Florida Department of Education

School Improvement Plan (SIP)

Form SIP-1

Summerfield Crossings Elementary

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Summerfield Crossings Elementary	District Name: Hillsborough
Principal: Rick Grayes	Superintendent: MaryEllen Elia
SAC Chair: Sabrina Mahoney	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	Rick Grayes	-Elementary Education K-6 -Ed. Leadership K-12 -ESOL -K-12 Principal Certification	3	7	**Clair Mel-** 2006-C/No-72% AYP 2007-C/No-95% AYP 2008-D/No-64% AYP 2009-C/No-85% AYP **Summerfield Crossings-** 2010- B/ No 79% AYP 2011-A/No 95% AYP 2012-A
Assistant Principal	Kirsten Simenson	Elementary Education K-6 Ed. Leadership K-12	1st year	1st year	N/A

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

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

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	Tiffany Latimore	Pre Kindergarten	4	3	2010 School Grade-B
		Primary Education (Age 3-Grade 3)			Proficiency- 72%
					Learning Gains- 62%
		MS Elementary Education			Lower 25%-52%
		NBCT			
					2011 School Grade-A
					Proficiency- 78%
					Learning Gains- 67%
					Lower 25%-59%
					2012 School Grade-A
					Proficiency- 65%
					Learning Gains- 68%
					Lower 25%- 65%

ESOL Resource Teacher	Marilyn Hernandez	Elementary Ed (K-6) ESOL ESE (K-12)	1st year	2	School: Gibsonton Elementary 2011 School Grade-D Proficiency- 46% Learning Gains- 60% Lower 25%-63% School: Gibsonton Elementary 2012 School Grade- C Proficiency- 54% Learning Gains- 51% Lower 25%- 46%

<u>Highly Qualified Teachers</u>

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.	Recruitment Fairs	District Staff	June	
3.	Salary Differential (Renaissance Schools)	N/A	N/A	We are not a Renaissance School
4.	District Peer Program	District Peers	ongoing	
5.	School-based teacher recognition system	Principal	ongoing	
6.	Opportunities for teacher leadership	Principal	ongoing	
7.	Regular time for teacher collaboration	Principal	ongoing	

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
There are 14 teachers who are out of field because they do not have their ESOL Endorsement.	**Administrators** • Meet with teachers twice per year to discuss their progress on completing the classes required for certification. **PLCs** • The teachers will attend PLCs on a regular basis to discuss effective instruction and learning strategies for all students including English Language Learners. **ESOL Resource Teacher** • The ESOL Resource Teacher will provide teachers with strategies to support the learning of English Language Learners.

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

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
72	7% (5)	32% (23)	50% (36)	11% (8)	29% (21)	100% (72)	1% (1)	1% (1)	62% (45)

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

Karen Koslow	Kelly Jones	Second year of teaching-Karen is mentor as part of the EET Grant.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Karen Koslow	Jessica Pagan	Second year of teaching-Karen is mentor as part of the EET Grant.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.

Karen Koslow	Kara Leesman	Second year of teaching-Karen is mentor as part of the EET Grant.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Karen Koslow	Sandy Springer	First year of teaching-Karen is mentor as part of the EET Grant.	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

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

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

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

Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.
 	
    ● Principal
 	
    ● APEI
 	
    ● Guidance Counselor
 	
    ● Speech Pathologist
 	
    ● Psychiatrist
 	
    ● Social Worker
 	
    ● ELL Resource Teacher
 	
    ● Reading Coach

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 core Leadership Team is to:

1. Review school-wide assessment data on an ongoing basis in order to identify instructional needs at all grade levels.

2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels.

3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains.

4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams.

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 Leadership team meets monthly Specific responsibilities include:

- Oversee the multi-layered model of instructional delivery (Tier 1/Core, Tier 2/Supplemental and Tier 3/Intensive)

- Create, manage and update the school resource map

- Determine scheduling needs, and assist teacher teams in identifying research-based instructional materials and intervention resources at Tiers2/3

- Determine the school-wide professional development needs of faculty and staff and arrange trainings aligned with the SIP goals

- Organize and support systematic data collection

- Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction through the:

    o Implementation and support of PLCs

    o Review of teacher/PLC core curriculum assessments/chapters tests/checks for understanding

    o Use of Common Core Assessments by teachers.

- On a monthly basis, assist in the evaluation of teacher fidelity data and student achievement data collected during the month.

- Support the planning, implementing, and evaluating the outcomes of supplemental and intensive interventions in conjunction with PLCs and Specialty PSLT.

