meet with parents after the assessments have been completed to review student performance. Data from the FAIR will be used to assist teachers in creating homogeneous groupings for small group reading instruction. Children entering Kindergarten may have benefited from the Hillsborough County Public Schools' Voluntary Prekindergarten Program. This program is offered at elementary schools in the summer and during the school year in selected Head Start classrooms and as a blended program in several Early Exceptional Learning Program (EELP) classrooms. Starting in the 2012-2013 school year, students in the VPK program will be given the state-created VPK Assessment that looks at Print Knowledge, Phonological Awareness, Mathematics and Oral Language/Vocabulary. This assessment will be administered at the start and end of the VPK program. A copy of these assessments will be mailed to the school in which the child will be registered for kindergarten, enabling the child's teacher to have a better understanding of the child's abilities from the first day of school. Parent Involvement events for Transitioning Children into Kindergarten include Kindergarten RoundUp. This event provides parents with an opportunity to meet the teachers and hear about the academic program. Parents are encouraged to complete the school registration procedure at this time to ensure that the child is able to start school on time.

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

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5). Reading Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring 3 or higher will increase from 45% to 48%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **45%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **48%**	1.1 Teachers are at various levels of understanding how to provide differentiated instruction based on student data	1.1 **Academic Coach and Teacher Collaboration** Student achievement improves through teachers' collaboration with the academic coach in all content areas. The academic coach's position description defines the level and type of teacher support that is expected. **Actions/Details Teacher** -The teacher will reflect on walk through and student assessment data in order to identify areas for coaching cycles. -Conduct grade level PLCS to: • Plan lessons that embed rigorous tasks • Analyze student data from standards based assessment • Plan for interventions and the intentional grouping of the students *Academic Coach* -The academic coach and administration conducts one-on-one data chats	1.1 Who Instructional Coaches AP Principal How Instructional Coaching Logs	1.1. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader shares SMART Goal data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	1.1 3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)

				with individual teachers using the teacher's student past and/or present data. -The academic coach rotates through all subjects' PLCs to: • Support lesson planning that embeds rigorous tasks • Support the identification/selection/development of rigorous standards based common assessments • Support the standards based assessment data analysis • Support the planning for interventions and the intentional grouping of the students -Using walk-through data, the academic coach/administration identifies teachers for support in co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing and debriefing. ***Leadership Team and Coach*** -The academic coach meets with the Leadership team to map out a high-level summary plan of action for the school year. -Every two weeks, the academic coach meets with the principal/AP to • Review log and work accomplished and • Develop a detailed plan of action for the next two weeks.			

			1.2 Teacher's knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development	1.2 **Identifying and creating text-dependent questions to deepen reading comprehension** Questions of all types and levels are necessary to scaffold students' understanding of complex text. Teachers need to understand and use **higher-order, text-dependent questions** (such as can be designed with Webb's Depth of Knowledge and Bloom's Taxonomy) at the word/phrase, sentence, and paragraph/passage levels. Student reading comprehension improves when students are required to provide evidence to support their answers to text-dependent questions. Scaffolding of students' grappling with complex text through well-crafted text-dependent question assists students' in discovering and achieving deeper understanding of the author's meaning. **Actions/Details** *Professional Development* -The site-based reading coach and content teacher leaders will deliver to all teachers the district-provided professional development, *Tools for Teachers: Implementing Key Shifts in the CCSS, Part*	1.2 Who AP Principal Coaches PLC Facilitators How Walk Through Data PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -Administration and coach rotate through PLCs looking for complex text discussion.	1.2. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)

			Two: Text Dependent Questions focused on the **characteristics and the structured process in creating in-depth and text-dependent questions.** -The site-based reading coach and content teacher leaders conduct small group l trainings and provide site-based professional development opportunities to assist teachers' in creating text-dependent questions that draw the reader back to the text to discover what it says, to demand concrete and explicit student answers rooted in the text, and to frame inquires in ways that do not rely on a mix of personal opinion, background information, and imaginative speculation. -The site-based reading coach provide teachers assistance through classroom modeling, facilitating peer-coaching sessions, co-teaching, and classroom observation. *Within PLCs* -All teachers work to improve upon, both individually and collectively, the ability to create and deliver higher-order, text-dependent questions that addresses the Anchor Reading Standard deficits in all content areas. -During PLCs, teachers create higher-order, text-dependent questions for upcoming lessons anticipating the need to		

			scaffold and differentiate questions based on student responses. -During PLCs, teachers study students' responses to the scaffolded close reading lessons in order to plan lessons. ***In the classroom*** <u>During the lessons, teachers:</u> - Will clearly identify the standards addressed in the lesson and the objectives to be achieved at the end of the lesson. - Will employ higher-order, text-dependent questioning to scaffold the students to understanding of the complex text. - Will wait for full attention from the class before asking questions and will employ wait time to ensure all students have the opportunity to think before responding. - Will monitor and adapt questions based on student responses to support students as they grapple with determining meaning from complex text. - Will ask in-depth, text-dependent questions to provide multiple reasons and opportunities for the students to self-discover the author's meaning. - Will focus on specific words, details, explanations and arguments as the basis for			

		creating text-dependent questions.	
		- Will facilitate discussion opportunities to scaffold students' understanding of the complex text when they hit roadblocks in understanding.	
		- Will ask probing questions to encourage students to elaborate and support assertions and claims drawn from the text.	
		- The teacher will allow students to "unpack their thinking" by describing how they arrive at an answer.	
		<u>**During the lessons, students:**</u>	
		- Will be able to share the lessons' objectives in terms of expected student outcomes.	
		- Will return to the text to find evidence to support answers to text-dependent questions.	
		- Will engage in analysis of the author's choice of words/phrases, sentence/syntax, paragraphs and passages to determine author's meaning	
		- Will participate in discussion activities to clarify their understanding of the complex text in response to teacher and student led questioning.	
		- Will independently respond to the text through a formative/culminating	

			writing activity which demands an evidence-based response to reading. *School Leadership* - The coach/resource teacher/PLC member/administrator collects walk-through data (percentage of use) on the implementation of higher-order, text-based questions.		
		1.3 Lack of consistent implementation of the Core-Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM)	1.3 **PLC Collaboration using the Plan-Do-Check-Act Model** **Strategy/Task** Student achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: • What is it we expect them to learn? • How will we know if they have learned it? • How will we respond when they don't learn? • How will we respond when they already know it? **Actions/Details** *Within PLCs* -To facilitate collaboration, each like course/grade level has a designated facilitator to guide discussions	1.3 Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -PLC facilitators How PLCS turn their logs into administration after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.	1.3. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team.	1.3 3x per year FAIR During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)

