

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



Oak Grove Elementary School School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Oak Grove Elementary	District Name: Hillsborough County
Principal: Pamela Roberts	Superintendent: MaryEllen Elia
SAC Chair: Ronja Smith and Rennex Franklin	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	Pamela Roberts	Bachelors of Science in Music Education Certification in Elementary Education Masters in Educational Leadership	Six years as Principal at current school	Five years as an Assistant Principal Eight years as a Principal	2003-04 Grade C, 92% AYP 2004-05 Grade C, 70% 2005-06 Grade C, 77% 2006-07 Grade F, 72% 2007-08 Grade B, 92% 2008-09 Grade A, 95% 2009-10 Grade A, 77% 2010-11 Grade A, 77% 2011-12 Grade

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

Assistant Principal	Cynthia Thro	Bachelor of Science in Education K-6 Masters in Educational Leadership	Five years as Assistant Principal at current school	Six years as an Assistant Principal	2007-08 Grade F, 69% 2008-09 Grade A, 95% 2009-10 Grade A, 77% 2010-11 Grade A, 77% 2011-12 Grade
---------------------	--------------	---	---	-------------------------------------	---

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 Coach	Nicole Dreby	Early Childhood	6	6	2007-08 Grade B, 92% 2008-09 Grade A, 95% 2009-10 Grade A, 77% 2010-11 Grade A, 77% 2011-12 Grade
Reading Resource	Debra Mills	Elementary Education 1-6 Media Specialist Certification	4	4	2008-09 Alexander Grade A, 100% 2009-10 Grade A, 77% 2010-11 Grade A, 77% 2011-12 Grade
Reading Resource	Laura Lesch	Bachelor of Science	7	7	2005-06 Grade B, 95% 2006-07 Grade A, 97% 2007-08 Grade B, 92% 2008-09 Grade A, 95% 2009-10 Grade A, 77% 2010-11 Grade A, 77% 2011-12 Grade
Science Resource	Ronald Davis	Bachelor Elementary Education K-6	2	3	2010-2011 Ippolito Grade B, 82% 2011-2012 Grade

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

		Masters in Education			
--	--	----------------------	--	--	--

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. Recruitment Fairs	Supervisor of Teacher Recruitment	Ongoing	
3. Performance Pay	General Director of Federal Programs	July 2012	
4. Regular time for teacher collaboration	Principal	Ongoing	
5. Salary Differential (Renaissance Schools)	General of Federal Programs	Ongoing	
6. District Mentor Program	District Mentors	Ongoing	
7. District Peer Program	District Peers	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 effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
6 staff teachers are not ESOL endorsed.	-Working on ESOL Endorsement - PLC's will provide support by discussing specific strategies for ELL students during PLC meetings. ELL Resource Teacher will provide extra support in: -providing coaching to improve English language acquisition -assist in developing lesson plans, curriculum development and implementation -present specific English language acquisition strategies, best practices and specific instructional

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

	resources --assist with parent conferences/communication
--	---

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
78	14% (11)	27% (21)	41% (32)	18% (14)	19% (15)	92% (72)	.01% (1)	0% (0)	60% (47)

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
Michelle Robellard	Applebaum, Caitlyn	First year teacher	Weekly planning, modeling, mentoring
Michelle Robellard	Cepeda, Jennifer	First year teacher	Weekly planning, modeling, mentoring
Michelle Robellard	Ellinger, Elizabeth	Second year teacher	Bi-weekly planning, modeling, mentoring
Michelle Robellard	Garretson, Brettany	First year teacher	Weekly planning, modeling, mentoring
Michelle Robellard	Hall, Stephanie	Second year teacher	Bi-weekly planning, modeling,

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

			mentoring
Michelle Robellard	Colman, Laura	First year teacher	Weekly planning, modeling, mentoring
Michelle Robellard	Painter, Mallorie	First year teacher	Weekly planning, modeling, mentoring
Michelle Robellard	Romney, Vanessa	First year teacher	Weekly planning, modeling, mentoring
Michelle Robellard	Walsh, Katelyn	First year teacher	Weekly planning, modeling, mentoring
Michelle Robellard	Delgado, Carolyn	Second year teacher	Bi-weekly planning, modeling, mentoring

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.

<p>Title I, 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.</p>
<p>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.</p>
<p>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.</p>
<p>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.</p>
<p>Title III Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language</p>

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

Learners.
Title X- Homeless The district receives funds to provide resources (social workers and tutoring) for students 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 N/A
Nutrition Programs N/A
Housing Programs N/A
Head Start We utilize information from students in Head Start to transition into Kindergarten.
Adult Education N/A
Career and Technical Education N/A
Job Training N/A
Other N/A

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
<p>Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Principal B. Assistant Principal for Curriculum C. School Psychologist D. Guidance Counselor E. Elementary: PLC facilitators for grades K-5 F. Instructional Coach and Resource Teachers G. ESE Specialist

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

- H. ELP Coordinator
- I. Social Worker
- J. ESE Teacher
- K. SAC Chair

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

Our MTSS Team is a part of the Problem Solving Leadership Team.

- The PSLT coordinates/collaborates with the other specialty school teams.
- Specialty PSLT teams analyze/track data for small groups (Tier 2) and individual students (Tier 3)

The Problem Solving Team will meet twice a month to:

- Use the MTSS problem solving model to:
 - Oversee a multi-tiered model of service delivery (Core/Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3)
 - Review/interpret student data (Academic, Behavior and Attendance)
 - Analyze/interpret grade level data: FAIR, FCAT, Stanford, DRA2 and other common assessments
 - Organize and support systematic data collection.
 - Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction:
 - Through analyzing data to guide/improve instruction
 - Through the use of Common Assessments which will be analyzed in order to guide instruction.
 - Through the implementation of research-based, scientifically validated instruction/interventions. This year our MTSS team will focus on Differentiated Instruction practices.
 - Plan, implement and oversee the supplemental and intensive interventions for student progression in Tier 2 and Tier 3.
 - Monitor interventions and data assessment in Tier 2 and Tier 3.
- Work collaboratively with the PLCs in Grades 3-5 in the implementation of the Continuous Improvement Model and progress monitoring
- Coordinate/collaborate with other working committees such as the Reading Committee.

Identify professional development needs and resources

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

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

- The Problem Solving Team along with the faculty and SAC were involved in School Improvement Plan development activities that were conducted prior to school being out for 11-12 school year and during preplanning for 12-13.
- The School Improvement Plan is the document that guides the work of the Problem Solving Team. The large part of the work of the Problem Solving Team is outlined in the Action Steps, Evaluation Process, Evaluation Too, and Professional Development of the School Improvement Plan.

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

MTSS Implementation

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

Reading: Data will be collected from FAIR, CIM, Successmaker, FCAT, classroom tests, etc. summarized and reviewed at PLC meetings and by the MTSS Leadership team. Using data walls for the actual MTSS meetings with MTSS facilitators (based on student levels that continually changes throughout the year). Create graphs for individual classes to allow teachers to plan for small groups and extra needed help. Electronic spreadsheet for each team to see how kids are progressing over the course of each year and over the course of many years.