- Work collaboratively with the PLCs in the implementation of the C-CIM (Core Continuous Improvement Model) on core curriculum material.

- Coordinate/collaborate/integrate with other working committees, such as the Literacy Leadership Team (which is charged with developing a plan for embedding/integrating reading and writing strategies across all other content areas).

MTSS Implementation

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

Core Curriculum (Tier 1)

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible
FCAT released tests	School Generated Excel Database	Administration/Reading Coach/PLCs
Baseline and Midyear District Assessments	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers, PSLT
District generated assessments from the Office of Assessment and Accountability: Math Formatives Science Formatives Practice Reading 2.0 Assessments	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall PLC Logs	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers,PSLT

Subject-specific assessments generated by District-level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Language Arts, Math, Writing and Science: Math Formatives Science Formatives Practice Reading 2.0 Assessments Monthly Demand Writes	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall PLC Logs	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers,PSLT
FAIR	Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network IPT Data Wall	Reading Coach LLT PSLT Grade Level PLCs
CELLA	Sagebrush (IPT)	ELL PSLT Representative
Teachers' common core curriculum assessments on units of instruction/big ideas. Math Chapter Assessments Science Chapter Assessments	PLC Logs Data Wall	Individual Teachers Grade Level PLCs Grade level MTSS Consultant
DRA-2	School Generated Excel Database	Individual Teacher, Grade Level PLCs

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)	School Generated Database in Excel	Leadership Team, ELP Facilitator, Grade Level PLCs
FAIR OPM	School Generated Database in Excel	Leadership Team/Reading Coach/Individual Teachers/Grade Level PLCs
Other Curriculum Based Measurement	Easy CBM School Generated Database in Excel	Leadership Team/PLCs/Individual Teachers
Research-based Computer-assisted Instructional Programs I Station FCAT Explorer	Assessments included in computer-based programs	PLCs/Individual Teachers

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

- Our District Resource Teacher will conduct trainings for our staff on September 4 and September 11.

Describe plan to support MTSS.

- Each grade level will have a MTSS Consultant assigned to them during the year. The MTSS Consultant will participate in PLC Meetings, facilitate data sorts and assist with planning the Tiered Support throughout the year. Each MTSS Consultant will report their grade level's progress during the monthly MTSS meetings.

- 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). Principal APEI Reading Coach Language Arts Teachers from each grade level Media Specialist

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

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

The administration 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 administration ensures that time is provided for the LLT to collaborate and share information with all site stakeholders including other administrators, teachers, staff members, parents and students.

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

- Implementation and evaluation of the SIP reading goals/strategies across the content areas

- Professional Development

- Co-planning, modeling and observation of research-based reading strategies within lessons across the content areas

- Data analysis (on-going)

- Implementation of the K-12 Reading Plan

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.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
	Not all teachers plan for higher order questions prior to teaching the lesson. -Not all teachers know how to ask higher order/open-ended questions during instruction. -Not all teachers are able to attend HOTS trainings. -Not all teachers involve students in leading discussions.	Strategy: Students' comprehension of course content/ standards increases through participation in **higher order thinking questioning techniques** to promote critical thinking and problem-solving skills. This strategy will be implemented across all content areas. For this strategy, teachers implement a variety or series of questions/prompts to challenge students cognitively, advance high level thinking and discourse, and promote meta-cognition. **Action Steps** **Plan** *Teacher PD for General Higher*	Who -Principal -APEI -PLCs -Peer and Mentor Evaluators How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -EET formal evaluations -EET informal evaluations	Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards mastery. PLC Level -PLCs calculate the average unit assessment score for all their students across the PLC per class/course. . Leadership Team Level -PSLT determines what specific data will be reported to the PSLT Team. -Leadership Team determines and maintains a school-wide data system to track student progress. -PSLT uses data to evaluate the effectiveness of strategy implementation, supplemental instruction for targeted students and future professional development	2-3x Per Year -Formative Assessments -FAIR -Practice FCAT Assessments -Common Assessments		

		Order -Teachers attend school-based and district offered TIF POWER 2 professional development activities on higher order questioning strategies and apply those strategies in the classroom. -PLCs identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs answer the question "How do we know if they have learned it?" -Within PLCs, teachers discuss how to scaffold questions and activities to meet the differentiated needs of students for upcoming lessons. -Teachers design higher order questions to increase rigor in lesson plans and promote student accountable talk.		for teachers.			