		-PLCs have a system for recording SMART goal outcomes and reporting the data to administration/ leadership team.
		-PLCs engage in the following instructional practices within the Plan-Do-Check/**Reflect**-Act model.
		• Identify which practice/box of the Plan-Do-Check-Act model/log will be the discussion topic for the PLC meeting.
		• **Plan for Instruction for upcoming units of study and/or Standards**
		  For an upcoming unit of instruction discuss the following:
		  a. What do we want students to learn by the end of the unit?
		  b. What are standards within this unit of instruction?
		• Planning for the End-of-Unit Assessment
		  For an upcoming unit of instruction, discuss one or more of the following:
		  a. Will a pre-test be administered? What tool will be used? How will we use this data to pace lessons within this unit of instruction and define the road map for teaching?
		  b. What end-of-unit assessment will be used?
		  c. When we unpack the assessment/test item specifications, what		

		information does it give us to guide instruction? d. What does mastery look like for each standard? e. How do we want teachers to aggregate the individual teacher data that will be brought to the PLC for analysis? f. What is the SMART goal for this unit of instruction? • **Plan for the "Do"** For an upcoming lesson, discuss one or more of the following: a. What do teachers need to do in order to meet our SMART goal? b. What resources do we need? c. How will the lessons be designed so they have the same rigor as the identified end-of-unit assessment? d. What are the instructional outcomes/essential questions for lessons? e. What content knowledge do we need to develop/build up in order to effectively teach the lesson? f. What are the specific instructional outcomes/essential questions? g. If a pretest is given – how are we going to use the data to drive lesson planning? h. What checks-for-understanding will we implement? i. What teaching		

			strategies/best practices will we use to help students learn? j. What are *teachers* going to do during the lesson? k. What are *student* going to do during the lesson? • **Reflect on the "Do"/Analyze Checks for Understanding and Student Work <u>during</u> the unit.** For lessons that have already been taught within the unit of instruction (both planned by the PLC **and** planned by individual teachers), teachers **reflect** and discuss one or more of the following: a. What worked within the lesson? How do you know it is successful? Why was it successful? b. What didn't work within the lesson? Why? What are we going to do next? c. For the implementation of the selected strategy which was chosen during PLCs, what worked? How do you know it is successful? Why was it successful? What checks for understanding were used during the lessons? d. For the implementation of the selected strategy which was chosen during PLCs, what didn't work? Why? What are we going to do next? e. What were the outcomes of the checks for			

understanding and/or analysis of student work?

f. How are we going to use the checks for understanding/analysis of student work to drive "laser-like-precision" lessons for whole group or targeted small groups?

g. How do we take what we have learned and apply it to future lessons?

- **Reflect/Check – Analyze the End-of-Unit Assessment**

Following the end-of-unit assessment, discuss one or more of the following:

a. What is the data?

b. What is the data telling us as individual teachers?

c. What is the data telling us as a grade level/PLC/department?

d. What are students not learning? Why is this occurring?

e. Who is not learning? For students who are not learning, implement the <u>Tier 1 Core Instruction Problem Solving Document</u> protocol to guide the problem solving process.

f. Using item analysis, why did students select wrong items?

g. Did we meet our SMART goal? Did we meet our SMART goal for our targeted

			subgroups? h. Do we need to re-teach to the whole group or small group of students? Do we need to re-teach as a mini-lesson? • **Reflect/Check – Provide Student Feedback** Discuss the following: a. How will we provide meaningful instructional feedback to our students? b. How will students analyze their errors? c. How will students chart their progress? • **Act on the End-of-Unit Assessment Data** After data analysis, develop a plan to act on the data. a. What are we going to do about students not learning? b. What are the skills/concepts/standards that need re-teaching/interventions? c. What skill(s) need to be re-taught to the whole class, either as a whole lesson mini-lesson? d. What skill(s) need to be re-taught in targeted students/groups? Who are the students that need re-teaching? e. How are we going to re-teach the skill differently? f. How we will know that our re-teaching/interventions are working? g. What are we going to do			

				for students who know the skills/standards? h. How will we use the data gathered from this end-of-unit assessment to drive future instructional units? (Back to step #2).				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.				2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Reading Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring 4 or 5 will increase from 19% to 22%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **19%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **22%**		See Goal 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3				
				2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
				2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.				3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.
Reading Goal #3: The number of points for students making annual learning gains will increase from 67 to 70.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **67 points**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **70 points**		See Goal 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3				

			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
			3.2.	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:							
4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.				4.1 See Goal 1.1			
Reading Goal #4: The number of points for students in the lowest 25% making annual learning gains will increase from 85 to 88.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **85 points**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **88 points**					
			4.2 Teachers may not clearly understand how to implement Reciprocal teaching throughout all components of the reader's workshop. -Understanding how to evaluate the effectiveness of Reciprocal teaching.	4.2 **Strategy** Students' reading comprehension will improve through the use of the four strategies (predicting, questioning, clarifying, and summarizing) that encompass Reciprocal teaching. **Action Steps** -As a Professional Development activity, -Teachers pretest using the FAIR assessment for K-5. -Teachers design Reciprocal teaching lessons to target the needs of small group, and individuals and establish appropriate timelines. -Teachers implement the lessons or the identified	4.2 Who -Principal -AP -Reading Coach -Reading Resource Teacher -PLC Facilitators -Instructional Coaches How -Small group/intervention group walk-throughs observing each component of Reciprocal teaching.	4.2. Teacher Level PLC Level PLCs will review evaluation data. Leadership Team Level The Problem-Solving Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team reviews FAIR data to determine the increase in the percentage of students making gains on the reading comprehension task on FAIR.	3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks) EASY CBM Progress Monitoring

			students -Teachers posttest using FAIR assessment for K-5. -Teachers bring assessment data back to PLCs to discuss the effectiveness of Reciprocal Teaching. -PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.				
			4.3 See Goal 1.3				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target			**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Reading Goal #5:								
5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.** Reading Goal #5A: The percentage of White students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 53% to 58%. The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 34% to 41%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White:53% Black: Y Hispanic: 34% Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White: 58% Black: Hispanic: 41% Asian: American Indian:	5A.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5A.1. See Goals 1, 3, & 4	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.	
			5A.2.	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2	

