FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Ruskin Elementary	District Name: Hillsborough County
Principal: Lisa Amos	Superintendent: Mary Ellen Elia
SAC Chair: Daniel Ruiz/Keri Kozerski	Date of School Board Approval: pending

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

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

Administrators

List your school's 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.

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

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	Lisa Amos	**MS Ed Lead BS Elem Ed K-6 ESOL**	3	13	**2011-2012 D 2010-2011 C 87% AYP 2009-2010 C 74%AYP 2008-2009 A 95% AYP**
Assistant Principal	Rebecca Salgado	**MS Ed Lead BS Elem Ed K-6 ; ESOL**	1	3	2011-2012 D

Instructional Coaches

List your school's 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 ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (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	Misty Rakowitz	Elem Ed ESOL	2	2	2010-2011 C 87%AYP
Reading	Sandy Mokros	BS Elem ED MS curriculum	13	10	2010-2011 C 87%AYP 2009-10 C 2008-09 A with AYP
Reading	Tracey Zirfas	Elem. Ed ESOL	2	2	2010-2011 C 87%AYP
Reading	Diane Nolet	Elem. Ed. ESOL Ed. Leadership	1	8	

Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Teacher Interview Day	General Directors	June
2. Recruitment Fairs	Quincy Bell	June
3. District Mentor Program	District Mentors	ongoing
4. District Peer Program	District Peers	ongoing
5. School-based teacher recognition system	Principal	ongoing
6. Opportunities for teacher leadership	Principal	ongoing

7. On-going school based trainings	Principal/Asst. Princ./Resource Teachers	ongoing
8. Weekly PLC meetings	Admin/PLC lead teachers	ongoing

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
0	NA

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	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
85	2%(2)	35%(30)	39%(33)	24%(20)	36%(31)		0	0	65%(55)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan 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
Destony Cook	Catherine Davis	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.

Destony Cook	Sarah Innocenti	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.
Destony Cook	Alissa McBride	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.
Destony Cook	Kelly McGuire	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.
Destony Cook	Cheyenne Olmo	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.
Destony Cook	Kaycie Ooley	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.
Destony Cook	Pamela Ramirez	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.
Destony Cook	Magda Rivera	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 Services are provided to ensure students who need additional remediation are provided support through: after school and summer programs, quality teachers through professional development, content resource teachers, and mentors.
Title I, Part C- Migrant The migrant advocate provides services and support to students and parents. The advocate works with teachers and other programs to ensure that the migrant students' needs are being met.
Title I, Part D The district receives funds to support the Alternative Education Program which provides transition services from alternative education to school of choice.
Title II The district receives funds for staff development to increase student achievement through teacher training. In addition, the funds are utilized in the Salary Differential Program at Renaissance schools.
Title III Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners
Title X- Homeless The district receives funds to provide resources (social workers and tutoring) for students for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school, reading coaches, and extended learning opportunity programs.
Violence Prevention Programs NA
Nutrition Programs NA
Housing Programs NA
Head Start We utilize information from students in Head Start to transition into Kindergarten.

Adult Education NA
Career and Technical Education The career and technical support is specific to each school site in which funds can be utilized, in a specific program, within Title I regulations
Job Training Job training support is specific to each school site in which funds can be utilized, in a specific program, within Title I regulations
Other

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. The leadership team includes: • Principal , Lisa Amos • Assistant Principal ,Rebecca Salgado • Guidance Counselor ,Megan Harvey • School Psychologist ,Kim Gonzalez • Social Worker ,Lissette Hernandez-Hall • Reading Coach, Misti Rakowitz • ESE teacher , Darlene Johnston • Representatives from the PLCs for each grade level, K-5 • SAC Chair, Keri Kozerski • ELP Coordinator, Rebecca Salgado • ELL Representative, Jennifer Tedder • Attendance Committee Representative, Lissette Hernandez-Hall • Behavior Specialist/Coach, Kim Gonzalez (Note that not all members attend every meeting, but are invited based on the goals and purpose of the meeting)
Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts? ***The purpose of the 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.*** The ***Leadership team meets regularly (e.g., bi-weekly/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 • ***Ensure the master schedule incorporates allocated time for intervention support at all grade levels.*** • Determine scheduling needs***, and assist teacher teams in identifying research-based instructional*** materials and intervention resources ***at Tiers2/3*** • Facilitate the implementation of specific programs (e.g., Extended Learning Programs during and after school; Saturday Academies) that provide intervention support to students identified through data sorts/chats conducted by the PLCs. • 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 ***(e.g., district and state assessments; during-the-grading period school assessments/checks for understanding; in-school***

surveys)