		-Within PLCs, teachers plan and write for higher order questions in upcoming lessons. **Do/Check** *Teachers in the Classroom* -During the lesson, teachers frequently ask higher order questions. The teacher responds to students' correct answers by probing for higher-level understanding in an effective manner. -During the lesson, teachers successfully engage all students in the discussion. -Students formulate many of the high-level questions and ensure that all voices are heard. -Students are provided with opportunities to reflect on classroom discussion				

		and discourse to increase understanding of learning objective -At the end of the unit, teachers administer the common assessment. **Check/Act** *PLCs After the Common Assessment* -Teachers bring their common assessment data back to the PLCs. -Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching. -After the assessment, teachers provide timely feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning.				

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

Reading Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 65% to 68%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	65%	**68%**					

		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		-Teachers are at various comfort levels of implementing accountable talk. -Not all classrooms have 100% classroom rapport between teacher/student and student/ student.	Strategy The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' comprehension of course content improves by engaging in accountable talk within collaborative structures/cooperative learning groups. **Plan** *Teacher Planning* -In PLCs, teachers plan ways to incorporate accountable talk and specific collaborative structures throughout the lesson (not just at the end of the lesson). Teachers repertoire of strategies include: Kagan Strategies -Teachers determine student grouping based on data, skill level, interest, etc to ensure equal engaged. -Teachers decide when a collaborative	See 1.1 Above	See 1.1 Above	See 1.1 Above	

			structure is appropriate and which one best suits the learning objective. -PLCs identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs are answering the question, "How do we know if they have learned it?" **Do/Check** *Teachers in the Classroom.* -During the lesson, teachers consistently implement accountable talk and collaborative structures effectively. -Teachers prepare students for the collaborative structure expectations. -Students are asked to make a connection between the collaboration and the learning objective. -At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment				

			identified from the core curriculum material. **Check/Act** _Teachers/PLCs after the Common Assessment_ -Teachers bring their common assessment data to their PLCs. -Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching. -In PLCs teachers discuss the outcomes of their accountable talk and collaborative structure lessons and share the effectiveness of their lessons. -After the assessment, teachers provide timely feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning.				
		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. See 1.1 Above	2.1. See 1.1 Above	2.1. See 1.1 Above	2.1. See 1.1 Above	2.1. See 1.1 Above	
Reading Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 42% to 44% %.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	42%	**44%**				
		2.2. See 1.2 Above	2.2. See 1.2 Above	2.2. See 1.1 Above	2.2. See 1.1Above	2.2. See 1.1Above
		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. See 1.1 Above	3.1. See 1.1 Above	3.1. See 1.1 Above	3.1. See 1.1 Above	3.1. See 1.1 Above		

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

Reading Goal #3:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 68 points to 70 points.							
	68	**70**					
		3.2. See 1.2 Above	3.2. See 1.2 Above	3.2. See 1.1 Above	3.2. See 1.1 Above	3.2. See 1.1 Above	
		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 Above	4.1. See 1.1 Above	4.1. See 1.1 Above	4.1. See 1.1 Above	4.1. See 1.1 Above		
Reading Goal #4: Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 65 points to 68 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	65	**68**					

		4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	
		See 1.2 Above	See 1.2 Above	See 1.1 Above	See 1.1Above	See 1.1 Above	
		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 years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.							
Reading Goal #5:							

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

5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**	5A.1. See 1.1 Above	5A.1 . See 1.1 Above	5A.1. See 1.1 Above	5A.1. See 1.1 Above	5A.1. See 1.1 Above		
Reading Goal #5A: The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Reading will increase from 46% to 51%. The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Reading will increase from 63% to 67%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	White:Y Black:46% Hispanic:63% Asian: Y American Indian: n/a	White: Black: 51% Hispanic: 67% Asian: American Indian: n/a				
		5A.2. See 1.2 Above	5A.2 See 1.2 Above	5A.2 See 1.1 Above	5A.2 See 1.1 Above	5A.2 See 1.1 Above
		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.	

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

| Reading Goal #5B:

N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Y					
		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. See 1.1 Above	5C.1. See 1.1 Above	5C.1. See 1.1 Above	5C.1. See 1.1 Above	5C.1. See 1.1 Above		

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

Reading Goal #5C:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
The percentage of English Language Learners making satisfactory progress in reading will increase from 48% to 53%						
	48%	**53%**				
	–	5C.2. See 1.2 Above	5C.2. See 1.2 Above	5C.2. See 1.1 Above	5C.2. See 1.1 Above	5C.2. See 1.1 Above
		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.		
	See 1.1 Above	See 1.1 Above	See 1.1 Above	See 1.1 Above	See 1.1 Above		
Reading Goal #5D: The percentage of Students with Disabilities making satisfactory progress in reading will increase from 30% to 37%	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	30%	**37%**					