Science: Overall, our 5th grade science scores increased 7.03% from the pre-test given in Sept. 2011 to the mid-year test given in Dec. 2011. The Science Lanyard Program began on 10/10/11 and focused on benchmarks that 40% or fewer of the students answered correctly. We covered 7 of those benchmarks before giving the mid-year science test. Of those 7 benchmarks, 6 of them were on both the pre-test and mid-year test, so we were able to compare the growth/improvement of those 6 common benchmarks. The 6 science lanyard benchmarks showed an average increase of 19.2% compared to an average increase of only 2.81% for benchmarks that were not covered by a science lanyard question. Also, the average percent of students answering correctly for science lanyard benchmark questions on the mid-year test was 56.4% compared to 41.2% to non-lanyard benchmark questions. That's a difference of 15.2%.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

- The MTSS PowerPoint presented to Principals during School Improvement Training was shared with staff.
- As the District's Problem Solving Team develops resources and staff development courses on MTSS these tools and staff development sessions will be conducted with staff when they become available.
- Professional Development sessions will occur during Tuesday faculty meeting times.

Describe plan to support MTSS.

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

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

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). <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Principal• Assistant Principal• Reading Coach• Reading Teachers• Media Specialist• Teachers across content areas (Language Arts, Math, Science, Social Studies and Electives) who have demonstrated effective reading instruction as reflected through positive student reading gains
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). <p>The LLT is a subset of Problem Solving Leadership Team. The team provides leadership for implementations of the reading goals and strategies identified on the SIP.</p> <p>The principal is the LLT chairperson. The reading coach is a member of the team and provides extensive expertise in data analysis and reading interventions. The reading coach and principal collaborate with the team to ensure that data driven instructional support is provided to all teachers.</p> <p>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 support identified instructional needs in conjunction with the Problem Solving Leadership team's support plan. Additionally the principal ensures that time is provided for the LLT to collaborate and share information with all site stakeholders including other administrators, teachers, staff members, parents and students.</p> <p>Team meets monthly to review and analyze school wide reading data, monitor student progress and suggest interventions.</p>
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?

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

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

Kindergarten Readiness Screener.) This state-selected assessment contains a subset of the Early Childhood Observation System and the first five measures of the Florida Assessments in Reading. The instruments used in the screening are based upon the Florida Voluntary Prekindergarten (VPK) Education Standards. Parents are provided with a letter from Dr. Eric. J. Smith, Commissioner of Education, explaining the assessments. Teachers will meet with parents after the assessments have been completed to review student performance. Data from the FLKRS 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. Students in the VPK program are given a district-created screening that looks at letter names, letter sounds, colors, shapes and numbers. This assessment is administered at the start and end of the VPK program. A copy of these assessments is 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. Parent Involvement events for Transitioning Children into Kindergarten include Kindergarten Round Up. 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. In an effort to support the transition from Pre-school to Kindergarten, our school has Headstart on campus. We also have the Early Exceptional Learning Program (EELP) offered at our school. During the spring, our school also offers the annual Spring Kindergarten Roundup. Early assessments are conducted on incoming Kindergarten students to gather baseline data and assist with teacher placement. Our school has an "open door" policy and allows for parents of incoming Kindergarten students to request a campus tour.

***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?

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

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).			1.1. - Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students). -Lack of instructional time -Difficulty communicating concepts to ELL students -Insufficient time to plan for Differentiated Instruction	1.1. <u>Strategy:</u> Tier 1- The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' reading comprehension will improve through teachers using the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM) with core curriculum and providing Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the problem-solving model. <u>Action Steps:</u> -The school will implement grade level and course specific PLC's. -MTSS resource pulling small groups (Tier 3, intensive individualized interventions) <u>Plan</u> -PLC's identify the essential skills and learning targets for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLC's answer the question, "What do we want students to learn?" -PLC's identify the common assessment for the upcoming	1.1. <u>Who</u> - Principal - AP -Resource Teachers -Grade Level PLC facilitators <u>How</u> Administration reviews PLC logs and provides feedback. Information from PLC meetings shared at Leadership meetings. Administration will have copies of the Reinforcement Calendars. Reinforcement Calendars shared at Leadership Team Meetings. Administration reviews PLC logs for discussion of modified Mini-Lessons based on Mini-Assessment data. Modified lessons and updated Reinforcement Calendars shared at	1.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> PLC unit assessment data will be printed through the SuccessMaker database bi-monthly. Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. <u>PLC/Department Level</u> PLC's will review the SuccessMaker reports monthly. PLC's will analyze data: FAIR, DRA2/Running Records, FCAT Form practice tests, Treasures Tests PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. Looked at FAIR data from last year and this year (AP1 and AP2)	1.1. <u>2-3x Per Year</u> FAIR on-going Progress Monitoring in comprehension. <u>DRA2</u> <u>During Grading Period</u> Bi-monthly Successmaker reports Running Records Treasure's Tests CIM
<u>Reading Goal #1:</u> In grades 3-5 the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 49% to 51%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 49%	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 51%					

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

				<p>unit of instruction. PLC's are answering the question, "How do we know if they have learned it?"</p> <p>-As a Professional Development Activity in their PLC's, teachers plan for Differentiated Instruction using data from previous assessments to guide student groupings. We have had two trainings this year in Differentiated Instruction.</p> <p>Do/Check</p> <p>-PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating effective strategies and Differentiated Instruction activities discussed at their PLC meetings.</p> <p>-At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material.</p> <p>Check/Act</p> <p>Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLC's.</p> <p>-Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching.</p> <p>-Based on the data, teachers discuss Differentiated Instruction strategies that were effective.</p> <p>-Based on the data teachers</p> <p>a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons for the entire class and c) decide what skills need to be re-taught to targeted students.</p>	<p>Leadership Team meetings.</p> <p>School-based informal walkthrough form. Not necessarily grade level based where an action plan is created. It is more generalizations about what is being seen and/or not seen. This information is then passed along through weekly emails from the Principal. Anyone with further questions is more than welcome to ask for further assistance.</p> <p><i>1st Grading Period Check</i> <i>Emerging</i></p> <p><i>2nd Grading Period Check</i> <i>Operational</i></p> <p><i>3rd Grading Period Check</i></p>	<p>trend in reading comprehension went up and encouraged teachers to continue with small group instruction to continue the trend.</p> <p>-Third grade teachers were concerned about scores on FAIR due to this being the first time using a computer based test. This year teachers conference more with the children to increase the scores and decrease the concern of computer based tests. There was an increase.</p> <p>-Students are tracking FAIR progress so they are setting levels that motivates them when taking a computer based test.</p> <p>-Second year doing RtI groups teachers are becoming more confident in the grouping process.</p> <p><i>1st Grading Period Check</i> Not Evident</p> <p><i>2nd Grading Period Check</i> <i>Operational</i></p> <p><i>3rd Grading Period Check</i></p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--	---	--

