Florida Department of Education

School Improvement Plan (SIP)

Form SIP-1

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Lithia Springs Elementary School	District Name: Hillsborough
Principal: Mary Ann Keene	Superintendent: MaryEllen Elia
SAC Chair: Patricia Dever	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

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

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	Mary Ann Keene	A.A., B.A., M. Ed. Certified in: Elementary Education (1-6) Early Childhood (Nursery – Kindergarten) ESOL School Principal (All levels)	6	16	11-12: A Lithia Springs Elementary School 10-11: A; 100% AYP Lithia Springs Elementary School 09-10: A; 100% AYP Lithia Springs Elementary School
Assistant Principal	Kevin Martin	B. S., M. Ed. Certified in: Elementary Education (K-6) Educational Leadership (All levels)	4	4	11-12: A Lithia Springs Elementary School 10-11: A; 100% AYP Lithia Springs Elementary School 09-10: A; 100% AYP Lithia Springs Elementary School

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	Heather Bisesto	B. S. Certified in: Elementary Education (K-6) ESOL	7	10	11-12: A; 10-11: A; 100% AYP 09-10: A; 100% AYP

Highly Qualified Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1. Teacher Interview Day	District staff	June	
2. District Mentor Program	District Mentors	ongoing	
3. District Peer Program	District Peers	ongoing	
4. School-based teacher recognition system	Principal	ongoing	
5. Opportunities for teacher leadership	Principal	ongoing	
6. Regular time for teacher collaboration	Principal	ongoing	

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
10	Depending on the needs of the teacher, one or more of the following strategies are implemented. **Administrators** Meet with the teachers at least four times per year to discuss progress on: - Preparing and taking the certification exam - Completing classes need for certification - Provide substitute coverage for the teachers to observe other teachers - Discussion of what teachers learned during the observation(s) **Reading Coach** - The coach co-plans, models, co-teaches, observes and conferences with the teacher on a regular basis

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
100% (45)	7% (3)	16% (7)	33% (15)	44% (20)	33% (15)	100% (45)	2% (1)	4% (2)	78% (35)

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
Tamala Geiger	Hilary Lain Barbara Mittelstadt Ernesto Sierra	The district-based mentor is with the EET initiative. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

Title I, Part A

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

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

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

Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.

The MTSS Leadership team (Multi-Tiered System of Supports – MTSS) includes:
- Principal, Mary Ann Keene
- Assistant Principal for Instruction, Kevin Martin
- Guidance Counselor, Linda Richards
- School Psychologist, Jeanne Raschke
- Social Worker, Patricia Ryans
- Reading Coach, Heather Bisesto
- Speech Therapist, Margaret Snaider
- ESE teachers
- Classroom teachers
- SAC Chair, Patricia Dever

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

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

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

The MTSS is considered the main leadership team in our school. The MTSS will meet monthly and use the problem solving process to:
- Oversee the multi-layered model of service delivery (Tier 1/Core, Tier 2/Supplemental and Tier 3/Intensive)
- Based on student data, recommend, coordinate and implement supplemental services (Tiers 2 and 3) that match students' non-mastery of skills through:
    - Tutoring during the day in small group pull-outs in reading and math
    - Extended Learning Programs during and after school
    - Create, manage and update the school resource map
- Determine scheduling needs, curriculum materials and intervention resources based on identified needs derived from data analysis
- Determine the school-wide professional development needs of faculty and staff and arrange trainings aligned with the SIP goals
- Review and interpret student data (academic, behavior and attendance) at the school and grade levels
- Organize and support systematic data collection as needed
- Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction through the:
    - Implementation and support of PLCs
    - Use of school-based *Reinforcement Instructional Calendars, Mini-Lessons* and *Mini-Assessments*
    - Use of Mini Assessments (data will be collected by PLCs)
    - Use of *Common Core Assessments* at the end of segments/chapters (data will be collected by PLCs)
    - Implementation of research-based, scientifically validated instructional strategies and/or interventions (e.g., Differentiated Instruction)
    - Communication with major stakeholders (e.g., parents, business partners, etc.) regarding student outcomes through data summaries and conferences
- At the end of each nine weeks, assist in the evaluation of teacher fidelity data and student achievement data collected during the nine weeks.
- Assist with planning, implementing, and evaluating the outcomes of supplemental and intensive interventions in conjunction with PLCs.
- Work collaboratively with the PLCs in the implementation of the C-CIM (Core Continuous Improvement Model) and F-CIM (Florida Continuous Improvement Model on specific tested benchmarks) and progress monitoring.
- Coordinate/collaborate with other working committees, such as the Literacy Leadership Team (which is charged with developing a plan for

embedding/integrating reading and writing strategies across all other content areas).
- Use intervention planning forms to communicate initiatives between the MTSS and PLCs.