			5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5B.1.	5B.1. See Goals 1, 3, & 4	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.
Reading Goal #5B: The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 45% to 51%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **45%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **51%**					
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
Reading Goal #5C:	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **Y**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (IND/ESE) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
Reading Goal #5D: The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 31% to 38%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **31%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **38%**		See Goals 1, 3, & 4			
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Text Complexity and Social Studies	K – 5	Reading Coach/Literacy Resource	School-wide	August 2012 Pre-planning	Classroom walkthroughs Lesson Plans	Administration Team Instructional Coaches
Identifying and Creating Text-Dependent Questions to Deepen Reading Comprehension (K-12)	K – 5	Reading Coach	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team Instructional Coaches
Designing and Delivering a Close Reading Lesson Using in-Depth Questioning (K-12)	K – 5	Reading Coach	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team Instructional Coaches

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

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

1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in mathematics (Level 3-5).			1.1.
			Teachers are at various levels of understanding how to provide differentiated instruction based on student data
				1.1.
				Academic Coach and Teacher Collaboration
				Student achievement improves through teachers' collaboration with the academic coach in all content areas. The academic coach's position description defines the level and type of teacher support that is expected.
				
				Actions/Details
				Teacher
				-The teacher will reflect on walk through and student assessment data in order to identify areas for coaching cycles.
				-Conduct grade level PLCS to:
				• Plan lessons that embed rigorous tasks
				• Analyze student data from standards based assessment
				• Plan for interventions and the intentional grouping of the students
				
				Academic Coach
				-The academic coach and administration conducts one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the
					1.1.
					Who
					   Instructional
					   Coaches
					   AP
					   Principal
					How
					   Instructional
					   Coaching Logs
						1.1.
						Teacher Level
						-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.
						-Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal.
						PLC Level
						-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses.
						-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.
						-For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.
						Leadership Team Level
						-PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Leadership Team.
						-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.
							1.1.
							3x per year
							District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing
							Form 1
							Form 2
							NGSSS
							
							During the Grading Period
							Go Math Chapter Assessments, Benchmark Mini-Assessments, Student Performance Tasks-Problem Solving

Mathematics Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Math will increase from 50% to 53%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **50%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **53%**					

				teacher's student past and/or present data. -The academic coach rotates through all subjects' PLCs to: • Support lesson planning that embeds rigorous tasks • Support the identification/selection/development of rigorous standards based common assessments • Support the standards based assessment data analysis • Support the planning for interventions and the intentional grouping of the students -Using walk-through data, the academic coach/administration identifies teachers for support in co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing and debriefing. ***Leadership Team and Coach*** -The academic coach meets with the Leadership team to map out a high-level summary plan of action for the school year. -Every two weeks, the academic coach meets with the principal/APC to • Review log and work accomplished and • Develop a detailed plan of action for the next two weeks.			

		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.

		Not all Teachers are aware of how to model for students on how to read a mathematics word problem and apply problem-solving strategies.
		
		Not all teachers are comfortable with problem solving being the primary focus of math instruction.
			Students' math skills will improve through participation in lessons where teachers model for students on how to read a mathematics word problem and apply problem-solving strategies.
			
			Action/Details:
			Professional Development
			-Teachers/Instructional Coaches will attend district offered Connections training, HOT Talk Cool Moves training and Problem Solving Training in Mathematics.
			-The instructional coach will conduct small group trainings and provide professional development opportunities to assist teachers in the use of the strategy, problem-solving, in a mathematics classroom and use of rubrics to assess student use of problem-solving strategies.
			-The instructional coach will provide teachers assistance through classroom modeling, coaching sessions, co-teaching, and observation.
			
			Instructional Coach
			-The instructional coach will provide weekly problem-solving task to each grade level, based on the global concept guides.
			-The instructional coach will
				Who
				   AP
				   Principal
				   Instructional Coach
				   PLC Facilitators
				   Classroom Teachers
				
				How
				-Classroom walk-throughs observing lessons designed with problem-solving strategies.
				-Elementary Mathematics Walk-through Form
				-Mathematics PLC Recording Documents
					Teacher Level
					-Teachers reflect on problem-solving lessons and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.
					-Teachers use the problem-solving rubric and on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal
					PLC Level
					-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses.
					-PLCs reflect on problem-solving lessons and data used to drive future instruction.
					-For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.
					Leadership Team Level
					-PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.
					-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.
						3x per year
						District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing
						Form 1
						Form 2
						NGSSS
						
						During the Grading Period
						Go Math Chapter Assessments, Benchmark Mini-Assessments, Student Performance Tasks-Problem Solving

		create a problem-solving rubric for teachers to utilize for strategy implementation. **Within PLCs** -All teachers will discuss the weekly problem-solving task and discuss anticipated student responses. Teachers will discuss differentiation strategies to support the problem-solving task. -During PLCs, teachers will bring assessment data from the problem-solving task and discuss the effectiveness of the problem-solving strategies that were implemented to guide future instruction. **In the Classroom** -Teachers will implement lessons, modeling for students on how to read a mathematics word problem and apply problem-solving strategies. -Teachers will implement the weekly problem-solving task provided by the instructional coach. -Teachers will utilize the problem-solving rubric to assess student use of problem-solving strategies. -Teachers and students will conduct discussions in a whole group setting to promote the use of problem-solving strategies.			
		1.3. Lack of consistent implementation of the Core-Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM)	1.3. **PLC Collaboration using the Plan-Do-Check-Act Model** **Strategy/Task** Student achievement	1.3. Who -Principal -AP -Instructional Coaches -PLC facilitators	1.3. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL,	1.3. 3x per year District Baseline and Mid-year Testing Form 1 Form 2

| | | | improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions:
 • What is it we expect them to learn?
 • How will we know if they have learned it?
 • How will we respond when they don't learn?
 • How will we respond when they already know it?