		5D.2. See 1.2 Above	5D.2. See 1.2 Above	5D.2. See 1.2 Above	5D.2. See 1.2 Above	5D.2. See 1.2 Above	
		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
Common Core Instructional Alignment Training and other Common Core Trainings	K-1 Teachers Reading	P. Sheffield M. McCray	Reading K-1	Oct. 16th first training On-going throughout the year	-Walkthroughs -PLC Notes -Formal/Informal Observations	-Teachers -Administrators -Peers/Mentors
HOT Questions Trainings	All subjects	TIF 2 trainers	School-wide	On going	-Walkthroughs -PLC Notes -Formal/Informal Observations	-Teachers -Administrators -Peers/Mentors

Words Their Way Book Study	Reading/	T. Latimore-Reading Coach	12 teachers initially	October 29th 1st Training-on going	-Walkthroughs	-Teachers
	Vocabulary				-PLC Notes	-Administrators
Test Complexity and Social Studies Training	K-5	Reading Coach	K-5	October 15th	-Formal/Informal Observations Walkthroughs	-Peers/Mentors
					-PLC Notes	
		4th Grade Teacher			-Formal/Informal Observations Walkthroughs	
Text Dependent Questions Training	K-5	Reading Coach	K-5	November		
					-PLC Notes	
		Reading Contact			-Formal/Informal Observations	

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**	

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

| 1. **FCAT 2.0:** Students scoring proficient in mathematics (Level 3-5). | 1.1. Not all teachers plan for higher order questions prior to teaching the lesson.

-Not all teachers know how to ask higher order/open-ended questions during instruction.

-Not all teachers are able to attend HOTS trainings.

-Not all teachers involve students in leading discussions. | 1.1.

Strategy:

Students' comprehension of course content/ standards increases through participation in **higher order thinking questioning techniques** to promote critical thinking and problem-solving skills. This strategy will be implemented across all content areas. For this strategy, teachers implement a variety or series of questions/prompts to challenge students cognitively, advance high level thinking and discourse, and promote meta-cognition.

Action Steps

Plan

Teacher PD for General Higher | 1.1.

Who

-Principal

-APEI

-PLCs

-Peer and Mentor Evaluators

How

-PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.

-Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.

-EET formal evaluations

-EET informal evaluations | 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.

-Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards mastery.

PLC Level

-PLCs calculate the average unit assessment score for all their students across the PLC per class/course. .

Leadership Team Level

-PSLT determines what specific data will be reported to the PSLT Team.

-Leadership Team determines and maintains a school-wide data system to track student progress.

-PSLT uses data to evaluate the effectiveness of strategy implementation, supplemental instruction for targeted students and future professional development | 1.1.

2-3x Per Year

-Formative Assessments

-FAIR

-Practice FCAT Assessments

-Common Assessments | | |

		Order		for teachers.			
		-Teachers attend school-based and district offered TIF POWER 2 professional development activities on higher order questioning strategies and apply those strategies in the classroom.					
		-PLCs identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs answer the question 'How do we know if they have learned it?"					
		-Within PLCs, teachers discuss how to scaffold questions and activities to meet the differentiated needs of students for upcoming lessons.					
		-Teachers design higher order questions to increase rigor in lesson plans and promote student accountable talk.					

		-Within PLCs, teachers plan and write for higher order questions in upcoming lessons. **Do/Check** _Teachers in the Classroom_ -During the lesson, teachers frequently ask higher order questions. The teacher responds to students' correct answers by probing for higher-level understanding in an effective manner. -During the lesson, teachers successfully engage all students in the discussion. -Students formulate many of the high-level questions and ensure that all voices are heard. -Students are provided with opportunities to reflect on classroom discussion				

		and discourse to increase understanding of learning objective -At the end of the unit, teachers administer the common assessment. **Check/Act** *PLCs After the Common Assessment* -Teachers bring their common assessment data back to the PLCs. -Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching. -After the assessment, teachers provide timely feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning.				