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

			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.			2.1. Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students). -Insufficient time to plan for Differentiated Instruction	2.1 - <u>Strategy</u> : Tier 1- The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' reading comprehension will improve through teachers using the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM) with core curriculum and providing Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the problem-solving model. <u>Action Steps</u> : -The school will implement grade level and course specific PLC's. -MTSS resource pulling small groups (Tier 3, intensive individualized interventions) Plan -PLC's identify the essential skills and learning targets for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLC's answer the question, "What do we want students to learn?" -PLC's identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLC's are answering the question, "How do we know if they have learned it?"	2.1. <u>Who</u> – Principal - AP -Grade Level PLC facilitators <u>How</u> Administration reviews PLC logs and provides feedback. Information from PLC meetings shared at Leadership meetings. Administration will have copies of the Reinforcement Calendars. Reinforcement Calendars shared at Leadership Team Meetings. Administration reviews PLC logs for discussion of modified Mini-Lessons based on Mini-Assessment data. Modified lessons and updated Reinforcement Calendars shared at Leadership Team meetings.	2.1 <u>Teacher Level</u> PLC unit assessment data will be printed through the SuccessMaker database bi-monthly. Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. <u>PLC/Department Level</u> PLC's will review the SuccessMaker reports monthly. PLC's will analyze data: FAIR, DRA2/Running Records, FCAT Form practice tests, Treasures Tests PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. <u>1st Grading Period Check</u> <i>Emerging</i> <u>2nd Grading Period Check</u>	2.1. <u>2-3x Per Year</u> FAIR on-going progress monitoring in comprehension. DRA2 <u>During Grading Period</u> Bi-monthly SuccessMaker reports Running Records Treasure's Tests CIM
Reading Goal #2: In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 23% to 27%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance</u> :* 23%	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance</u> :* 27%					

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

				<p>-As a Professional Development Activity in their PLC's, teachers plan for Differentiated Instruction using data from previous assessments to guide student groupings.</p> <p>Do/Check -PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating effective strategies and Differentiated Instruction activities discussed at their PLC meetings. -At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material.</p> <p>Check/Act -Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLC's. -Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching. -Based on the data, teachers discuss Differentiated Instruction strategies that were effective. -Based on the data teachers a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons for the entire class and c) decide what skills need to be re-taught to targeted students.</p>	<p>Pull bi-monthly SuccessMaker reports that will be reviewed at monthly PLC meetings.</p> <p><i>1st Grading Period Check</i> Emerging</p> <p><i>2nd Grading Period Check</i> Operational</p> <p><i>3rd Grading Period Check</i></p>	<p><i>Operational</i></p> <p><i>3rd Grading Period Check</i></p>	
			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

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. Teachers at varying levels of using Differentiated Instruction strategies. -Insufficient time to plan for Differentiated Instruction -Teachers tend to give all students the same lesson	3.1 Strategy: The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Student's comprehension of course content improves by participation in consistent, effective and appropriate Differentiated Instruction strategies. Differentiated Instruction is based on: acceleration, enrichment, extensions, increase rigor and remediation. Action Steps: -MTSSI resource pulling small groups (Tier 3, intensive individualized interventions) Plan -Using data from previous assessments and daily classroom performance/work, teachers plan Differentiated Instruction groupings and activities for the delivery of new content in upcoming lessons. Do/Check -Teachers implement lessons using Differentiated Instruction activities. Check/Act -Teachers bring their common assessment data to their PLC's. -Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching. -PLC teachers discuss the outcomes of their Differentiated Instruction lessons and share the effectiveness of their lessons. -Using the data, effective Differentiated Instruction strategies and techniques are	3.1. 3.1. Who Principal AP Reading Coach Grade Level PLC facilitators How Lesson planning recorded on PLC logs. Discussion shared at Leadership Team Meetings Administration reviews PLC logs for discussion of differentiated instruction strategies of core curriculum. Differentiated Instructional strategies shared at Leadership Team Meetings. <i>1st Grading Period Check</i> <i>Emerging</i> <i>2nd Grading Period Check</i> <i>Operational</i> <i>3rd Grading Period Check</i>	3.1 <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. <u>PLC/Department Level</u> -PLC's discuss how to report and share the data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to identify effective activities in future lessons. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> Walkthroughs of PLC meetings. Focused classroom walkthroughs to monitor implementation of differentiated instruction techniques. <i>1st Grading Period Check</i> <i>Emerging</i> <i>2nd Grading Period Check</i> <i>Emerging</i> <i>3rd Grading Period Check</i>	3.1. 3.1. 2-3x Per Year FAIR on-going progress monitoring in comprehension. DRA2 <u>During Grading Period</u> Running Records Treasure's Tests CIM
Reading Goal #3: In grades 3-5, the percentage of All Curriculum students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 69% to 71%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 69%	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 71%					

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

				identified, discussed and modeled in order to implement techniques in future lessons.			
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1
<u>Reading Goal #4:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	-Need additional training to implement effective reading strategies for students performing at this level. -Finding appropriate text to develop the lessons and assessments. -Teachers at varying skill levels with the FCIM model. -Difficulty communicating concepts to ELL students	4.1. <u>Strategy:</u> In addition to the 90 minute Reading Block Bottom Quartile students will receive intensive instruction based on student's needs for a minimum of 30 minutes and increase rigor. <u>Action Steps:</u> -The school will implement the FAIR assessments to monitor student progress. -Small group instruction in phonics as needed. -MTSS resource pulling small groups (Tier 3, intensive individualized interventions) -other students are receiving computer enrichment -Reciprocal Teaching: training, resource teachers went into specific classrooms and modeled/coached on the Reciprocal Teaching methods. There will be a follow up training later on the year.	4.1. <u>Who</u> Principal AP Reading Coach Leadership Team Classroom Teacher <u>How</u> -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form(EET tool. The FCIM strategy will be added to the form under Instructional Practices.) <u>1st Grading Period Check</u> Emerging <u>2nd Grading Period Check</u> Emerging <u>3rd Grading Period Check</u>	4.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> -PLC's will review mini-assessment data. FAIR, running records (with miscue analysis), phonics inventories, lstation monthly reports <u>PLC/Department Level</u> -PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review FAIR data to determine the percentage of students scoring medium to high. -This information has not been analyzed at this time because AP2 has not officially closed to this point. It will be discussed in the near future. <u>1st Grading Period Check</u> Not Evident <u>2nd Grading Period Check</u> Emerging <u>3rd Grading Period Check</u>	.2-3x Per Year FAIR <u>During Grading Period</u> Running Records Treasure's Tests CIM
In grades 3-5, 74% of Bottom Quartile All Curriculum students made annual learning gains on the 2012 FCAT Reading Test. In grades 3-5, 76% of Bottom Quartile All Curriculum students will make annual learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading Tests.							