- ***Assist and monitor teacher use of SMART goals per unit of instruction. (data will be collected and analyzed by PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT)***
- Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction through the:
  - Implementation and support of PLCs
  - ***Review of teacher/PLC core curriculum assessments/chapters tests/checks for understanding*** (data will be collected ***and analyzed*** by PLCs and ***reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT)***
  - ***Use of Common Core Assessments by teachers teaching the same grade/subject area/course*** (data will be collected ***and analyzed*** by PLCs ***and reported to the Leadership Team***/PSLT)
  - Implementation of research-based scientifically validated instructional strategies and/or interventions. ***(as outlined in our SIP)***
  - Communication with major stakeholders (e.g., parents, business partners, etc.) regarding student outcomes through data summaries and conferences.
- ***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).

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

- The Chair of SAC is a member of the ***Leadership Team/PSLT.***
- ***The administration, leadership team, teachers and SAC are involved in the School Improvement Plan development and monitoring throughout the school year.***
- The School Improvement Plan is the working document that guides the work ***of the Leadership Team and all teacher teams***. 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 Leadership Team/PLST monitors the effectiveness of instruction and intervention by reviewing student data as well as data related to implementation fidelity (teacher walk-through data).***
- ***The Leadership Team/PSLT communicates with and supports the PLCs in implementing the proposed strategies by distributing Leadership Team members across the PLCs to facilitate planning and implementation. Once strategies are put in place, the Leadership Team members who are part of the PLCs regularly report on their efforts and student outcomes to the larger Leadership Team/PSLT.***
- The ***Leadership Team***/PSLT and PLCs both use the problem solving process (Problem Identification, Problem Analysis, Intervention Design and Implementation and Evaluation to:
  - ***Use the problem-solving model when analyzing data:***
    1. ***What is the problem? (Problem Identification)***
    2. ***Why is it occurring? (Problem Analysis and Barrier Identification)***
    3. ***What are we going to do about it? (Action Plan Design and Implementation)***
    4. ***Is it working? (Monitor Progress and Evaluate Action Plan Effectiveness)***
  - ***Identify the problem (based on an analysis of the data disaggregated via data sorts) in multiple areas – curriculum content, behavior, and attendance***
  - Develop and test hypotheses about why student/school problems are occurring (changeable barriers).
  - Develop and target interventions based on confirmed hypotheses.
  - ***Identify*** appropriate progress monitoring assessments to be administered at ***regular*** intervals matched to the intensity of ***the level of instructional/intervention support provided.***
  - ***Develop grading period or units of instruction//intervention*** goals ***that are ambitious, time-bound, and measureable (e.g., SMART goals).***
  - Review ***progress monitoring data at regular intervals*** 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 intervention and/or enrichment ***support).***
  - ***Each PLC develops PLC action plan for SIP strategy implementation and monitoring***.
  - Assess the implementation of the strategies on the SIP using the following questions:
    1. ***Does the data show implementation of strategies are resulting in positive student growth?***
    2. ***To what extent are we making progress toward the school's SIP goals?***
    3. ***If we are making progress, what can we do to sustain what is working?***
    4. ***What barriers to implementation are we facing and how will we address them?***
    5. ***What should we do next? What should be our plan of action?***

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.
T

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

Editor Note: In your response, be more specific than the example below regarding the data sources (assessments/checks for understanding) your school is using. Don't forget to emphasize core curriculum school-based assessments/checks for understanding that you are collecting/analyzing outside of the mandated state and district assessments. True on-going progress monitoring includes using the results of the core curriculum to guide interventions.