 Actions/Details
 Within PLCs
 -To facilitate collaboration, each like course/grade level has a designated facilitator to guide discussions
 -PLCs have a system for recording SMART goal outcomes and reporting the data to administration/ leadership team.
 -PLCs engage in the following instructional practices within the Plan-Do-Check/**Reflect**-Act model.
 • Identify which practice/box of the Plan-Do-Check-Act model/log will be the discussion topic for the PLC meeting.
 • **Plan for Instruction for upcoming units of study and/or Standards** | How
 PLCS turn their logs into administration after a unit of instruction is complete.
 -PLCs receive feedback on their logs.
 -Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings
 -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team
 -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis. | and/or leadership team. | NGSSS

 During the Grading Period
 Go Math Chapter Assessments, Benchmark Mini-Assessments, Student Performance Tasks-Problem-Solving |

			For an upcoming unit of instruction discuss the following: a. What do we want students to learn by the end of the unit? b. What are standards within this unit of instruction? • Planning for the End-of-Unit Assessment For an upcoming unit of instruction, discuss one or more of the following: a. Will a pre-test be administered? What tool will be used? How will we use this data to pace lessons within this unit of instruction and define the road map for teaching? b. What end-of-unit assessment will be used? c. When we unpack the assessment/test item specifications, what information does it give us to guide instruction? d. What does mastery look like for each standard? e. How do we want teachers to aggregate the individual teacher data that will be brought to the PLC for analysis? f. What is the SMART goal for this unit of instruction? • **Plan for the "Do"** For an upcoming lesson, discuss one or more of the following: a. What do teachers need to do in order to meet our SMART goal? b. What resources do we need? c. How will the lessons be			

		designed so they have the same rigor as the identified end-of-unit assessment?	
		d. What are the instructional outcomes/essential questions for lessons?	
		e. What content knowledge do we need to develop/build up in order to effectively teach the lesson?	
		f. What are the specific instructional outcomes/essential questions?	
		g. If a pretest is given – how are we going to use the data to drive lesson planning?	
		h. What checks-for-understanding will we implement?	
		i. What teaching strategies/best practices will we use to help students learn?	
		j. What are *teachers* going to do during the lesson?	
		k. What are *student* going to do during the lesson?	
		• **Reflect on the "Do"/Analyze Checks for Understanding and Student Work <u>during</u> the unit.**	
		For lessons that have already been taught within the unit of instruction (both planned by the PLC **and** planned by individual teachers), teachers **reflect** and discuss one or more of the following:	
		a. What worked within the lesson? How do you	

			know it is successful? Why was it successful? b. What didn't work within the lesson? Why? What are we going to do next? c. For the implementation of the selected strategy which was chosen during PLCs, what worked? How do you know it is successful? Why was it successful? What checks for understanding were used during the lessons? d. For the implementation of the selected strategy which was chosen during PLCs strategy, what didn't work? Why? What are we going to do next? e. What were the outcomes of the checks for understanding and/or analysis of student work? f. How are we going to use the checks for understanding/analysis of student work to drive "laser-like-precision" lessons for whole group or targeted small groups? g. How do we take what we have learned and apply it to future lessons? • **Reflect/Check – Analyze the End-of-Unit Assessment** Following the end-of-unit assessment, discuss one or more of the following: a. What is the data? b. What is the data telling us as individual teachers? c. What is the data telling us as a grade level/PLC/department?			

			d. What are students not learning? Why is this occurring? e. Who is not learning? For students who are not learning, implement the <u>Tier 1 Core Instruction Problem Solving Document</u> protocol to guide the problem solving process. f. Using item analysis, why did students select wrong items? g. Did we meet our SMART goal? Did we meet our SMART goal for our targeted subgroups? h. Do we need to re-teach to the whole group or small group of students? Do we need to re-teach as a mini-lesson? • **Reflect/Check – Provide Student Feedback** Discuss the following: a. How will we provide meaningful instructional feedback to our students? b. How will students analyze their errors? c. How will students chart their progress? • **Act on the End-of-Unit Assessment Data** After data analysis, develop a plan to act on the data. a. What are we going to do about students not learning? b. What are the skills/concepts/standards that need re-teaching/interventions? c. What skill(s) need to be re-taught to the whole class, either as a whole			

lesson mini-lesson? d. What skill(s) need to be re-taught in targeted students/groups? Who are the students that need re-teaching? e. How are we going to re-teach the skill differently? f. How we will know that our re-teaching/interventions are working? g. What are we going to do for students who know the skills/standards? h. How will we use the data gathered from this end-of-unit assessment to drive future instructional units? (Back to step #2).		

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Mathematics Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring 4 or 5 on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Math will increase from 17% to 20%. / 2012 Current Level of Performance:* **17%** / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **20%**	See Goal 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3				
	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool

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

3. **FCAT 2.0:** Points for students making learning gains in mathematics.			3.1. See Goal 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.
Mathematics Goal #3: The number of points for students making annual learning gains on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Math will increase from 57 to 60.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **57 points**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **60 points**					
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3..3.	3.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
4. **FCAT 2.0:** Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4.1. See Goal 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.
Mathematics Goal #4: The number of points for students in the lowest 25% making annual learning gains on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Math will increase from 59 to 62.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **59 points**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **62 points**					
			4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.
			4.3	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.

Hillsborough 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised July, 2012

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** Mathematics Goal #5A: The percentage of White students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 54% to 59%. The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 61% to 65%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White: 54% Black:61% Hispanic: Y Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White: 59% Black: 65% Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5A.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5A.1. **See goals 1, 3 & 4**	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.	
			5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	
			5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**	
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	

	Y						
			5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
Mathematics Goal #5C:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Y						
			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 (IND/ESE) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
Mathematics Goal #5D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

| | | | 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
Problem Solving Training in Mathematics	K - 5	Math Resource	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going PLC meetings	Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor DI implementation -PLC logs	Administration Team Instructional Coach
Differentiated Instruction	K - 5	-Administration -District Resource Personnel -Math Resource	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going PLC meetings	Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor DI implementation -PLC logs	Administration Team Instructional Coach

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science.
 	