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

			4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.
			4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.								
<u>Reading Goal #5:</u>								
5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5A.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5A.1. <u>Strategy:</u> Tier 1-The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen rigor and the core curriculum. Students’ vocabulary acquisition will improve through the implementation of appropriately leveled, vocabulary development lessons across all content areas.	5A.1. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Reading Coach -PLC Facilitators -ELL Resource	5A.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> Teachers assess students using end of unit/chapter tests. <u>PLC/Department Level</u> PLCs will review unit assessments.	5A.1. <u>2-3x Per Year</u> FAIR <u>During Grading Period</u> Running Records Treasure’s Tests CIM	
<u>Reading Goal #5A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>						
The percentage of White students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA will increase from 58% to 62%.	White: 58%	White: 62%	PLC meetings do not include discussion of leveled vocabulary development and assessment for content instruction.					
The percentage of Black students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA will increase from 32% to 39%.	Black: 32%	Black: 39%	-PLC meetings do not include the development of vocabulary needs within each content area.					
The percentage of Hispanic students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA will increase from 49% to 54%.	Hispanic: 49%	Hispanic: 54%	-Lack of instructional time.					
	Asian: NA	Asian: NA		<u>Action Steps:</u> -RTI resource pulling small groups	<u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration -Classroom walkthroughs observing vocabulary development. -Evidence of strategy in teacher’s lesson plans.	<u>Leadership Team Level</u> -The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review FAIR data to determine the percentage of students scoring medium to high. -This information has not been analyzed at this time because AP2 has not officially closed to this point. It will be discussed in the near future.		
	American Indian: NA	American Indian: NA		<u>Plan</u> -PLCs will recognize vocabulary needs within each content area and needs of all proficiency levels (A,B,C) of ELL students. -PLCs will familiarize	<u>1st Grading Period Check</u> Emerging <u>2nd Grading Period Check</u> Emerging	<u>1st Grading Period Check</u> Emerging <u>2nd Grading Period Check</u>		

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

				themselves with the content standards. -Differentiated Instruction Book Study Do/Check -Teachers will need to use differentiated instruction to make sure all student levels are understanding the instruction. Check/Act -Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. -Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching	<i>3rd Grading Period Check</i>	Emerging <i>3rd Grading Period Check</i>	
			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.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.
Reading Goal #5B: The percentage of Economically Disadvantage students scoring a satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA will increase from 47% to 52%.			PLC meetings do not include discussion of leveled vocabulary development and assessment for content instruction. -PLC meetings do not include the development of vocabulary needs within each content area. -Lack of instructional time.	Strategy: See 3.1 Action Steps: See 3.1	Who See 3.1 How See 3.1 <i>1st Grading Period Check</i> Emerging <i>2nd Grading Period Check</i> Operational <i>3rd Grading Period Check</i>	Teacher Level See 3.1 PLC/Department Level See 3.1 Leadership Team Level See 3.1 <i>1st Grading Period Check</i> Emerging <i>2nd Grading Period Check</i> Emerging <i>3rd Grading Period Check</i>	5B.1. 2-3x Per Year See 3.1 During Grading Period See 3.1
	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 47%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 52%					

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

			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:							
The percentage of ELL students scoring a satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA will increase from 38% to 44%.							
	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	PLC meetings do not include discussion of leveled vocabulary development and assessment for content instruction. -PLC meetings do not include the development of vocabulary needs within each content area. -Lack of instructional time.	Strategy: See 3.1 Action Steps: See 3.1	Who See 3.1 How See 3.1 <u>1st Grading Period Check</u> Emerging <u>2nd Grading Period Check</u> Operational <u>3rd Grading Period Check</u>	Teacher Level See 3.1 PLC/Department Level See 3.1 Leadership Team Level See 3.1 <u>1st Grading Period Check</u> Emerging <u>2nd Grading Period Check</u> Emerging <u>3rd Grading Period Check</u>	2-3x Per Year See 3.1 During Grading Period See 3.1
	38%	44%					
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.

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

			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool				
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.				
<p><u>Reading Goal #5D:</u> The percentage of Students with Disabilities scoring a satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA will increase from 25% to 33%.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></td> <td><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>25%</td> <td>33%</td> </tr> </table>			<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	25%	33%	See 5A.1	<p><u>Strategy:</u> See 4.1</p> <p><u>Action Steps:</u> See 4.1</p>	<p><u>Who</u> See 4.1</p> <p><u>How</u> See 4.1 -use corrective reading strategies</p> <p><u>1st Grading Period Check</u> Emerging</p> <p><u>2nd Grading Period Check</u> Emerging</p> <p><u>3rd Grading Period Check</u></p>	<p><u>Teacher Level</u> See 4.1</p> <p><u>PLC/Department Level</u> See 4.1</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u> See 4.1</p> <p><u>1st Grading Period Check</u> Not Evident</p> <p><u>2nd Grading Period Check</u> Emerging</p> <p><u>3rd Grading Period Check</u></p>	<p><u>2-3x Per Year</u></p> <p>See 4.1</p> <p><u>During Grading Period</u> See 4.1</p>
<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>										
25%	33%										
			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
Reciprocal Teaching	K-5/Reading	MTSS Team	School-wide	3 times per year and as needed for individual teachers	Classroom walkthroughs as needed for teachers.	MTSS Team
Differentiated Instruction	K-5/Reading	MTSS Team	School-wide	3 times per year and as needed for individual teachers	Classroom walkthroughs as needed for teachers.	MTSS Team

End of Reading Goals

Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check	Strategy Data Check	Student Evaluation Tool
1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in mathematics (Level 3-5).			1.1. Limited Computer lab access. Technology Issues Limited manipulatives -Not all teachers of the same course give the same common assessment at the end of the instructional cycle -Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students.) -Insufficient time to plan for Differentiated Instruction	1.1 . Strategy: The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the math core curriculum. Student's comprehension of course content/standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction as a result of the common assessments (GoMath chapter tests and FCAT 2.0 beginning, mid and end of year tests)to ensure the mastery of essential skills. Action Steps: Plan -PLC's identify the essential skills and learning targets for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLC's answer the question, "What do we want students to learn?" -PLC's are answering the question, "How do we know if they have learned it?" Do/Check -PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating effective strategies and Differentiated Instruction activities discussed at their PLC meetings. -At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment	1.1. Who Principal AP PLC facilitator How -PLC logs turned into administration. -Evidence of strategy in teacher's lesson plans seen during administration walkthroughs. Not necessarily grade level based where an action plan is created. It is more generalizations about what is being seen and/or not seen. This information is then passed along through weekly emails from the Principal. Anyone with further questions is more than welcome to ask for further assistance <i>1st Grading Period Check</i> Emerging <i>2nd Grading Period Check</i> Operational <i>3rd Grading Period Check</i>	1.1 . Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. <u>PLC/Department Level</u> PLC leader will take scores to the leadership team. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> The leadership team will analyze the scores. -Data will be used to plan for future supplemental instruction. <i>1st Grading Period Check</i> Operational <i>2nd Grading Period Check</i> Operational <i>3rd Grading Period Check</i>	1.1. 2-3x Per Year FCAT 2.0 beginning, mid and end of year tests. <u>During Grading Period</u> Successmaker reports FASTT Math reports GoMath chapter tests
Mathematics Goal #1: In grades 3-5, 46% of Standard Curriculum students will score a Level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT Math Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 44%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 46%					