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

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

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

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

- The MTSS will communicate with and support the PLCs in implementing the proposed strategies by assigning MTSS members as consultants to the PLCs to facilitate planning and implementation. Once strategies are put in place, PLCs will periodically report on their efforts and student outcomes to the larger MTSS team through the subject area MTSS representatives.
- The MTSS and PLCs both use the problem solving process: Problem Identification, Problem Analysis, Intervention Design and Implementation and Evaluation to:
  - review and analyze screening and collateral data
  - develop and test hypotheses about why student/school problems are occurring (changeable barriers)
  - develop and target interventions based on confirmed hypotheses
  - establish methods to track students' progress with appropriate progress monitoring assessments at intervals matched to the intensity of the interventions and/or enrichment
  - develop progress monitoring goals to determine when student(s) need more or less support (e.g., frequency, duration, intensity) to meet established class, grade, and/or school goals (e.g., use of data-based decision-making to fade, maintain, modify or intensify interventions and/or enrichments)
  - review goal statements to ensure they are ambitious, time-bound and meaningful (e.g., SMART goals)
  - assess the fidelity of instruction/intervention implementation and other PS/RtI processes

MTSS Implementation

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

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

Core Curriculum (Tier 1)

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible
FCAT released tests	School Generated Excel Database	Reading Coach/Math Coach/AP
Baseline and Midyear District Assessments	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers
Subject-specific assessments generated by District-level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Language Arts, Math, Writing and Science (Math, Science, and Writing formatives, FAIR K-5, and KRT for Kindergarten)	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall PLC Logs	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers
FAIR	Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network Data Wall	Reading Coach/ Assistant Principal
CELLA	Sagebrush (IPT)	ELL Aide, Assistant Principal
DRA-2	School Generated Excel Database	Individual Teacher

Supplemental/Intensive Instruction (Tiers 2 and 3)

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible for Monitoring
Extended Learning Program (ELP) Ongoing Progress Monitoring (mini-assessments and other assessments from adopted curriculum resource materials) (Easy CBM – Reading comprehension)	School Generated Database in Excel	Leadership Team/ ELP Facilitator
Differentiated mini assessments based on core curriculum assessments.	Individual teacher data base PLC/Department data base	Individual Teachers/PLCs
FAIR OPM	School Generated Database in Excel	Leadership Team/Reading Coach
Research-based Computer-assisted Instructional Programs i.e., ISIP	Assessments included in computer-based programs, i.e., istation	PLCs/Individual Teachers

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

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. The Leadership Team will continue to work to build consensus with all stakeholders regarding a need for and a focus on school improvement efforts. The Leadership Team will work to align the efforts of other school teams that may be addressing similar identified issues. As the District's MTSS Committee/MTSS Facilitators develop(s) resources and staff development trainings on PS/MTSS, these tools and staff development sessions will be conducted with staff when they become available. Professional Development sessions, as identified by teacher needs assessment and/or EET evaluation data, will occur during faculty meeting times or rolling faculty meetings. The Leadership Team will send school team representatives to ongoing PS/MTSS trainings/support sessions that are offered district-wide. Our school will invite our area MTSS Facilitator to visit quarterly (or as needed) to review our progress in implementation of PS/MTSS and provide on-site coaching and support to our Leadership Teams/PLCs. New staff will be directed to participate in trainings relevant to PLCs and PS/MTSS as they become available.
Describe plan to support MTSS. Response to Intervention (RtI, now called MTSS) has also been described in Florida as a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) for providing high quality instruction and intervention matched to student needs using learning rate over time and level of performance to inform instructional decisions. In order to support MTSS in our schools, we will: ● Consistently promote the shared vision of one system meeting the needs of ALL students with MTSS as the platform for integrating all school initiatives (i.e., PLC, PSLT, Steering, and SAC meetings, lesson study, school-wide behavior management plans). ● Provide designated school personnel with the requisite knowledge and experience to support coordination and implementation of MTSS. ● Provide continued training and support to all school based personnel in problem solving, responding to student data and the use of a systematic method to increase student achievement.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). The Reading Leadership Team serves as the school's literacy Professional Learning Community. The team is comprised of: • Principal, Mary Ann Keene • Assistant Principal for Curriculum, Kevin Martin • Reading Coach, Heather Bisesto • Reading Teachers • Media Specialist, Carolyn Lemanski

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

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

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

| 1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5). | 1.1.
- Lack of understanding of how to implement the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM with the core curriculum), as the emphasis has been placed on F-CIM for targeted mini lessons and NOT on the core curriculum.

-Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction.

-Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments.

-Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices.

- Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students).

-Lack of common "Higher Order Thinking" strategies | Strategy:
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.

Action Steps
1. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.)
2. As a Professional Activity, teachers and staff will continue to use questions learned at last year's "Higher Order Thinking" skills workshop.
3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling researched-based best-practice strategies.
4. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI and | 1.1.
Who
-Principal
-AP
-Reading Coach
-Team Leaders
-Classroom Teachers

How
-PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.
-Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.
-Classroom Teachers will provide monthly to their team leaders, a random set of HOT questions used in classroom content lessons.
-Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). The C-CIM and DI strategies will be added to the form.
-Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.
-Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. | 1.1.
Teacher Level

PLC unit assessment data will be recorded in a course-specific PLC data base (excel spread sheet).

PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.

PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team/ Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.

PLC/Department Level

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

Leadership Team Level

Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. | 1.1.
2-3x Per Year
-FAIR, on-going
-Chapter/Unit tests
-RR/Comp. checks
-Progress Monitoring of HOT & DI strategies

During Nine Weeks
- Course unit assessments | | |

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

	training.	HOT strategies from their PLC discussions. 5. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 6. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs and discuss strategies that were effective. 7. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment). 8. PLCs record their work in PLC notes.					
Reading Goal #1: In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 84% to 87%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	84%	**87%**					
		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**		

Hillsborough 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised July, 2012

18

2. **FCAT 2.0:** Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1		
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 57% to 60%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	57%	**60%**					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

3. **FCAT 2.0:** Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.	3.1. See 1.1	3.1. See 1.1	3.1. See 1.1	3.1. See 1.1	3.1. See 1.1		
Reading Goal #3: Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 67 points to 70 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	67 points	**70 points**					
		3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	
		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3..3.	3.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

4. FCAT 2.0: **Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.**	4.1. **See 1.1**	4.1. **See 1.1**	4.1. **See 1.1**	4.1. **See 1.1**	4.1. **See 1.1**	
Reading Goal #4: Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 67 points to 70 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	67 points	**70 points**				
		4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.
		4.3	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.							
Reading Goal #5:							

5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5A.1. White: 88% Black: NA Hispanic: Y Asian: Y American Indian: NA	5A.1. White: The percentage of White students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 87% to 89% Black: The percentage of White students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 75% to 77% Hispanic: The percentage of White students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 74% to 77% Asian: The percentage of White students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 79% to 80%	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.		
Reading Goal #5A: See 1.1	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	White:88 Black:75 Hispanic:74 Asian:79 American Indian:NA	White:89 Black:78 Hispanic:77 Asian:80 American Indian:NA					

		5A.2.	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2	
		5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5B.1. **See 1.1**	5B.1. **See 1.1**	5B.1. **See 1.1**	5B.1. **See 1.1**	5B.1. **See 1.1**		
Reading Goal #5B: **See 1.1**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	62%	66%					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
Reading Goal #5C: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	NA	**NA**					
		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. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5D.1. **See 1.1**	5D.1. **See 1.1**	5D.1. **See 1.1**	5D.1. **See 1.1**	5D.1. **See 1.1**		
Reading Goal #5D: In grades 3-5, the percentage of Students With Disabilities making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 69% to 72%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	69%	**72%**					
		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						

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

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
Teaching Strategies (Teach Like a Champion)	All	Leadership Teams, Grade Levels	All faculty and staff members assigned to student interaction	Monthly Faculty meetings	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk-Thrus, Observations	Leadership Team, PLC, Administration
K/1 Applying the CCSS.	K-1	District Training	All K-1 teachers	October 2012	Classroom Walk-thrus	Leadership Team, PLC, Administration

End of Reading Goals

Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

| 1. **FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in mathematics (Level 3-5).** | 1.1.
- Lack of understanding of how to implement the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM with the core curriculum) , as the emphasis has been placed on F-CIM for targeted mini lessons and NOT on the core curriculum.
-Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction.
-Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments.
-Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices.
- Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated | 1.1.
Strategy:
Tier 1 - The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' mathematics instruction 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. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.)