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

Mathematics Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 67% to 70 %.							
	67%	**70%**					

		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		-Teachers are at various comfort levels of implementing accountable talk. -Not all classrooms have 100% classroom rapport between teacher/student and student/ student.	Strategy The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' comprehension of course content improves by engaging in accountable talk within collaborative structures/cooperative learning groups. **Plan** *Teacher Planning* -In PLCs, teachers plan ways to incorporate accountable talk and specific collaborative structures throughout the lesson (not just at the end of the lesson). Teachers repertoire of strategies include: Kagan Strategies -Teachers determine student grouping based on data, skill level, interest, etc to ensure equal engaged. -Teachers decide when a collaborative	See 1.1 Above	See 1.1 Above	See 1.1 Above	

			structure is appropriate and which one best suits the learning objective. -PLCs identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs are answering the question, "How do we know if they have learned it?" **Do/Check** *Teachers in the Classroom.* -During the lesson, teachers consistently implement accountable talk and collaborative structures effectively. -Teachers prepare students for the collaborative structure expectations. -Students are asked to make a connection between the collaboration and the learning objective. -At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment				

			identified from the core curriculum material. **Check/Act** *Teachers/PLCs after the Common Assessment* -Teachers bring their common assessment data to their PLCs. -Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching. -In PLCs teachers discuss the outcomes of their accountable talk and collaborative structure lessons and share the effectiveness of their lessons. -After the assessment, teachers provide timely feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning.				
		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

2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics.	2.1. See 1.1 Above	2.1. See 1.1 Above	2.1. See 1.1 Above	2.1. See 1.1 Above	2.1. See 1.1 Above		
Mathematics Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 37% to 40 %.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	37%	**40%**					

		2.2. See 1.2 Above	2.2. See 1.2 Above	2.2. See 1.1 Above	2.2. See 1.1 Above	2.2. See 1.1 Above	
		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 Above	3.1. See 1.1 Above	3.1. See 1.1 Above	3.1. See 1.1 Above	3.1. See 1.1 Above		

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

Mathematics Goal #3:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 76 points to 78 points.							
	76	**78**					
		3.2. See 1.2 Above	3.2. See 1.2 Above	3.2. See 1.1 Above	3.2. See 1.1 Above	3.2. See 1.1 Above	
		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 Above	4.1. See 1.1 Above	4.1. See 1.1 Above	4.1. See 1.1 Above	4.1. See 1.1 Above		
Mathematics Goal #4: Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 78 points to 80 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	78	**80**					

		4.2. See 1.2 Above	4.2. See 1.2 Above	4.2. See 1.1 Above	4.2. See 1.1 Above	4.2. See 1.1 Above	
		4.3	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**	
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.							
Math Goal #5:							

5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics**	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5A: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	White:Y Black:Y Hispanic:Y Asian:Y American Indian:n/a	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:n/a					
		5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	

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

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

		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5C.1. See 1.1 Above	5C.1. See 1.1 Above	5C.1. See 1.1 Above	5C.1. See 1.1 Above	5C.1. See 1.1 Above		

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

Mathematics Goal #5C:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The percentage of English Language Learner students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 54% to 59%.							
	54%	**59%**					
		5C.2. See 1.2 Above	5C.2. See 1.2 Above	5C.2. See 1.1 Above	5C.2. See 1.1 Above	5C.2. See 1.1 Above	
		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.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5D: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Y						
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	

End of Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Planning and Implementing Effective Math Instruction	K-5	L. Worthen	School-wide	December	-Walkthroughs	-Teachers
					-Formal/Informal Observations	-Administrators
					-Classroom data	-Peers/Mentors
Common Core SMP Scenarios Training	K-5	L. Worthen	School-Wide	February	-Walkthroughs	-Teachers
					-Formal/Informal Observations	-Administrators
					-Classroom data	-Peers/Mentors

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**		

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

1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science.	1.1. -Not all teachers know how to identify misconceptions and depth of student knowledge of science concepts. -Not all teachers are able to attend available science trainings on dates available by the district. -Not all teachers are knowledgeable of the strategies of inquiry based instruction such as engaging the students, explore time, accountable talk, higher order questioning, etc. -Not all PLC meetings include regular discussion of student data and/or the implementation	1.1. Strategy: The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students will develop problem-solving and creative thinking skills while constructing new knowledge. To achieve this goal, science teachers will increase the number of **inquiry based instruction** (such as student engagement, explore time, accountable talk and higher order questioning) per unit of instruction. Action Steps:	1.1. Who Teacher Principal AP How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. - Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administrative walk-throughs. -EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET informal observation(Admin and Peer/Mentor)	1.1. Teacher Level Science Resource PLC Meetings- Data Chats (Elementary) District Science Team – 5th grade Area Data Chats 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. Leadership Team Level The Leadership Team will review common assessment date and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery.	1.1. 2-3x Per Year District level-baseline and mid-year tests During Grading Period Mini Assessments Unit Assessments		

	of the inquiry model. -Teachers are at varying skill levels with the use of achievement series to accurately analyze student data.	-PLCs write SMART goals based on each Grading Period of material. (For example, during the first Grading Period, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.)<mark> </mark> -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling inquiry based instruction strategies. -PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum and inquiry based instruction strategies. - At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment				

		identified from the core curriculum material. - PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.					
Science Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 64% to 66 %.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	64%	**66%**					