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
District generated assessments from the Office of Assessment and Accountability ***(Name the 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 ***(Name the assessments)***	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall ***PLC Logs***	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers
FAIR	Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network Data Wall	Reading Coach/ ***Reading Resource Teacher***/Reading PLC Facilitator
CELLA	Sagebrush (IPT)	ELL PSLT Representative
Teachers' common core curriculum assessments on units of instruction/big ideas. ***(What classes/courses will your Leadership Team monitor? PLC monitor?)***	***Ed-Line*** ***PLC Database*** ***PLC logs***	Individual Teachers/ Team Leaders/ PLC Facilitators/***Leadership Team Member***
DRA-2	School Generated Excel Database	Individual Teacher
Reports on Demand/Crystal Reports	***District Generated Database***	***Leadership Team/Specialty PSLT***

Supplemental/Intensive Instruction (Tiers 2 and 3)

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible for Monitoring
Extended Learning Program (ELP)* *(see below)* Ongoing Progress Monitoring (mini-assessments and other assessments from adopted curriculum resource materials) ***(What specific assessments are you using?)***	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
Ongoing assessments within Intensive Courses *(Middle/High)*	Database provided by course materials (for courses that have one), School Generated Database in Excel	Leadership Team/PLC/Individual Teachers
Other Curriculum Based Measurement	***easyCBM*** School Generated Database in Excel	Leadership Team/PLCs/***Individual Teachers***
Research-based Computer-assisted Instructional Programs	***Assessments included in computer-based programs***	***PLCs/Individual Teachers***

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 ***RtI Committee/RtI Facilitators*** develop(s) resources and staff development trainings on PS/RtI, 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/RtI trainings/support sessions that are offered district-wide***. Our school will invite our area RtI Facilitator to visit quarterly ***(or as needed)*** to review our progress in implementation of PS/RtI 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/RtI as they become available.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Editor Note: This is a new question from the state.

Response to Intervention (RtI) has also been described in Florida as a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) for providing high quality instruction and intervention matched to student needs using learning rate over time and level of performance to inform instructional decisions. In order to support MTSS in our schools, we will:

- Consistently promote the shared vision of one system meeting the needs of ALL students with MTSS as the platform for integrating all school initiatives (i.e., PLC, PSLT, Steering, and SAC meetings, lesson study, school-wide behavior management plans).
- Provide designated school personnel with the requisite knowledge and experience to support coordination and implementation of MTSS.
- Provide continued training and support to all school based personnel in problem solving, responding to student data and the use of a systematic method to increase student achievement.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?

Public School Choice

- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**
  Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.

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 (2)(b) F.S

For schools with grades 6-12, how does the school ensure that every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student?

High Schools Only

Note: Required for High School-Sec. 1003.413(2)(g), (2)(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

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

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.			1A.1. - Lack of understanding of how to implement the Continuous Improvement Model (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. - Need additional training to implement effective PLCs. - Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students). -poor student attendance -low academic vocabulary of students - not all teachers have had deeper CCSS trainings	1A.1. Strategy: **Tier 1** - The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' reading comprehension will improve through teachers using the **Continuous Improvement Model (CIM)** with core curriculum and providing **Differentiated Instruction (DI)** as a result of the problem-solving model. Action Steps As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling researched-based best-practice strategies. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions. Data to expand core instruction At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material based on CCSS. Re-assessments also need to occur. Easy Grade Pro training for staff Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs monthly.	1A.1. Who -Principal -AP -ART -Reading Coach -Reading Resource How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). The CIM and DI strategies will be added to the form. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This walk-through form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty. -Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. -Students justify answers with	1A.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. Leadership Team Level PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards PLC and individual SMART goals Bi-weekly chats about common assessment data	1A.1. 2-3x Per Year - FAIR On-going Progress Monitoring in comprehension During the nine weeks - Course unit assessments -Formative Assessments (A, B, and C)
Reading Goal #1A: In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 41% to 45%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 41%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 45%					

				Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective. Based on the data, teachers a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students. 8. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment). PLCs record their work in logs.	text		
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Reading Goal #1B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.			2A.1. Not all teachers know how to identify student needs from assessments administered to students. -Not all teachers know how to ask higher order/open-ended questions during instruction. -Not all teachers are able to attend HOTS trainings. -PLC's struggle with how to structure meetings.	2A.1. **Strategy:** **Tier 1** - The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' reading skills will improve through participation in **HOTS** activities. Teachers will analyze data, plan instruction based on data and include HOT questions designed to increase rigor in lesson plans. Curriculum strengthened at K-1 level to increase HOT skills. Action Steps: 1. Bring HOT training here. (or Reading Coach/Resource will provide on-going training in HOTS.) 2. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers discuss HOT strategies and how they can be implemented in the upcoming lessons. 3. Teachers implement the targeted higher order questioning strategies in their lessons. 4. Teachers implement the common assessments that have been designed by the team and are aligned with CCSS. 5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 6. PLCs study specifically students' responses to the higher order questions to assess students' higher order	2A.1. Who Teacher Principal AP ART Reading Coach Reading Resource How Monitored -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This walk-through form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty. Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. -HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool) (HOTs strategy on the form.)	2A.1. Teacher Level PLCs – Periodic (weekly or bi-weekly) progress monitoring of assessment scores to determine the number of students demonstrating proficiency toward benchmark attainment. 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. *1st Grading Period Check* *Form A-FCAT 2.0* *2nd-46% 70 or higher* *3rd-45% 70 or higher* *4th-52% 70 or higher* *5th-58% 70 or higher*	2A.1. 2-3x Per Year - FAIR On-going Progress Monitoring in comprehension During the nine weeks - Unit assessments
Reading Goal #2A: In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 15% to 17%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 15%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 17%					

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3"></td><td>thinking processes.
7. Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of higher order strategy implementation.
8. PLCs record their work in logs</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>2A.2.</td><td>2A.2.</td><td>2A.2.</td><td>2A.2.</td><td>2A.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>2A.3.</td><td>2A.3.</td><td>2A.3.</td><td>2A.3.</td><td>2A.3.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.</td><td>2B.1.</td><td>2B.1.</td><td>2B.1.</td><td>2B.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Reading Goal #2B:

Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td></tr>
<tr><td>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</td><td>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>2B.2.</td><td>2B.2.</td><td>2B.2.</td><td>2B.2.</td><td>2B.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>2B.3.</td><td>2B.3.</td><td>2B.3.</td><td>2B.3.</td><td>2B.3.</td></tr>
</table>

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.
Reading Goal #3A: In grades 3-5, the percentage of All Curriculum students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 58% to 64%	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 58%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 64%	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
			3A.3. See 4.1	3A.3. **Tier 2/3 -** Students' reading comprehension will improve through implementation of 30 minutes of supplemental instruction during the daily **iii (Immediate Intensive Interventions)** time (which includes both lessons and assessments). -Daytime ELP	3A.3. Who Reading Coach Reading Resource AP ART Principal How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This walk-through form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty. Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.	3A.3. Teachers analyze mini assessment data on skills taught/reviewed during iii time. Teachers review data at PLC meetings. 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.	3A.3. 3x per year - FAIR On-going Progress Monitoring in comprehension -Formatives (A, B, and C) During the nine weeks -Mini assessments - K-12 Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM) *(From District RtI/Problem Solving Facilitators.)* -Text complexity -CLOSE reading -Performance talk
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.

Reading Goal #3B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4: In grades 3-5, the percentage of All Curriculum students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 72% to79%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 72%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 79%	4A.1. - Teachers at varying skills levels with the CIM model. - Teachers' implementation of the CIM model is not consistent across language arts and reading courses. - District mini lessons, mini assessments and District calendar do not always align with school student data. - Lack of common planning time to develop/identify PLC based mini lessons and mini assessments (using curriculum based materials) geared toward on-going progress monitoring. - Lack of common planning time to analyze mini lesson data. - Lack of understanding of when and how to implement the mini lessons within the District pacing guide. - Finding appropriate text to develop the lessons and assessments.	4A.1. **Tier 1** – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' reading comprehension will improve through teachers using the **CIM** strategy on identified tested benchmarks in reading and Language Arts classes. Action Steps 1. Through data analysis of FCAT, baseline data, classroom assessments and student performance, PLCs identify essential tested benchmarks for their students that need reinforcement and/or remediation. 2. Students will receive supplemental reading interventions outside of their reading block. 3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers identify (using District resources and curriculum resources) 4. Resource teachers analyze data from EASI, CBM tests and progress monitoring. Common assessments will be used to drive instruction.	4A.1. Who -Principal -AP -ART -Reading Coach How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form *(EET tool. The CIM strategy will be added to the form under Instructional Practices.)* -PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This walk-through form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty.	4A.1. -PLCs will review mini-assessment data. Mini-assessment data recorded in PLC data base (excel spread sheet). -For the mini-assessments, PLCs will chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on each mini-assessment. -PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -With the Literacy Leadership Team, the Problem Solving Leadership Team 1) reviews FAIR OPM data to determine the percentage of students scoring medium to high and 2) reviews course-generated nine week assessment that includes all skills covered during the nine week period. -The PSLT will review assessment data for positive trends	4A.1. 3x per year. -FAIR During nine weeks -Mini assessment data -School generated review nine week assessment (by course) of all mini skills covered during the nine weeks.
			4A.2. Communication between classroom teachers and tutors	4A.2. **Tier 2/3** - Students' reading comprehension will improve through the use of **during-the-day tutorials** for supplemental instruction. The frequency and duration of supplemental instruction depends on individual progress monitoring data. Action Steps 1. School will utilize ELP funds to	4A.2. *Who* *Homeroom teachers* *During the day tutors(retired teachers)* *How* *Teachers document student performance from previous week. Students attend remediation based on need.*	4A.2. Teachers analyze mini assessment data on skills taught/reviewed in during the day tutoring period. Mini-assessment data recorded for review as needed by the PSLT. Teachers review data at PLC meetings. PLC facilitator will share data with the PSLT. The PSLT will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.	4A.2. Curriculum adopted assessments -District and school-based mini-assessments -K-8 Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM) *(From District RtI/Problem Solving Facilitators.)*