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

				(GoMath chapter tests) Check/Act -Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. -Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching. -Based on the data, teachers discuss Differentiated Instruction strategies that were effective. -PLC's discuss Differentiated Instruction strategies for re-teaching of essential skills.			
			1.2. Lack of teacher support for planning remediation and enrichment activities. Need additional training to implement effective PLC's. Teachers at varying levels of implementation of differentiated instruction -Insufficient time to plan for Differentiated Instruction	1.2. Strategy: Strategy: The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math scores will improve through teachers using the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM) with core curriculum and providing Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the problem-solving model. Action Steps: 1. The school will implement grade level and course specific PLC's. 2. PLC's will implement CIM by developing grade level School-Based Reinforcement Calendars, Mini-Lessons, and Mini-Assessments for Math. PLCs will also gather data for math based computer technology. 3. Based on the data gathered in Action Step 2, PLC's will meet to discuss data, to modify and implement future Mini-Lessons and Reinforcement Calendar.	1.2. Who: See 1.1 How: See 1.1 1st Grading Period: Emerging 2nd Grading Period: Operational 3rd Grading Period	1.2. <u>Teacher Level</u> Reports will determine who is making acceptable gains and which students are in need of additional support. <u>PLC/Department Level</u> PLC leader will take scores to the leadership team. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> The leadership team will analyze the scores. <u>1st Grading Period Check</u> <i>Operational</i> <u>2nd Grading Period Check</u> <i>Operational</i> <u>3rd Grading Period Check</u>	1.2 <u>2-3x Per Year</u> County created beginning, mid and end of year assessments. <u>During Grading Period</u> Successmaker reports FASTT Math reports

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

			4. Implement PLC training for faculty. 5. PLC's meet to discuss and implement differentiated instructional strategies for teaching students at various levels of understanding.				
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics.			2.1. See 1.1	2.1 Strategy: See 1.1 Action Steps: See 1.1	2.1. Who See 1.1 How See 1.1 <i>1st Grading Period Check</i> <i>Emerging</i> <i>2nd Grading Period Check</i> <i>Operational</i> <i>3rd Grading Period Check</i>	2.1. Who See 1.1 How See 1.1 <i>1st Grading Period Check</i> <i>Emerging</i> <i>2nd Grading Period Check</i> <i>Operational</i> <i>3rd Grading Period Check</i>	2.1. <u>2-3x Per Year</u> See 1.1 <u>During Grading Period</u> See 1.1
Mathematics Goal #2: In grades 3-5, 18% of Standard Curriculum students will score a Level 4 or 5 on the 2013 FCAT Math Test.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 16%	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 18%					
			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 mathematics.			3.1. See 1.2	3.1. Strategy: See 1.2 Action Steps:	3.1. Who See 1.2 How	3.1. Teacher Level See 1.2 PLC/Department Level	3.1. <u>2-3x Per Year</u> See 1.2
Mathematics Goal #3:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

<p>In grades 3-5, 72% of <u>All Curriculum</u> students will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math Test.</p>	<p>72%</p>	<p>74%</p>		See 1.1	See 1.2	See 1.2	<p><u>During Grading Period</u></p> <p>See 1.2</p>
					<p><u>1st Grading Period Check</u> <i>Emerging</i></p> <p><u>2nd Grading Period Check</u> <i>Operational</i></p> <p><u>3rd Grading Period Check</u></p>	<p><u>Leadership Team Level</u> See 1.2</p> <p><u>1st Grading Period Check</u> <i>Operational</i></p> <p><u>2nd Grading Period Check</u> <i>Operational</i></p> <p><u>3rd Grading Period Check</u></p>	
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.
<p>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:</p>			<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p>Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	<p>Student Evaluation Tool</p>
<p>4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</p>			4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.
			See 1.2	<p>Strategy: See 1.2</p> <p>Action Steps: See 1.2</p>	<p>Who See 1.2</p> <p>How See 1.2</p> <p><u>1st Grading Period Check</u> <i>Operational</i></p> <p><u>2nd Grading Period Check</u> <i>Operational</i></p> <p><u>3rd Grading Period Check</u></p>	<p><u>Teacher Level</u> See 1.2</p> <p><u>PLC/Department Level</u> See 1.2</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u> See 1.2</p> <p><u>1st Grading Period Check</u> <i>Operational</i></p> <p><u>2nd Grading Period Check</u> <i>Operational</i></p> <p><u>3rd Grading Period Check</u></p>	<p>2-3x Per Year</p> <p>See 1.2</p> <p><u>During Grading Period</u></p> <p>See 1.1</p>
<p>Mathematics Goal #4:</p> <p>In grades 3-5, of <u>Bottom Quartile All Curriculum</u> students will score a Level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT Math Test.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
			4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.

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

			4.3	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.							
<u>Math Goal #5:</u>							
5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics		5A.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5A.1. Strategy: See 1.1	5A.1. Who See 1.1	5A.1. Teacher Level See 1.1	5A.1. 2-3x Per Year See 1.1	
<u>Math Goal #5A:</u> The percentage of White students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA will increase from 54% to 59%. The percentage of Black students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA will increase from 32% to 39%. The percentage of Hispanic students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA will increase from 43% to 49%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> White:54% Black: 32% Hispanic: 43% Asian:NA American Indian:NA	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> White:59% Black:39% Hispanic:49% Asian:NA American Indian:NA	See 1.1	<u>Action Steps:</u> See 1.1	How See 1.1	<u>PLC/Department Level</u> See 1.1	<u>During Grading Period</u> See 1.1
			5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.
			5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.
					<u>1st Grading Period Check</u> <i>Operational</i>	<u>Leadership Team Level</u> See 1.1	
					<u>2nd Grading Period Check</u> <i>Highly Functional</i>	<u>1st Grading Period Check</u> <i>Operational</i>	
					<u>3rd Grading Period Check</u>	<u>2nd Grading Period Check</u> <i>Highly Functional</i>	
						<u>3rd Grading Period Check</u>	

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
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5B.1. See 1.2	5B.1. <u>Strategy:</u> See 1.2 <u>Action Steps:</u> See 1.2	5B.1. <u>Who</u> See 1.2 <u>How</u> See 1.2 <i>1st Grading Period Check</i> <i>Operational</i> <i>2nd Grading Period Check</i> <i>Operational</i> <i>3rd Grading Period Check</i>	5B.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> See 1.2 <u>PLC/Department Level</u> See 1.2 <u>Leadership Team Level</u> See 1.2 <i>1st Grading Period Check</i> <i>Operational</i> <i>2nd Grading Period Check</i> <i>Operational</i> <i>3rd Grading Period Check</i>	5B.1. <u>2-3x Per Year</u> See 1.2 <u>During Grading Period</u> See 1.2
<u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring satisfactory on the 2013FCAT/FAA will increase from 44% to 50%.	44%	50%					
			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. Difficulty communicating concepts to ELL students	5C.1. <u>Strategy:</u> See 1.1 <u>Action Steps:</u> See 1.1	5C.1. <u>Who</u> See 1.1 <u>How</u> See 1.1 <i>1st Grading Period Check</i> <i>Operational</i> <i>2nd Grading Period Check</i>	5C.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> See 1.1 <u>PLC/Department Level</u> See 1.1 <u>Leadership Team Level</u> See 1.1 <i>1st Grading Period Check</i> <i>Operational</i>	5C.1. <u>2-3x Per Year</u> See 1.1 <u>During Grading Period</u> See 1.1
<u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
The percentage of ELL students scoring a satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA will increase from 30% to 37%.	30%	37%					