		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		Not all teachers plan for higher order questions prior to teaching the lesson. -Not all teachers know how to ask higher order/ open-ended questions during instruction. -Not all teachers are able to attend HOTS trainings. -Not all teachers involve students in leading discussions.	Strategy: Students' comprehension of course content/ standards increases through participation in **higher order thinking questioning** to promote critical thinking and problem-solving skills. This strategy will be implemented across all content areas. For this strategy, teachers implement a variety or series of questions/ prompts to challenge students cognitively, advance high level thinking and discourse, and promote meta-cognition. **Action Steps** **Plan** *Teacher PD for General Higher Order* -Teachers attend school-based and district offered TIF POWER 2 professional development activities on higher order questioning strategies and apply those strategies in the classroom.	Who -Principal -APEI -PLCs -Peer and Mentor Evaluators How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -EET formal evaluations -EET informal evaluations	Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards mastery. PLC Level -PLCs calculate the average unit assessment score for all their students across the PLC per class/course. -PLCs discuss how to report and share the data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to identify effective higher order activities in future lessons. Leadership Team Level -PSLT determines	2-3x Per Year -Formative Assessments -FAIR During Grading Period Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards mastery. PLC Level -PLCs calculate the average unit assessment score for all their students across the PLC per class/course. Leadership Team Level -Leadership Team determines and maintains a school-wide data system to track student progress.	

			— -PLCs identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs answer the question "How do we know if they have learned it?" -Within PLCs, teachers discuss how to scaffold questions and activities to meet the differentiated needs of students for upcoming lessons. -Teachers design higher order questions to increase rigor in lesson plans and promote student accountable talk. **Do/Check** *Teachers in the Classroom* -During the lesson, teachers frequently ask higher order questions. The teacher responds to students' correct answers by probing for higher-level understanding in an effective manner. -During the lesson, teachers successfully engage all students in the discussion.		what specific data will be reported to the PSLT Team. -Leadership Team determines and maintains a school-wide data system to track student progress. -PLC facilitator shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -PSLT uses data to evaluate the effectiveness of strategy implementation, supplemental instruction for targeted students and future professional development for teachers.		

			-Students formulate many of the high-level questions and ensure that all voices are heard. -At the end of the unit, teachers administer the common assessment. **Check/Act** *PLCs After the Common Assessment* -Teachers bring their common assessment data back to the PLCs. -Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching. -Using the data, effective higher order strategies and techniques are identified, discussed, and modeled in order to implement techniques in future lessons. -After the assessment, teachers provide timely feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning. *Administrators/Leadership Team*

			— -PLC Facilitators put higher order thinking questioning techniques/ Costa's higher order questions on PLC agendas, allowing teachers to share successes and challenges.				
		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?				

| 2. **FCAT 2.0:** Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science. | 2.1.

See 1.1 Above | 2.1.

See 1.1 Above | 2.1.

See 1.1 Above | 2.1.

See 1.1 Above | 2.1.

See 1.1 Above | | |

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

Science Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 19% to 21 %.							
	19%	**21%**					
		2.2. See 1.2 Above	2.2. See 1.2 Above	2.2. See 1.2 Above	2.2. See 1.2 Above	2.2. See 1.2 Above	
		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**		

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 identify student needs from demand writes and/or ask higher order/open-ended questions during one-on-one/ Star Interview conferences. - Not all teachers know how to promote the use of elaboration in student-created writing.	1.1. Strategy: The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' use of elaboration will improve through the teachers' use of daily Writers' Workshop lessons focused on craft through elaboration and one-on-one conferencing to support differentiated instruction. 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	1.1. Who Teacher Principal AP District Writing Team How PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs looking for higher-order use of craft and elaboration models, verbiage, and expectations by teachers using district elementary walk-through tool. Use the Administrator Writers' Workshop Walk-through Checklist for HCPS. *(available from Elementary LA/Writing)* -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.	1.1. Teacher Level PLC/Department Level PLCs – Monthly demand writes, daily drafts, and conferencing notes are reviewed to determine the needs of students, connect writing to state anchor papers, and verify monthly growth. PLCs will chart the increase in the number of students reaching 4.0 and above on the monthly writing prompt. District Writing Team-Monthly demand write scores provided through email to Elementary Writing Supervisor followed by fourth-grade writing review meetings and support pieces provided at monthly resource/contact meetings. Leadership Team Level The PSLT will chart the	1.1. Monthly Demand Writes Benchmark Assessments in grades 2 and 5 FCAT Writes		

		prompt. -As a Professional Development Activity, teachers participate in PLCs and faculty presentations that focus on elaboration lessons and ideas shared monthly at district writing resource/ contact meetings attended by a site representative. -Teachers provide one-on-one/Star/ Smile Interviews with students to promote elaboration and subsequent student revisions to experience, understand, and achieve elaboration to move monthly demand writes pieces to 4.0 and beyond. -As a Professional Development activity, PLCs reconvene to discuss ideas/ lessons that focus on higher-		increase in the number of students reaching 4.0 and above on the monthly writing prompt.			