			hire retired teachers to provide supplemental instruction. 2. Reading Coach and Reading Resource teachers and classroom teachers analyze data and form groups based on students' needs.			
		4A.3. *Scheduling of students as to not interfere with other instruction*	4A.3. **Tier 2/3** - Students' reading comprehension will improve through the use of **during-the-day tutorials** for supplemental instruction. The frequency and duration of supplemental instruction depends on individual progress monitoring data. Action Steps 1. School will utilize ELP funds to hire retired teachers to provide supplemental instruction.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3. - Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM) *(From District RtI/Problem Solving Facilitators.)*

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**						
Reading Goal #5A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.** Reading Goal #5B: In grades 3-5, **86%** of the following All Curriculum student subgroups will score a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 10%. ***(Safe Harbor Targets: White – 70%, Hispanic - 59%)***	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White: 55 Black: 27 Hispanic: 38 Asian: NA American Indian: NA	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White: 72 Black: 39 Hispanic: 50 Asian: NA American Indian: NA	5B.1. -Lack of common planning time. -Teachers are at varying levels of understanding of the ELA vocabulary standards. - Teachers are at varying levels of understanding of the types of vocabulary items that complement content instruction. -PLC meetings do not include discussion of leveled vocabulary development and assessment for content instruction. -PLC meetings do not include the development of vocabulary instructional activities for upcoming lessons. -Administrators and support staff are at varying skill levels with identifying appropriate levels of vocabulary development.	5B.1. **Tier 1** – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' vocabulary acquisition will improve through the implementation of appropriately leveled, **vocabulary development** lessons across all content areas. Action Steps 1. PLC schedule will provide common planning time. 2. PLCs will familiarize themselves with the content standards. 3. PLCs will recognize vocabulary needs within each content area. 4. PLCs come to consensus on the use of common assessments: 1) vocabulary items included in end of the unit/segment assessment 2) LA-embedded vocabulary development activities and/or 3) any program assessment provided in curriculum resources and materials. 5. EOR vocabulary available for all students in grades 3-5 6. Teachers implement the common assessments. 7. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs from reading common assessments PLCs study students' responses to the scaffolded lessons.	5B.1. Who -Principal -AP -ART -Reading Coach -PLC Facilitators -Reading Leadership Team How Monitored -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form *(EET tool - Vocabulary strategy will be added to the form under Instructional Practices.)* -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -Classroom walk-through form for Grades K-12 Reading Intervention classes *(available from Reading Department)* -PSLT will review student data and fidelity data every nine weeks.	5B.1. PLCs-Teachers assess students using end of unit/chapter tests. PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. PLCs will review evaluation data. 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.	5B.1. 3x per year (Reading) - FAIR On-going Progress Monitoring Tool (Scaffolded Discussion Templates) Form A, B, and C During the nine weeks - End-of-unit/chapter tests (All Content Areas), common assessments IStation and Easy CBM data -Program generated assessments -LA embedded assessments -Vocabulary assessments (All Content Areas)	