Science Goal #1:
 	
The percentage of students scoring 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 30% to 33%.
			1.1.
			
			Teachers are at various levels of understanding how to provide differentiated instruction based on student data
				1.1.
				
				Academic Coach and Teacher Collaboration
				Student achievement improves through teachers' collaboration with the academic coach in all content areas. The academic coach's position description defines the level and type of teacher support that is expected.
				
				Actions/Details
				Teacher
				-The teacher will reflect on walk through and student assessment data in order to identify areas for coaching cycles.
				-Conduct grade level PLCS to:
				• Plan lessons that embed rigorous tasks
				• Analyze student data from standards based assessment
				• Plan for interventions and the intentional grouping of the students
				
				Academic Coach
				-The academic coach and administration conducts one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the teacher's student past and/or
					1.1.
					Who
					    Instructional
					    Coaches
					    AP
					    Principal
					How
					    Instructional
					    Coaching Logs
						1.1.
						Teacher Level
						-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.
						-Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal.
						PLC Level
						-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses.
						-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.
						-For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.
						Leadership Team Level
						-PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Leadership Team.
						-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.
							1.1.
							3x per year
							District Baseline and Mid-year Tests
							
							During the Grading Period
							Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, intervention checks, etc…)

2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	
30%	**33%**	

				present data.			
				-The academic coach rotates through all subjects' PLCs to: • Support lesson planning that embeds rigorous tasks • Support the identification/selection/ development of rigorous standards based common assessments • Support the standards based assessment data analysis • Support the planning for interventions and the intentional grouping of the students -Using walk-through data, the academic coach/administration identifies teachers for support in co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing and debriefing. ***Leadership Team and Coach*** -The academic coach meets with the Leadership team to map out a high-level summary plan of action for the school year. -Every two weeks, the academic coach meets with the principal/APC to • Review log and work accomplished and • Develop a detailed plan of action for the next two weeks.			
			1.2. Teachers are at varying skill levels in the use of	1.2. **Students' science skills will improve through**	1.2. Who AP	1.2. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson	1.2. 3x per year District Baseline and Mid-

		inquiry and the 5E lesson plan model. Lack of common planning time to facilitate and hold PLCs.	**participation in the 5E instructional model.** **Action/Details:** -Teachers will attend the District Science training and share the 5E instructional model information with their PLCs. -PLCs write SMART goals based on units of instruction. -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time collaboratively building 5E Instructional Model for upcoming lessons. -PLC teachers instruct students using the 5E Instructional Model. -At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. -Teachers bring assessment data back to PLCs. Based on the data, teachers discuss effectiveness of the 5E Lesson Plans to drive future instruction	Principal District Resource Teachers PLC Facilitators Classroom Teachers 1.2 How -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. -Elementary Science Classroom Walk-Through Form	outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	year Tests During the Grading Period Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, intervention checks, etc…)
		1.3. Lack of consistent implementation of the Core-Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM)	1.3. **PLC Collaboration using the Plan-Do-Check-Act Model** **Strategy/Task** Student achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions:	1.3. Who -Principal -AP -Instructional Coaches -PLC facilitators How PLCS turn their logs into administration after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators and coaches attend	1.3. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team.	1.3. 3x per year District Baseline and Mid-year Tests During the Grading Period Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, intervention checks, etc…)

			- What is it we expect them to learn? - How will we know if they have learned it? - How will we respond when they don't learn? - How will we respond when they already know it? **Actions/Details** *Within PLCs* -To facilitate collaboration, each like course/grade level has a designated facilitator to guide discussions -PLCs have a system for recording SMART goal outcomes and reporting the data to administration/ leadership team. -PLCs engage in the following instructional practices within the Plan-Do-Check/**Reflect**-Act model. - Identify which practice/box of the Plan-Do-Check-Act model/log will be the discussion topic for the PLC meeting. **Plan for Instruction for upcoming units of study and/or Standards** For an upcoming unit of instruction discuss the following: a. What do we want students to learn by the end of the unit? b. What are standards within this unit of instruction? - Planning for the End-of-Unit Assessment For an upcoming unit of instruction, discuss one or more of the following:	targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.		

			a. Will a pre-test be administered? What tool will be used? How will we use this data to pace lessons within this unit of instruction and define the road map for teaching? b. What end-of-unit assessment will be used? c. When we unpack the assessment/test item specifications, what information does it give us to guide instruction? d. What does mastery look like for each standard? e. How do we want teachers to aggregate the individual teacher data that will be brought to the PLC for analysis? f. What is the SMART goal for this unit of instruction? • **Plan for the "Do"** For an upcoming lesson, discuss one or more of the following: a. What do teachers need to do in order to meet our SMART goal? b. What resources do we need? c. How will the lessons be designed so they have the same rigor as the identified end-of-unit assessment? d. What are the instructional outcomes/essential questions for lessons? e. What content knowledge do we need to develop/build up in order to effectively teach the lesson? f. What are the specific instructional outcomes/essential			

			questions?			
			g. If a pretest is given – how are we going to use the data to drive lesson planning?			
			h. What checks-for-understanding will we implement?			
			i. What teaching strategies/best practices will we use to help students learn?			
			j. What are *teachers* going to do during the lesson?			
			k. What are *student* going to do during the lesson?			
			• **Reflect on the "Do"/Analyze Checks for Understanding and Student Work <u>during</u> the unit.**			
			For lessons that have already been taught within the unit of instruction (both planned by the PLC **and** planned by individual teachers), teachers **reflect** and discuss one or more of the following:			
			a. What worked within the lesson? How do you know it is successful? Why was it successful?			
			b. What didn't work within the lesson? Why? What are we going to do next?			
			c. For the implementation of the selected strategy which was chosen during PLCs , what worked? How do you know it is successful? Why was it successful? What checks for understanding were used during the lessons?			
			d. For the implementation of the selected strategy			