		level craft and elaboration techniques based on student needs. -As a Professional Development activity, teachers provide peer reviews of modeled writing drafts for use in Writers' Workshop lessons to verify rigor of models in order to promote higher-level craft and elaboration techniques. -PLCs review Grading Period data and set a new goal for the following Grading Period. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.					

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

Writing/LA Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance·*					
The percentage of students scoring **Level 3.0** or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes will increase from 82% to 90 %.							
	82%	**90%**					
		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.

Most students with significant unexcused absences (10 or more) have serious personal or family issues that are impacting attendance. | 1.1.

Student attendance and tardies will be monitored through the Instructional Planning Tool

When a student reaches 5 days of unexcused absences, guidance counselors or other identified staff contact the parents via the phone and records documentation on the Attendance Intervention form (SB90717). | 1.1.

Administration

School Social Worker

Classroom Teacher | 1.1.

Administration, Classroom Teachers and the Social Worker will pull weekly absence reports from the Instructional Planning Tool. | 1.1.

-School Attendance Rate

-Individual Student Attendance Rate | | |

		When a student reaches 6-10 days of unexcused absences and/or unexcused tardies to school, the administration or identified staff will investigate the reason for the absences and may notify the parents and guardians via mail that future absences/ tardies must have a doctor note or other reason outlined in the Student Handbook to receive an excused absence/ tardy and must be approved through an administrator.					

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

Attendance Goal #1:	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
1. The attendance rate will increase from 95.9% in 2011-2012 to 96% in 2012-2013. 2. The number of students who have 10 or more **unexcused** absences throughout the school year will decrease by 10% 3. The number of students who have 10 or more **unexcused** tardies to school throughout the school year will decrease by 10%.							
	95.9%	**96%**					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					

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

	68	**61**					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	0	**0**					
		1.2. See 1.1 Above	1.2. Student incentives- At the end of each grading period, students who have perfect attendance will have their names placed into a drawing for various prizes from local businesses.	1.2 Student Incentive Team	1.2. The PSLT team will review the attendance reports taken from the Instructional Planning Tool.	1.2. See 1.1 Above	
		1.3. There are no real significant consequences that can be enforced when students do not arrive on time.	1.3. Letters will be sent home to students with excessive tardies. Conferences will be scheduled by Administration for the parents of students who continue to have excessive tardies.	1.3. See 1.2 Above	1.3. See 1.2 above	1.3. -School Tardy Reports -Individual Student Tardy 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

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.

Data indicates that there is wide variation in the number of Student Incident Reports generated across classrooms. | 1.1.

The goal for this strategy is to build relationships amongst teachers and students and students with their peers.

Teachers will incorporate Morning Meetings into their daily routines. | 1.1.

Classroom Teachers | 1.1.

-Schedules

-Classroom Walkthroughs | 1.1.

"UNTIE" ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data. | | |

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

Suspension Goal #1:	2012 Total Number of __ In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of __ In- School Suspensions					
Suspension Goal #1: 1. The total number of In-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%. 2. The total number of students receiving In-School Suspension throughout the school year will decrease by 10%. 3. The total number of Out-of-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%. 4. The total number of students receiving Out-of-School Suspensions throughout the school year will decrease by 10%.							

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

	16 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	**14** 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School				
	14 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	**12** 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions				
	6 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	**5** 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School				
	5	**4**				
	1.2. See 1.1 Above 1.3.	1.2. The RTI Process will be implemented for students who continue to have behavior infractions.	1.2. -Classroom Teacher -Guidance Counselor -Core RTI Team	1.2. RTI Data	1.2. See 1.1 Above	1.2. See 1.1 Above
		1.3. Monthly Terrific Kid Awards will be given to one student in each class.	1.3. -Classroom Teacher -Guidance Counselor	1.3. Classroom Teachers Guidance Counselor (Monthly Award Recipients)	1.3.	1.3. See 1.1 Above

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

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

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 Involveme					

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

	nt						
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. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1:							
N/A							
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**		