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

					Highly Functional 3 rd Grading Period Check	2 nd Grading Period Check Highly Functional 3 rd Grading Period Check	
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
5D. Student with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1. See 1.2	5D.1. Strategy: See 1.2 Action Steps: See 1.2	5D.1. Who See 1.2 How See 1.2	5D.1. Teacher Level See 1.2 PLC/Department Level See 1.2 Leadership Team Level See 1.2 1 st Grading Period Check Operational 2 nd Grading Period Check Operational 3 rd Grading Period Check Operational	5D.1. 2-3x Per Year See 1.2 During Grading Period See 1.2
<u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
The percentage of student with disabilities scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA will increase from 30% to 35%.	30%	35%					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3

End of Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

Algebra EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check 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
Alg1. Students scoring proficient in Algebra (Levels 3-5).			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Algebra Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
Alg2. Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in Algebra.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Algebra Goal #2: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each 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 Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science.			1.1. -Lack of instructional time. -Content Knowledge -Differentiate Instruction -Lack of knowledge in how to use interactive student notebook -High % of ELL students -High level of content specific science text.	1.1. <u>Strategy:</u> The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the science core curriculum. Students comprehension of course content/standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction as a result of the common assessments to ensure the mastery of essential skills. <u>Action Steps:</u> -All teachers will use the Interactive Student notebook -All teachers will model Higher Order Questions -PLC will spend time on curriculum planning -Training teachers in how to use/implement the interactive student notebook. -All 5 th grade teachers will use active thinking notebooks. -Training teachers how to use/implement lanyard questions -Overall, our 5th grade science scores increased 7.03% from the pre-test given in Sept. 2011 to the mid-year test given in Dec. 2011. The Science Lanyard Program began on 10/10/11 and focused on benchmarks that 40%	1.1. <u>Who</u> Principal AP Science Resource Science Teachers <u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration offers feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walkthroughs. <u>1st Grading Period Check</u> Not Evident <u>2nd Grading Period Check</u> Emerging <u>3rd Grading Period Check</u>	1.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. <u>PLC/Department Level</u> -PLC's will give scores to the Leadership Team. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -PLC facilitator/ Subject area leaders shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. <u>1st Grading Period Check</u> Not evident <u>2nd Grading Period Check</u> Emerging <u>3rd Grading Period Check</u>	1.1. <u>2-3x Per Year</u> County created beginning, mid and end of year assessments. <u>During Grading Period</u> Chapter Tests Interactive Science Notebooks Lanyard questions
<u>Science Goal #1:</u> 43% of the standard curriculum fifth grade students will score a level 3 or above on the FCAT science test.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 40%	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 43%					

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

				<p>or fewer of the students answered correctly. We covered 7 of those benchmarks before giving the mid-year science test. Of those 7 benchmarks, 6 of them were on both the pre-test and mid-year test, so we were able to compare the growth/improvement of those 6 common benchmarks. The 6 science lanyard benchmarks showed an average increase of 19.2% compared to an average increase of only 2.81% for benchmarks that were not covered by a science lanyard question. Also, the average percent of students answering correctly for science lanyard benchmark questions on the mid-year test was 56.4% compared to 41.2% to non-lanyard benchmark questions. That's a difference of 15.2%.</p> <p>-Training teachers in how to create/maintain long term science investigations.</p> <p>-Mini Awareness sessions that will be held a minimum of twice through the year on assigned third Monday's of the month</p> <p>Plan</p> <p>-PLC's identify the essential skills and learning targets for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLC's answer the question,"What do we want students to learn?"</p> <p>-PLC's identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction.</p> <p>-PLC's are answering the question, "How do we know if they have learned it?"</p> <p>Do/Check</p> <p>-PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating effective strategies and Differentiated Instruction activities discussed at their PLC meetings.</p> <p>-At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

				identified from the core curriculum material. Check/Act -Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. -Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching. -Based on the data, teachers discuss Differentiated Instruction strategies that were effective			
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science.			2.1. See 1.1	2.1. <u>Strategy:</u> See 1.1 <u>Action Steps:</u> See 1.1	2.1. <u>Who</u> See 1.1 <u>How</u> See 1.1 <u>1st Grading Period Check</u> <i>Not Evident</i> <u>2nd Grading Period Check</u> <i>Operational</i> <u>3rd Grading Period Check</u>	2.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> See 1.1 <u>PLC/Department Level</u> See 1.1 <u>Leadership Team Level</u> See 1.1 <u>1st Grading Period Check</u> <i>Not Evident</i> <u>2nd Grading Period Check</u> <i>Operational</i> <u>3rd Grading Period Check</u>	2.1. <u>2-3x Per Year</u> County created beginning, mid and end of year assessments. <u>During Grading Period</u> Course driven assessments
Science Goal #2: In grade 5, of the Standard Curriculum students will score a Level 4 or 5 on the 2013 FCAT Science.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
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 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. -Teachers not implementing the whole Writer's workshop daily. -School scheduling (extra curriculars) will shorten or completely delete Writer's workshop. -Teachers lack skill and understanding regarding the FCAT Writing Assessment and Scoring Rubric.	1.1. <u>Strategy:</u> The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Student's use of elaboration will improve through the teachers use of daily Writer's Workshop lessons focused on craft through elaboration and one-on-one conferencing to support differentiated instruction, mode and conventions. <u>Action Steps:</u> -Daily implementation of Writer's Workshop. -School will implement 2-5 monthly writing assessments and discuss data in PLC's. -Teachers will conference daily with different students based on needs. -Mini-awareness sessions to be held a minimum of twice through the year on assigned third Monday's of the month (for professional development) -implement writing lanyards that will focus on the highest needs of students (just began in January of 2012) -dictations sentences.	1.1 <u>Who</u> Teacher Writing Resource Principal AP <u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration. -Evidence of strategy in teacher's lesson plans. -Writing resources aiding in the writer's workshop. <u>1st Grading Period Check</u> Emerging <u>2nd Grading Period Check</u> Operational <u>3rd Grading Period Check</u>	1.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> PLC's-monthly demand writes, daily drafts and conferencing notes are reviewed to determine the number of students demonstrating proficiency in writing through scoring data. <u>PLC/Department Level</u> PLC's-monthly demand writes, daily drafts and conferencing notes are reviewed to determine the number of students demonstrating proficiency in writing through scoring data. PLC facilitator will share the data with the Writing resource <u>Leadership Team Level</u> The Writing resource will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. <u>1st Grading Period Check</u> Emerging <u>2nd Grading Period Check</u> Operational <u>3rd Grading Period Check</u>	1.1. 2-3x Per Year Monthly demand writes During Grading Period Student daily drafts and conferencing notes and star interviews.
Writing/LA Goal #1: 88% of the standard curriculum fourth grade students will score a 3.0 or above on the FCAT Writes test.	2012 Current Level of Performance: * 86%	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * 88%					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.