			which was chosen during PLCs , what didn't work? Why? What are we going to do next?			
			e. What were the outcomes of the checks for understanding and/or analysis of student work?			
			f. How are we going to use the checks for understanding/analysis of student work to drive "laser-like-precision" lessons for whole group or targeted small groups?			
			g. How do we take what we have learned and apply it to future lessons?			
			• **Reflect/Check – Analyze the End-of-Unit Assessment**			
			Following the end-of-unit assessment, discuss one or more of the following:			
			a. What is the data?			
			b. What is the data telling us as individual teachers?			
			c. What is the data telling us as a grade level/PLC/department?			
			d. What are students not learning? Why is this occurring?			
			e. Who is not learning? For students who are not learning, implement the <u>Tier 1 Core Instruction Problem Solving Document</u> protocol to guide the problem solving process.			
			f. Using item analysis, why did students select wrong items?			
			g. Did we meet our SMART goal? Did we meet our SMART goal for our			

			targeted subgroups? h. Do we need to re-teach to the whole group or small group of students? Do we need to re-teach as a mini-lesson? • **Reflect/Check** – **Provide Student Feedback** Discuss the following: a. How will we provide meaningful instructional feedback to our students? b. How will students analyze their errors? c. How will students chart their progress? • **Act on the End-of-Unit Assessment Data** After data analysis, develop a plan to act on the data. a. What are we going to do about students not learning? b. What are the skills/concepts/standards that need re-teaching/interventions? c. What skill(s) need to be re-taught to the whole class, either as a whole lesson mini-lesson? d. What skill(s) need to be re-taught in targeted students/groups? Who are the students that need re-teaching? e. How are we going to re-teach the skill differently? f. How we will know that our re-teaching/interventions are working? g. What are we going to do for students who know the skills/standards? h. How will we use the data gathered from this end-of-			

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science.			2.1. See Goal 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Science Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a 4 or 5 on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 3% to 11%. .	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **3%**	2013Expected Level of Performance:* **11%**					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

(above table continues from previous page, top cell: "unit assessment to drive future instructional units? (Back to step #2).")

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Differentiated Instruction	K - 5	-Administration -District Resource Personnel -Math Resource	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going	Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor DI implementation -PLC logs	Administration Team Instructional Coach
Identifying and Creating Text-Dependent Questions to Deepen Reading Comprehension (K-12)	K – 5	Reading Coach	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team Instructional Coaches

Designing and Delivering a Close Reading Lesson Using in-Depth Questioning (K-12)	K – 5	Reading Coach	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team Instructional Coaches

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**
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing.			1.1. Not all teachers know how to plan and execute writing lessons with a focus on mode-based writing. -Not all teachers know how to review student writing to determine trends and needs in order to drive instruction. -All teachers need training to score student writing accurately during the 2012-2013 school year using information provided by the state.	1.1. **Strategy** Students' use of mode-specific writing will improve through use of Writers' Workshop/daily instruction with a focus on mode-specific writing. **Action Steps** -Based on baseline data, PLCs write SMART goals for each Grading Period. (For example, during the first Grading Period, 50% of the students will score 4.0 or above on the end-of-the Grading Period writing prompt.) *Plan:* -Professional Development for updated rubric courses -Professional Development for instructional delivery of mode-specific writing -Training to facilitate data-driven PLCs -Using data to identify trends and drive instruction -Lesson planning based on the needs of students *Do:* -Daily/ongoing models and application of appropriate mode-specific writing based on teaching points -Daily/ongoing conferencing *Check:* Review of daily drafts and	1.1. Who Teacher Principal APEI Resource/Contact PLCs How Monitored -PLC logs -Classroom walk-throughs -Elementary Writers' Workshop Walk-through Checklist for HCPS	1.1. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	1.1. -Student monthly demand writes/formative assessments -Student daily drafts -Student revisions -Student portfolios
Writing/LA Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes will increase from 86% to 89%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **86%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **89%**					

				scoring monthly demand writes -PLC discussions and analysis of student writing to determine trends and needs *Act:* -Receive additional professional development in areas of need -Seek additional professional knowledge through book studies/research -Spread the use of effective practices across the school based on evidence shown in the best practice of others -Use what is learned to begin the cycle again, revise as needed, increase scale if possible, etc. -Plan ongoing monitoring of the solution(s)			
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Writing/Language Arts Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Writing Scoring Rubric Proficiency Update	Grades 2 – 5	District PDS (MOODLE) APEI	Grades 2 – 5	On-going	Classroom Walkthroughs	Administration District Resource Personnel
Mode and Craft	Grades 2 – 5	District PDS (MOODLE) APEI	Grades 2 – 5	On-going	Classroom Walkthroughs Lesson Plans	Administration District Resource Personnel

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** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
1. Attendance <u>Attendance Goal #1:</u> 1. The attendance rate will increase from 92.87% to 93%. 2. The number of students who have 10 or more **unexcused** absences throughout the school year will **decrease by 10%.**	2012 Current Attendance Rate:* **92.87** 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) **114** 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) **0**	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* **93.5** 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) **102** 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) **0**	1.1 Students are absent and parents are not contacting the school.	1.1. **Tier 1** All teachers contact parents after the third unexcused absence. Teachers are given a script to follow for making the phone call. Teachers record documentation of contact (to be used for an Attendance Referral if needed).	1.1. Teachers will keep a parent contact log in which the phone call will be documented.	1.1. Administrative Team and Attendance committee will review the parent contact logs as needed.	1.1. Parent Contact Logs
			1.2. No system is utilized to easily identify students with significant number of tardies and how much instructional time is lost.	**1.2 Tier 1** School will use EASI online attendance to sign students in and out and will print the report of students with excessive sign-ins and sign-outs every week.	1.2 Attendance Committee Will review the interventions implemented for students with excessive sign-ins and outs.	1.2 Reports from EASI sign in system will be analyzed to determine if the problem is improving and which students should be targeted.	1.2 EASI Attendance Reports on Demand excessive sign-in report.
			1.3. There is not a system to reinforce parents for facilitating improvement in attendance.	**1.3 Tier 2** Beginning at the 5th unexcused absence, the Attendance Committee (which is a subgroup of the Leadership Team)	1.3 Social Worker Guidance Counselor MTSS LEADERSHIP TEAM	1.3 MTSS LEADERSHIP TEAM will disaggregate attendance data for the "Tier 2" group along with the guidance counselor and maintain communication about these	1.3 EASI Attendance Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/Tardy data

			collapse to assure that a letter is sent home to parents outlining the state statute that requires parents to send students to school. If a student's attendance improves (no absences in a 20 day period) a positive letter is sent home to the parent regarding the increase in their child's attendance. **Tier 2** When a student reaches 5 days of unexcused absences, guidance counselors or other identified staff contact the parents via the phone and records documentation on the Attendance Intervention form (SB90717). **Tier 2/3** When a student reaches 6-10 days of unexcused absences and/or unexcused tardies to school, the administration or identified staff will investigate the reason for the absences and may notify the parents and guardians via mail that future absences/tardies must have a doctor note or other reason outlined in the Student Handbook to receive an excused absence/tardy and must be approved through an administrator. A parent-administrator-student conference is scheduled and held regarding these procedures. The goal of the conference is to create a plan for assisting the students to improve his/her attendance/tardies.		children	