2. Teachers and staff will continue to use "Higher Order Thinking" skills learned at last year's workshop. | 1.1.
Who
Principal
-AP
-Team Leaders
-Classroom Teachers

How
-PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.
-Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.
-Classroom Teachers will provide monthly to their team leaders, a random set of HOT questions used in classroom content lessons.
-Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). The C-CIM and DI strategies will be added to the form.
-Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.
-Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. | 1.1.
Teacher Level
PLC unit assessment data will be recorded in a course-specific PLC data base (excel spread sheet).

PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.

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

Leadership Team Level
The Problem Solving Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. | 1.1.
2-3x Per Year
-SIM
-Unit chapter Tests
-NGSS
-EOY

During Grading Period
Chapter Tests
Benchmark Tests
GO Math – BOY
GO Math – MOY
Go Math - EOY | | |

	Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students). -Lack of common "Higher Order Thinking" strategies training.	3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling researched-based best-practice strategies. 4. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI and HOT strategies from their PLC discussions. 5. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 6. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs and discuss strategies that were effective. 7. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment). 8. PLCs record their work in PLC notes..				

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

Mathematics Goal #1: In grades 3-5, the percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 83% to 86%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	83%	**86%**				
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**	
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics.	2.1. **See 1.1**	2.1. **See 1.1**	2.1. **See 1.1**	2.1. **See 1.1**	2.1. **See 1.1**	

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

Mathematics Goal #2: In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 54% to 57%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	54%	**57%**				
		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 1.1**	3.1. **See 1.1**	3.1. **See 1.1**	3.1. **See 1.1**	3.1. **See 1.1**	

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

Mathematics Goal #3: Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 84 points to 87 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	84 points	**87 points**				
		3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3..3.	3.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**	
4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4.1. **See 1.1**	4.1. **See 1.1**	4.1. **See 1.1**	4.1. **See 1.1**	4.1. **See 1.1**	

Mathematics Goal #4: Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 81 points to 84 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	81 points	**84 points**				
		4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.
		4.3	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.						
Math Goal #5:						

5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics**	White:Y Black:NA Hispanic: 68 Asian:84 American Indian:NA	5A.1. White: Black: **Hispanic**: The percentage of Hispanis students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 68% to 71% **Asian:** The percentage of Asian students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 84% to 86% American Indian:	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.		
Reading Goal #5A: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. **See 1.1**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	White:Y Black:NA Hispanic: 68 Asian:84 American Indian:NA	White:Y Black:NA Hispanic:71 Asian:86 American Indian:NA					
		5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	

		5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5B.1. **See 1.1**	5B.1. **See 1.1**	5B.1. **See 1.1**	5B.1. **See 1.1**	5B.1. **See 1.1**		
Mathematics Goal #5B: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. **See 1.1**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	68%	**70%**					
		5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5C: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	NA	**NA**					
		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 1.1**	5D.1. **See 1.1**	5D.1. **See 1.1**	5D.1. **See 1.1**	5D.1. **See 1.1**		
Mathematics Goal #5D: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. **See 1.1**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	60%	**64%**					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community						

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

End of Mathematics Goals

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

<u>Elementary and Middle School Science Goals</u>

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		

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

1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science.	1.1. - Lack of understanding of how to implement the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM with the core curriculum) , as the emphasis has been placed on F-CIM for targeted mini lessons and NOT on the core curriculum. -Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. -Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments. -Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices. - Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated	1.1. Strategy: **Tier 1** - The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' science 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 Action Steps: l. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) 2. Teachers and staff will	1.1. Who -Principal -AP -Reading Coach -Team Leaders -Classroom Teachers How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. -Classroom Teachers will provide monthly to their team leaders, a random set of HOT questions used in classroom content lessons. -Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). The C - CIM and DI strategies will be added to the form. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.	1.1. Teacher Level PLC unit assessment data will be recorded in a course-specific PLC data base (excel spread sheet). PLC/Department Level PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. Leadership Team Level Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.	1.1. 2-3x Per Year End of Unit Tests District Level baseline & mid- year tests. During Grading Period -Core Curriculum Assessments		