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

		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

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			1.1. Teachers at various levels of implementation of planned strategy.	1.1. Implement “In your class and in your seat” program where two students’ names are randomly selected and announced 1 st thing in a.m. Students selected are rewarded for on time attendance.	1.1. Teachers School Social Worker Guidance counselors Principal Assistant Principal.	1.1. Random daily checks, school wide. Monthly District Attendance Reports will be reviewed for current attendance rate by attendance committee.	1.1. Monthly District Attendance Reports.
Attendance Goal #1: Based on the 2011-2012 School Attendance, the average daily attendance for the school year was 94.52%. The average percentage of attendance for the 2012-2013 school years will increase to 96% The number of students who have 10 or more <u>unexcused</u> absences throughout the school year will decrease 131 in 2011-2011 to 125 in 2012-2013.	2012 Current Attendance Rate: * 94.52	2013 Expected Attendance Rate: * 96.00	Need additional resources – financial resources	Have a points program in place rewarding each class as they achieve a certain amount of days in a row “all present”. Classes receive incentives. Each grade receives the right to hold “Oak Grove trophy” for a month for best attendance percentage; along with a special sign & recognition on morning show.			
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) 131	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) 125					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) 138	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) 129					
-The number of students who have 10 or more <u>unexcused</u> tardies to school throughout the school year will decrease from 138 in 2011-2012 to 129 in 2012-2013.			1.2. Need additional resources	1.2. Teacher contacts parent/guardian regarding absences starting around the 5 th day. Teacher fills out the SAIF Social Worker & teacher bring case up to the Attendance Committee or school CST for review. Committee formally refers case to school social worker	1.2. Teachers, Social Worker, Attendance Committee or school CST.	1.2. Random attendance reports will be reviewed by social worker to determine students with excessive absences. Information shared in the rti Leadership team and the Attendance Committee	1.2. Monthly District Attendance reports

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

		1.3. Need additional resources – financial resources	1.3. Attendance Committee will implement additional programs aimed at increasing on time attendance for students and increasing parent involvement and motivation for on time attendance.	1.3. Principal, assistant principal, attendance committee members	1.3. Committee will meet monthly to review implementation of strategy and current attendance rates from district reports	1.3. Monthly District Attendance reports
--	--	---	--	--	---	---

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Attendance formality	KG-5 th	Jody Orlando	Attendance Committee, Team leaders	Monthly committee meeting, faculty meetings	Monthly District Attendance reports	Attendance Committee members

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension			1.1. Lack of parental support/understanding of important of education	1.1. Stress importance of attendance and education to parents.	1.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Social worker, Guidance Counselor, School Psychologist, teachers. Stress importance of regular attendance and education in newsletters and conferences.	1.1. Monthly attendance reports and monthly suspension reports will be monitored to ensure our goals are being met.	1.1. Monthly attendance reports and monthly suspension reports.
Suspension Goal #1:	2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions					
During the 2011-2012 school year we will have 25 child serve in school suspension and decrease out of school suspensions and number of students suspended by 10%.	0	0					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School					
	0	0					

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

	2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	35	32					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School					
	24	22					
			1.2. Lack of participation in school wide student recognition program for appropriate behavior. Lack of classroom management	1.2. Implement school wide reward program for positive behaviors.	1.2. Principal -Assistant Principal -key staff members who have created/implemented the plan	1.2. PLC's will discuss the effectiveness of the plan in individual classrooms -PLC facilitators will bring these thoughts to monthly leadership meetings	1.2. Monthly attendance reports and monthly suspension reports.
			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
Decrease inappropriate behaviors school wide	K-5	Judy Atkins	PLC and School wide procedures	1 time a week	We will monitor discipline data.	Judy Atkins and Cynthia Thro

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)		Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>		1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
NA	2012 Current Dropout Rate:*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*				
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*				
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
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 Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Hillsborough 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised July, 2012

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

			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 the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:							
1. Parent Involvement			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Parent Involvement Goal #1:							
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check 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. Parent Involvement			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Parent Involvement Goal #2:							
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*					
			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Health and Fitness Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. Health and Fitness Goal			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Health and Fitness Goal #1: During the 2012-2013 school Year, the number of students scoring in the “healthy fitness zone” (HFZ) on the Pacer for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular health will increase from 55% on the Pretest to 65% on the Posttest.	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*	90 minutes of teacher directed PE may not always be active physical education. Teachers may also use the time to teach health related topics.	Elementary students will engage in 150 minutes of physical education per week in grades kindergarten through 5.	Principal	Classroom walk-throughs Class-schedules	Classroom teachers document 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 physical education
	55%	65%					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

			the 150 Minutes of Elem. Physical Education folder on IDEAS.	Classroom Teacher		
--	--	--	--	-------------------	--	--

Health and Fitness Goals Professional Development

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

Continuous Improvement Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. Continuous Improvement Goal			1.1.	1.1	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
<u>Continuous Improvement Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>	-staff not reading the material -Teachers not using the <i>Teach Like a Champion</i> model in their classroom.	Student achievement improves when students are intellectually active in learning important and challenging content.	-Principal -Assistant Principal who will plan the book study -book chats	PLC's will discuss the information learned through the book chats and share how it is being implemented in each classroom. - The PLC facilitators will share with administration the implementation strategies discussed.	Administrative walkthroughs of PLC meetings -Faculty book study feedback
In 2012-2013 all teachers will be trained to use the book <i>Teach Like a Champion</i> in classrooms.							
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.

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

		-Teachers not attending the mini awareness sessions -Teachers not using the information they gain from the mini awareness sessions	Mini Awareness sessions for	Principal -Assistant Principal -Resource teachers who will teach the mini awareness sessions	Same as 1.1	Same as 1.1
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