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

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

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1: Goals 1.The total number of in-school suspensions, number of students receiving in-school suspensions, out-of-school suspensions, and number of students receiving out-of-school suspensions will decrease by 10% respectively.	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions **4** 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School **3** 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions **22** 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions **3** 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In –School **2** 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions **19** 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School	1.1. Teachers need to have common school-wide expectations and rules and provide explicit instruction to students on the expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior.	1.1. Administration will assign a subgroup to develop school-wide expectations and rules, set these through staff survey and discussion, and provide training to staff in methods for teaching and reinforcing the school-wide rules and expectations. Administration and MTSS Leadership Team will explore several, district recommended classroom and behavioral management programs/strategies to implement school wide. (CHAMPS, PBS, Conscious Discipline are possibilities)	1.1. Administration Discipline Committee	1.1. Administration and Discipline Committee will review data on Classroom Referrals (CRs), Office Discipline Referrals (ODRs) and out of school suspensions quarterly.	1.1. CR and ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data

	13	**11**					
			1.2 Our school does not have a clear school-wide system for reinforcing students specifically for following expectations and rules.	1.2 Administration and discipline committee will implement individual and classroom incentives to be used as positive reinforcements for students complying with school-wide and classroom behaviors and rules.	1.2 Administration Discipline Committee	1.2 Administration and Discipline Committee will review data on Classroom Referrals (CRs), Office Discipline Referrals (ODRs) and out of school suspensions quarterly	1.2 CR and ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data
			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
CHAMPS/Classroom management	K-5/All	Administration	School-wide	Fall Semester 2012	Classroom walkthroughs looking for evidence of implementation.	Administration

End of Suspension Goals

Health and Fitness Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
1. Health and Fitness Goal	1.1.	1.1 Elementary students will	1.1 Principal	1.1 Classroom walk-throughs	1.1 Classroom teachers document

Health and Fitness Goal #1:	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students scoring in the "Healthy Fitness Zone" (HFZ) on the Pacer for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular health will increase from 64% on the Pretest to 74% on the Posttest. *Schools will enter the data after the Pretest and Posttest. Make sure there is at least a 10% between the Pretest and Posttest.*	**64%**	**74%**		engage in 150 minutes of physical education per week in grades kindergarten through 5.		Class schedules	in their lesson plans the ninety (90) minutes of "Teacher Directed" physical education that students have per week. This is also reflected in the Master Schedule. Physical Education teachers' schedules reflect the remaining sixty (60) minutes of the mandated 150 Minutes of Elementary Phys. Ed.
			1.2.	1.2. Health and physical activity initiatives developed and implemented by the Principal's designee.	1.2 Principal's designee.	1.2 Data on the number of students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ)	1.2. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.
			1.3.	1.3. Use of the playground or fitness course equipment; walk/jog/run activities in designated areas; and exercising to the outdoor activities such as the ones provided in the 150 Minutes of Elem. Physical Education folder on IDEAS.	1.3. Physical Education Teacher	1.3. Lesson plans of Physical Education Teacher	1.3. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.

Health and Fitness Goals Professional Development

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

Continuous Improvement Goal(s)

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

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. Continuous Improvement Goal Continuous Improvement Goal #1: The percentage of teachers who strongly agree with the indicator that "teachers deliver lessons that consistently include higher order thinking skills (under Teaching and Learning)" will increase from 35% in 2012 to 45% in 2013.	2012 Current Level :* **35%**	2013 Expected Level :* **45%**	1.1. Teacher's knowledge base of incorporating higher order thinking skills needs professional development	1.1. Teachers need to understand and use **higher-order, text-dependent questions** at the word/phrase, sentence, and paragraph/passage levels (Webb's, Bloom, Costas). Student reading comprehension improves when students are required to provide evidence to support their answers to text-dependent questions. Scaffolding of students' grappling with complex text through well-crafted text-dependent question assists students' in discovering and achieving deeper understanding of the author's meaning. **Actions/Details** *Professional Development* -The site-based reading coach and content teacher leaders will deliver to all teachers the district-provided professional development, *Tools for Teachers: Implementing Key Shifts in the CCSS, Part Two: Text Dependent Questions* focused on the **characteristics and the structured process in creating in-depth and text-dependent questions.** -The site-based reading	1.1. Who 　AP 　Principal 　Coaches 　PLC Facilitators How Walk Through Data PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -Administration and coach rotate through PLCs looking for complex text discussion.	1.1. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator -Problem Solving Leadership Team -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	1.1. 3x per year FAIR During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)

				coach and content teacher leaders conduct small group l trainings and provide site-based professional development opportunities to assist teachers' in creating text-dependent questions that draw the reader back to the text to discover what it says, to demand concrete and explicit student answers rooted in the text, and to frame inquires in ways that do not rely on a mix of personal opinion, background information, and imaginative speculation. -The site-based reading coach provide teachers assistance through classroom modeling, facilitating peer-coaching sessions, co-teaching, and classroom observation. ***Within PLCs*** -All teachers work to improve upon, both individually and collectively, the ability to create and deliver higher-order, text-dependent questions that addresses the Anchor Reading Standard deficits in all content areas. -During PLCs, teachers create higher-order, text-dependent questions for upcoming lessons anticipating the need to scaffold and differentiate questions based on student responses. -During PLCs, teachers study students' responses to the scaffolded close reading lessons in order to plan			

			lessons.			
		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
Identifying and Creating Text-Dependent Questions to Deepen Reading Comprehension (K-12)	K – 5	Reading Coach	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team Instructional Coaches
Designing and Delivering a Close Reading Lesson Using in-Depth Questioning (K-12)	K – 5	Reading Coach	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team Instructional Coaches