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

	Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students). -Lack of common "Higher Order Thinking" strategies training.	continue to use "Higher Order Thinking" skills learned in last year's workshop. 3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling researched-based best-practice strategies. 4. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI and HOT strategies from their PLC discussions. 5. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 6. Teachers bring assessment data back				

		to the PLCs and discuss strategies that were effective. 7. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment). 8. PLCs record their work in PLC notes.				
Science Goal #1: In grade 5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 73% to 76%	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	73%	**76%**				
		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. **See 1.1**	2.1. **See 1.1**	2.1. **See 1.1**	2.1. **See 1.1**		
Science Goal #2: In grade 5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2011 FCAT Science will increase from 34% to 37%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	34%	**37%**					
		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						

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

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**		

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing.	1.1. Not all teachers know how to plan and execute writing lessons with a focus on mode-based writing. -Not all teachers know how to review student writing to determine trends and needs in order to drive instruction. -All teachers need training to score student writing accurately during the 2012-2013 school year using information provided by the state.	1.1. **Strategy** Students' use of mode-specific writing will improve through use of Writers' Workshop/daily instruction with a focus on mode-specific writing. **Action Steps** -Based on baseline data, PLCs write SMART goals for each Grading Period. (For example, during the first Grading Period, 50% of the students will score 4.0 or above on the end-of-the Grading Period writing prompt.) ***Plan:*** -Professional Development for updated rubric courses -Professional Development for instructional delivery of mode-specific writing -Training to facilitate data-driven PLCs -Using data to identify	1.1. <u>Who</u> Principal APC SAL District (Writing Team, Supervisors, Writing Resources, Academic Coaches, and DRTs) <u>How Monitored</u> -PLC logs -Classroom walk-throughs Observation Form -Conferencing while writing walk-through tool (for coaches)	1.1. See "Check" & "Act" action steps in the strategies column	1.1. -Student monthly demand writes/ formative assessments -Student daily drafts -Student revisions -Student portfolios		

		trends and drive instruction -Lesson planning based on the needs of students *Do:* -Daily/ongoing models and application of appropriate mode-specific writing based on teaching points -Daily/ongoing conferencing *Check:* Review of daily drafts and scoring monthly demand writes -PLC discussions and analysis of student writing to determine trends and needs *Act:* -Receive additional professional development in areas of need -Seek additional professional knowledge through book studies/research -Spread the use of effective practices across the school based				

		on evidence shown in the best practice of others -Use what is learned to begin the cycle again, revise as needed, increase scale if possible, etc. -Plan ongoing monitoring of the solution(s)				
Writing/LA Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring Level 3.0 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes will increase from 97% to 98%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	97%	**98%**				
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Writing/Language Arts Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional					

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

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**	

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

1. Attendance	1.1 -Attendance committee needs to meet on a regular basis throughout the school year. -Need support in building and maintain the student database.	1.1 **Tier 1** The school will establish an attendance committee comprised of Administrators, Guidance Counselor, SSW, teachers and other relevant personnel to review the school's attendance plan and discuss school wide interventions to address needs relevant to current attendance data. The attendance committee will also maintain a database of students with significant attendance problems and implement and monitor interventions to be documented on the attendance intervention form (SB 90710) The attendance committee meets every two months.	1.1 Attendance committee will keep a log and notes that will be reviewed by the Principal & others on a bi-monthly basis and share with faculty.	1.1 Attendance committee will monitor the attendance data from the targeted group of students.	1.1 Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/ Tardy data Ed Connect		

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

Attendance Goal #1: The attendance rate will increase from 96.46% in 2011-2012 to 97% in 2012-2013.						
	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*				
	96.46	**97.0**				
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)				
	29	**26**				
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)				
	44	**41**				
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

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

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

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

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

| 1. Suspension | 1.1
There needs to be common school-wide expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior. | 1.1
<u>Tier 1</u>
-Positive Behavior Support (PBS) or CHAMPS will be implemented to address school-wide expectations and rules, set these through staff survey, discipline data, and provide training to staff in methods for teaching and reinforcing the school-wide rules and expectations.

-Providing teachers with resources for continued teaching and reinforcement of school expectations and rules.

-Leadership team conducts walkthroughs using a PBS or CHAMPS walk-through form (generated by the district RtI facilitators).