NEW Reading Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

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

NEW Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking.		1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
<u>CELLA Goal #C:</u>	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</u>					
The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from 46% to 48%	46%	<p>1.1.</p> <p>PLC meetings do not include discussion of leveled vocabulary development and assessment for content instruction.</p> <p>-PLC meetings do not include the development of vocabulary needs within each content area.</p> <p>-Lack of instructional time.</p>	<p>1.1.</p> <p>Tier 1-The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' vocabulary acquisition will improve through the implementation of appropriately leveled, vocabulary development lessons across all content areas.</p> <p><u>Action Steps:</u></p> <p>-RTI resource pulling small groups</p> <p>Plan</p> <p>-PLCs will recognize vocabulary needs within each content area and needs of all proficiency levels (A,B,C) of ELL students.</p> <p>-PLCs will familiarize themselves with the content standards.</p> <p>-Differentiated Instruction Book Study</p> <p>Do/Check</p> <p>-Teachers will need to use differentiated instruction to make sure all student levels are understanding the instruction.</p> <p>Check/Act</p> <p>-Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs.</p> <p>-Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching</p>	<p>1.1.</p> <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>-Principal</p> <p>-AP</p> <p>-Reading Coach</p> <p>-PLC Facilitators</p> <p>-ELL Resource</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-PLC logs turned into administration</p> <p>-Classroom walkthroughs</p> <p>observing vocabulary development.</p> <p>-Evidence of strategy in teacher's lesson plans.</p> <p><u>1st Grading Period Check</u></p> <p>Emerging</p> <p><u>2nd Grading Period Check</u></p> <p>Emerging</p> <p><u>3rd Grading Period Check</u></p> <p>Emerging</p>	<p>1.1.</p> <p><u>Teacher Level</u></p> <p>Teachers assess students using end of unit/chapter tests.</p> <p><u>PLC/Department Level</u></p> <p>PLCs will review unit assessments.</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u></p> <p>-The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review FAIR data to determine the percentage of students scoring medium to high.</p> <p>-This information has not been analyzed at this time because AP2 has not officially closed to this point. It will be discussed in the near future.</p> <p><u>1st Grading Period Check</u></p> <p>Emerging</p> <p><u>2nd Grading Period Check</u></p> <p>Emerging</p> <p><u>3rd Grading Period Check</u></p>	<p>1.1.</p> <p><u>2-3x Per Year</u></p> <p>FAIR</p> <p><u>During Grading Period</u></p> <p>Running Records</p> <p>Treasure's Tests</p> <p>CIM</p>

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

		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. 2-3x Per Year
<u>CELLA Goal #D:</u>	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :</u>					
The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase from 27% to 29%	27%	PLC meetings do not include discussion of leveled vocabulary development and assessment for content instruction. -PLC meetings do not include the development of vocabulary needs within each content area. -Lack of instructional time.	. Tier 1-The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' vocabulary acquisition will improve through the implementation of appropriately leveled, vocabulary development lessons across all content areas. <u>Action Steps:</u> -RTI resource pulling small groups Plan -PLCs will recognize vocabulary needs within each content area and needs of all proficiency levels (A,B,C) of ELL students. -PLCs will familiarize themselves with the content standards. -Differentiated Instruction Book Study Do/Check -Teachers will need to use differentiated instruction to make sure all student levels are understanding the instruction. Check/Act -Teachers bring assessment	<u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Reading Coach -PLC Facilitators -ELL Resource <u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration -Classroom walkthroughs observing vocabulary development. -Evidence of strategy in teacher's lesson plans. <u>1st Grading Period Check</u> Emerging <u>2nd Grading Period Check</u> Emerging <u>3rd Grading Period Check</u> Emerging	<u>Teacher Level</u> Teachers assess students using end of unit/chapter tests. <u>PLC/Department Level</u> PLCs will review unit assessments. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review FAIR data to determine the percentage of students scoring medium to high. -This information has not been analyzed at this time because AP2 has not officially closed to this point. It will be discussed in the near future. <u>1st Grading Period Check</u> Emerging <u>2nd Grading Period Check</u> Emerging <u>3rd Grading Period Check</u>	FAIR <u>During Grading Period</u> Running Records Treasure's Tests CIM

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

			data back to the PLCs. -Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching			
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
E. Students scoring proficient in Writing.		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
CELLA Goal #E: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA will increase from 19% to 21%	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u> 19%	2.1. PLC meetings do not include discussion of leveled vocabulary development and assessment for content instruction. -PLC meetings do not include the development of vocabulary needs within each content area. -Lack of instructional time.	Tier 1-The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' vocabulary acquisition will improve through the implementation of appropriately leveled, vocabulary development lessons across all content areas. <u>Action Steps:</u> -RTI resource pulling small groups Plan -PLCs will recognize vocabulary needs within each content area and needs of all proficiency levels (A,B,C) of ELL students. -PLCs will familiarize themselves with the content standards. -Differentiated Instruction Book Study Do/Check -Teachers will need to use differentiated instruction to make sure all student levels are understanding the instruction.	Who -Principal -AP -Reading Coach -PLC Facilitators -ELL Resource How -PLC logs turned into administration -Classroom walkthroughs observing vocabulary development. -Evidence of strategy in teacher's lesson plans. <u>1st Grading Period Check</u> Emerging <u>2nd Grading Period Check</u> Emerging <u>3rd Grading Period Check</u> Emerging	Teacher Level Teachers assess students using end of unit/chapter tests. <u>PLC/Department Level</u> PLCs will review unit assessments. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review FAIR data to determine the percentage of students scoring medium to high. -This information has not been analyzed at this time because AP2 has not officially closed to this point. It will be discussed in the near future. <u>1st Grading Period Check</u> Emerging <u>2nd Grading Period Check</u> Emerging <u>3rd Grading Period Check</u>	2-3x Per Year FAIR <u>During Grading Period</u> Running Records Treasure's Tests CIM

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

			Check/Act -Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. -Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching			
		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:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
NA	NA	NA					
			F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.
			F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.
G. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.			G.1.	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.
Mathematics Goal G:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

NA	NA	NA					
			G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	G.2.
			G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	G.3.

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

Geometry EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
H. Students scoring in the middle or upper third (proficient) in Geometry.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Geometry Goal H: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	NA	NA					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool

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

I. Students scoring in the upper third on Geometry.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Geometry Goal I: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	NA	NA					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Geometry EOC Goals

NEW 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.	J.1.	J.1.	J.1.	J.1.
Science Goal J: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	J.2.
			J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	J.3.

--	--	--	--	--	--

NEW Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Biology EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
K. Students scoring in the middle or upper third (proficient) in Biology.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Biology Goal K: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
L. Students scoring in upper third in Biology.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Biology Goal L: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

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

NEW Writing Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
M. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing (Levels 4-9).			M.1.	M.1.	M.1.	M.1.	M.1.
Writing Goal M: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	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

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

STEM Goal #1: Implement/expand integrative approaches to the Common Core State Standards.	1.1. Need common planning time for math, science, ELA and other STEM teachers.	1.1. -Explicit directions 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 team leaders	1.1. Administrative walk-throughs	1.1. Logging number of project-based learning in math, science and CTE/STEM. 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
PLC focus on STEM Integration	k-5th	Administrator	Math and Science Teachers	On-going	Administrative walk-throughs	Administration

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	Student Evaluation Tool

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

				effectiveness of strategy?	
CTE Goal #1: Increase the student membership from 50% in 2011-2012 to 100% in 2012-2013	1.1.	1.1. Provide field trips to local businesses or CTE student competitions.	1.1. CTE Teachers	1.1. Aggregate and analyze the data every quarter to develop the next steps.	1.1. JA-Biz Town Great American Teach-In
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Integration of career opportunities in core academic areas	k-5th	District	teachers		Log of events and attendance	Teachers

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		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> 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
Implement a Character Education program that targets building a community of learners on a monthly basis.	Core Essentials	Internal Funding	
Final Amount Spent			