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. Improving the proficiency of InD/ESE in our school is of high priority. -Teachers need support in drilling down their core assessments to the InD/ESE level.	A.1. **Strategy/Task** IND/ESE student achievement improves through **teachers' implementation of the Plan-Do-Check-Act model** in order to plan/carry out lessons/assessments with appropriate strategies and modifications. **Actions** *Plan* For an upcoming unit of instruction determine the following: -What do we want our IND/ESE to learn by the end of the unit? -What are standards that our IND/ESE need to learn? -How will we assess these skills/standards for our IND/ESE? -What does mastery look like? -What is the SMART goal for this unit of instruction for our IND/ESE? *Plan for the "Do"* What do teachers need to do in order to meet the IND/ESE SMART goal? -What resources do we need? -How will the lessons be designed to maximize the learning of IND/ESE? -What checks-for-understanding will we implement for our IND/ESE? -What teaching strategies/best	A.1 Who -School based Administrators -PLC Facilitators How PLC logs (with specific InD/ESE information) for like courses/grades.	A.1. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the InD SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.	A.1. During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for ESE performance
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:*					

| | | | | practices will we use to help IND/ESE students learn?
-Specifically how will we implement the selected strategy during the lesson?
-What are teachers going to do during the lesson for IND/ESE students?
-What are IND/ESE students going to do during the lesson to maximize learning?

Reflect on the "Do"/Analyze Checks for Understanding and Student Work <u>during</u> the unit.
For lessons that have already been taught within the unit of instruction, teachers **reflect** and discuss one or more of the following regarding their IND/ESE:
-What worked within the lesson? How do we know it was successful? Why was it successful?
-What didn't work within the lesson? Why? What are we going to do next?
-For the implementation of the selected strategy, what worked? How do we know it was successful? Why was it successful? What checks for understanding were used during the lessons?
-For the implementation of the selected strategy, what didn't work? Why? What are we going to do next?
-What were the outcomes of the checks for understanding? And/or analysis of student performance?
-How do we take what we have learned and apply it to future lessons? | | | |

				Reflect/Check – Analyze Data Discuss one or more of the following: -What is the IND/ESE data? -What is the data telling us as individual teachers? -What is the data telling us as a grade level/PLC/department? -What are IND/ESE students not learning? Why is this occurring? -Which IND/ESE students are learning? **Act on the Data** After data analysis, develop a plan to act on the data. -What are we going to do about IND/ESE students not learning? -What are the skills/concepts/standards that need re-teaching/interventions (either to individual IND/ESE students or small groups)? -How are we going to re-teach the skill differently? -How we will know that our re-teaching/interventions are working?				
			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 Goal A.1	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.
Reading Goal B: The percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
			B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.
			B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.

NEW Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking. CELLA Goal #C: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from 52% to 55%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: **52%**	C1.1 -Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our school is of high priority. -Teachers need support in drilling down their core assessments to the ELL level.	C1.1 ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/standards improves in reading, language arts, math, science and social studies through teachers working collaboratively to focus on ELL student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act model** to structure their way of work for ELL students. Action Steps -Teachers analyze CELLA data to identify ELL students who need assistance in the areas of listening/speaking, reading and writing. -Teachers use time during PLCs to reinforce and strengthen targeted ELL Differentiated Instruction lessons using the district provided ELL Differentiated Instruction binders (provided by the ELL Department) in Reading, Language Arts, Math, Science and Social Studies. -PLCs generate SMART goals for ELL students for upcoming units of instruction. -PLCs/teachers plan for upcoming lessons/units using	C1.1 Who -School based Administrators -ESOL Resource Teachers -PLC Facilitators How PLC logs (with specific ELL information) for like courses/grades.	C1.1 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -AP meets with Reading, Language Arts, Social Studies and Science PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader shares ELL SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. -ERTs (APEI) meet with RtI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs)	C1.1 -FAIR -CELLA During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for ELL performance

			Differentiated Instruction strategies based on ELLs needs in the areas of listening/speaking, reading and writing. -PLCs/teachers plan for accommodations for core curriculum content and assessment. -When conducting data analysis on core curriculum assessments, PLCs aggregate the ELL data. -Based on the data, PLCs/teachers plan interventions for targeted ELL students using the resources from Differentiated instruction binders.				
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
D. Students scoring proficient in Reading.		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
CELLA Goal #D: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase from 22% to 25%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading : **22%**		See Goal for CELLA C1.1			
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
E. Students scoring proficient in Writing.		2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1
CELLA Goal #E: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA will increase from 19% to 22%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : **19%**	See Goal for CELLA C1.1				
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

NEW Math Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

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

NEW Science Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

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

NEW Writing Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

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

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

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

STEM Professional Development

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
CTE Goal #1: Increase student interest in career opportunities and program selection prior to middle school. The school will increase the frequency of career exposure activities/events from 2 in 2011-2012 to 3 in 2012-2013.	1.1.	1.1 Implement special speakers to visit and share with students about CTE careers throughout the year and during the Great American Teach-In.	GATI Coordinator Administration	Administration/Leadership team aggregate and analyze the data every quarter to develop next steps.	1.1 Log of CTE special speakers
	1.2.	1.2 Administer career surveys to the students to see interest areas of focus.	Guidance Counselor	Administration/Leadership team aggregate and analyze the data every quarter to develop next steps.	1.2 Career survey data
	1.3.	1.3. Provide field trips to local businesses or CTE student competitions. (JA BizTown)	1.3. Grade Level Teachers Administration	1.3 Administration/Leadership team aggregate and analyze the data every quarter to develop next steps.	1.3. Field Trip Log

CTE Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
JA BizTown	Grade 5	5th Grade PLC Leader	5th Grade	Fall 2012	Walkthroughs PLC Logs	Administration

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
Writing/LA Goal #1.1	Individual 3 ring binders for Student Writing	$250.00	
Suspension Goal #1.1	CHAMPs resources and materials for professional development	$750.00	
Final Amount Spent			