-The data is shared with faculty at a monthly meeting, tracking the overall improvement of the faculty. | 1.1
<u>Who</u>
-PSLT Behavior Committee
-Leadership Team
-Administration | 1.1
- PSLT /Behavior Committee will review data on Office Discipline Referrals ODRs and out of school suspensions, ATOSS data bi-monthly. | UNTIE , EASI ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data | | |

		-Where needed, administration conducts individual teacher walk-through data chats.					
Suspension Goal #1: -The total number of Suspensions will decrease from 3 in 2011-2012 to 2 in 2012- 2013.	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions					
	0	**0**					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					
	0	**0**					
	2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	3	**2**					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	3	**2**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Suspension Professional Development

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

End of Suspension Goals

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**					

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

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. Elementary students will engage in 150 minutes of physical education per week in grades kindergarten through 5.	1. Principal 2. PE Teacher	1. Classroom walk-throughs Class schedules	1. 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 Phys. Ed.		
Health and Fitness Goal #1: During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of fifth grade students scoring in the "Healthy Fitness Zone" (HFZ) on the Pacer for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular health will increase from 79% on the Pretest to 82% on the Posttest.	2012 Current Level :* 2013 Expected Level :*						
	79%	**82%**					

			2. Health and physical activity initiatives developed and implemented.			2. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.
			3. Use of the playground or LYNX Lap fitness course equipment; walk/jog/run activities in designated areas; and exercising to the outdoor activities such as the ones provided in the 150 Minutes of Elem. Physical Education folder on IDEAS.	3. Physical Education Teacher	3. Lesson plans of Physical Education Teacher	3. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.

Health and Fitness Goals Professional Development

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

Continuous Improvement Goal(s)

* 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	1.2 -Not enough time to meet in PLCs.	1.2 Leadership team will use teacher survey information every nine weeks to determine next steps for PLC professional development. The leadership team will become trained on the use of the PLC on the Plan-Do-Check-Act model.. The work will be recorded on PLC logs that are reviewed by the Administration.	1.2 Who Leadership team How Leadership team aggregates the data	1.2 "Quick" PLC informal surveys will be administered during the school year every two months. The Leadership Team will aggregate the data and share outcomes of the school-wide results with their PLCs. The data will provide direction for future PLC training.	1.2 PLC Survey at end of year.	

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

Continuous Improvement Goal #1: During the 2012-2013 school year, the teachers will increase the use of classroom data to evaluate the effectiveness of their teaching from 86% to 89%, as measured by the 2013 School Climate & Perception Survey.	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	86%	**89%**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.					

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

NEW Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

CELLA Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/ Speaking.	1.1. See Reading Goal #1	1.1. **See Reading Goal 1a.**	1.1. See Reading Goal #1	1.1. See Reading Goal #1	1.1. See Reading Goal #1
CELLA Goal #C: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from 0% to 50%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:				
	0% (2 students)				
	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. See Reading Goal #1	2.1. **See Reading Goal 1a.**	2.1. See Reading Goal #1	2.1. See Reading Goal #1	2.1. See Reading Goal #1	
CELLA Goal #D: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from 0% to 50%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading : **0%** **(2 students)**					
		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.	
		See Reading Goal 1a.				
CELLA Goal #E: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will maintain from 100%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
	100% (2 students)					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool

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

STEM Goal #1: Implement/expand project/problem-based learning in math and science.	1.1 Need common planning time for math, science, and ELA teachers	1.1 -Explicit direction for STEM professional learning communities to be established. -Documentation of planning of units and outcomes of units in logs. -Increase effectiveness of lessons through lesson study and district metrics, etc.	1.1 PLC &/or Team Leaders	1.1 Administrative/SAL walk-throughs	1.1 Logging number of project-based learning in math and science elective per semester. Share data with teachers.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

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

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
CTE Goal #1: Increase student interest in career opportunities and program selection prior to middle school. The school will increase the frequency of career exposure speakers from 42 speakers in 2011-2012 to 45 speakers in 2012-2013.	1.1. Day/times available.	1.1. Implement special speakers to visit and share with students about CTE careers throughout the year and during the Great American Teach-In.	1.1. Guidance Counselor	1.1. Feedback from students and faculty.	1.1. Log of CTE special speakers.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

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

Hillsborough 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised July, 2012

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

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 CTE Goal(s)

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
☐Priority	☐Focus	☐Prevent

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

X☐ Yes   ☐ No

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

Describe the use of SAC funds.			
Name and Number of Strategy from the School Improvement Plan	Description of Resources that improves student achievement or student engagement	Projected Amount	Final Amount
All	Increase communication and interaction with curriculum	$	

Final Amount Spent			