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

2.Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #2						
N/A						

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Health and Fitness Goal(s)

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

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

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

1. Health and Fitness Goal	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
	Creating a schedule to ensure there is adequate outside space to accommodate teacher directed PE.	Elementary students will engage in 150 minutes of physical education per week in grades kindergarten through 5.	Classroom Teacher PE Teachers Administration	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 Phys. Ed		

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

Health and Fitness Goal #1:	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students scoring in the "Healthy Fitness Zone" (HFZ) on the Pacer for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular health will increase from 82 % on the Pretest to 92 % on the Posttest.	**82%** **(125)**	**92%** **(138)**					

		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		Ensuring that there is enough equipment to share amongst all of the classes.	Use of the playground or fitness course equipment; walk/ jog/run activities in designated areas; and exercising to the outdoor activities such as the ones provided in the *150 Minutes of Elem. Physical Education* folder on IDEAS.	Physical Education Teacher	Lesson plans of Physical Education Teacher	PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Health and Fitness Goals Professional Development

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

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		

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

1. Continuous Improvement Goal	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
	-There is still some confusion as to what the support and documentation should look like at each MTSS level. -The size of our grade levels makes it difficult to have a common time to implement MTSS by grade level.	-The reading coach will lead teachers in grades K-5 through data sorts to ensure students receive the type of support to maximize their learning. Grade levels will implement the CIM model and monitor student progress via common assessments and universal screening assessments.	PLCs Teachers PSLT Administrators PLC logs will be reviewed. RTI consultants will assist grade levels with MTSS implementation and data collection.	–School wide data will be reviewed by the PSLT -Grade level PLCs will use formative data and common assessment data to evaluate the effectiveness of the MTSS.	-Formative Assessment Data -Common Assessment Data -FAIR Data		

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

Continuous Improvement Goal #1:	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
The percentage of teachers who strongly agree with the indicator that "students who are not proficient receive interventions and or additional support" will increase from 31% to 40%.							
	31%	**40%**					
		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

Hillsborough 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised July, 2012

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.		
Reading Goal A: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

		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.		

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

Reading Goal B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	
		B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	

NEW Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

CELLA Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**	

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

C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/ Speaking.	1.1. See 1.1 Above	1.1. See 1.1 Above	1.1. See 1.1 Above	1.1. See 1.1 Above	1.1. See 1.1 Above	
CELLA Goal #C: The percentage of students scoring in the satisfactory range on the listening/speaking of the 2013CELLA Assessment will increase from 35% to 38%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					
	35%					

		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		See 1.2 Above	See 1.2 Above	See 1.1 Above	See 1.1 Above	See 1.1 Above
		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 1.1 Above	2.1. See 1.1 Above	2.1. See 1.1 Above	2.1. See 1.1 Above	2.1. See 1.1 Above	

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

CELLA Goal #D:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :					
The percentage of students scoring in the satisfactory range on the reading section of the 2013 CELLA Assessment will increase from 34% to 37%.						
	34%					
		2.2. See 1.2 Above	2.2. See 1.2 Above	2.2. See 1.1 Above	2.2. See 1.1 Above	2.2. See 1.1 Above
		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**	

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

E. Students scoring proficient in Writing.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	
	See 1.1 Above	See 1.1 Above	See 1.1 Above	See 1.1 Above	See 1.1 Above	
CELLA Goal #E: The percentage of students scoring in the satisfactory range on the writing portion of the 2013 CELLA Assessment will increase from 30% to 33%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					

	30%					
		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.		

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

Mathematics Goal F:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
Enter narrative for the goal in this box. N/A						
		F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.
		F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.

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

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: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

NEW Science Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

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

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

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: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					

		J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	
		J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	

NEW Writing Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

Writing Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check

Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check

How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | | |

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

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. N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	
		M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: Implement/expand inquiry-based learning experiences for students in math and science through the 5 E model.	1.1. Need common planning time for math and science teachers.	1.1. Increase the effectiveness of lessons through lesson study and district metrics, etc.	1.1. Administrators (walkthroughs)	1.1. The number of project based learning activities taking place in the classrooms.	1.1. Chapter Tests Formative Assessments

	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						

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
CTE Goal #1: Increase student interest in career opportunities and program selection prior to middle school.	1.1. Not having the resources or contacts to inform students about CTE.	1.1. Invite speakers to share with students about CTE during the Great American Teach-In.	1.1. Log of speakers during the Great American Teach-In	1.1. Career Survey Data	1.1. Career Survey

	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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Differentiated Accountability

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
Priority	Focus	Prevent

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

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

Final Amount Spent			