				8. As a Professional Development activity, PLCs use data with the problem-solving process to determine next steps in their vocabulary acquisition implementation. 9. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs. 10. Word of the Week 11. Sight words on sidewalks			
			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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5C.1. -Teachers at varying skill levels regarding the use of CALLA. -Teachers implementation of CALLA is not consistent across core courses. -ELLs at varying levels of English language acquisition and acculturation is not consistent across core courses. -Administrators at varying skill levels regarding use of CALLA in order to effectively conduct a CALLA fidelity check walk-through. -DRTs are at varying levels of interpreting district level assessments	5C.1. ELLs (LYs/LFs) reading comprehension will improve through core content teachers (Reading, Language Arts, Science, Social Studies) implementing the **Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA)** Action Steps 1. ESOL Resource Teacher (ERT) provides professional development to all content area teachers on how to embed CALLA into core content lessons. 2. ERT models lessons using CALLA. 3. ERT observes content area teachers using CALLA and provides feedback, coaching and support. 4. Across all content areas, PLCs write ELL SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the **ELL** students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) 5. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing and modeling CALLA strategies 6. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating CALLA strategies from their PLC discussions. 4. Teachers bring ELL assessment data back to the PLCs. 5. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective for ELL students. 6. Based on the data, teachers decide what skills need to be re-taught to targeted students using DI techniques. 7. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students	5C.1. Who -School based Administrators -District Resource Teachers -ESOL Resource Teachers How -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form *(EET tool – CALLA strategy will be added to the form under Instructional Practices.)* -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This walk-through form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty. Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.	5C.1. ERTs are on the problem-solving leadership teams in order to update the team on ELLs (inclusive of LFs) performance data. -ERTs meet with Language Arts PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data. -ERTs meet with core content teachers during PLC meetings to review ELL (inclusive of LF's) performance data. -ERTs meet with PSLT to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs) PLC facilitator will share ELL 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. -DRTs meet with administration/designee to review ELLs performance data and progress of ELLs (FAIR/CELLA/district-wide baseline and mid-year test). *1st Grading Period Check* *ELL-FAIR AP1* 3rd-21% above 40th%ile 4th-33% above 40th %ile 5th-34.3% above 40%ile *2nd Grading Period Check* *ELL-FAIR AP2* 3rd-40% above 40th%ile	5C.1. FAIR -CELLA During the nine weeks -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests
Reading Goal #5C: In grades 3-5, **86% ELL** All Curriculum students will score a Level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 10% in 2013. ***(Safe Harbor Target- 54%)***	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 32%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 45%					

				(remediation and enrichment). 8. PLCs record their work in logs.		4th-29% above 40th %ile 5th-35% above 40%ile *3rd Grading Period Check*	
			5C.2. -Lack of common planning time to discuss vocabulary strategies -Teachers are at varying levels of understanding of the ELA vocabulary standards. - Teachers are at varying levels of understanding of the types of vocabulary items that complement content instruction - PLC meetings do not regularly and consistently include discussion of leveled vocabulary development and assessment for content instruction. -PLC meetings do not regularly and consistently include the development of vocabulary instructional activities for upcoming lessons. - Administrators and support staff are at varying skill levels with identifying appropriate levels of vocabulary development.	5C.2. Students' vocabulary acquisition will improve through the implementation of appropriately leveled, **vocabulary development** lessons across all content areas based on ELL proficiency level. Action Steps 1. Consensus on site PLC schedule will provide common planning time. 2. As a Professional Development activity, PLCs will familiarize themselves with the content standards. 3. PLCs will recognize vocabulary needs within each content area and needs of all proficiency levels (A,B,C) of ELL students. 4. PLCs come to consensus on the use of common assessments: a) vocabulary items included in end of the unit/segment assessment b) LA- embedded vocabulary development activities and/or c) any program assessment provided in curriculum resources and materials. 5. As a Professional Development activity, ELL instructional strategies used in Developmental Language Arts classes will be shared with all content areas.	5C.2. Who -Principal -Assistant Principals -Instructional Coaches -ELL Resource Teachers and classroom teachers -PLC Facilitators -School and Reading Leadership Teams How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This walk-through form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty. Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.	5C.2. FAIR assessment is administered. ELL Proficiency assessment is administered. Teachers implement agreed upon assessments. PLCs review assessment data. Problem-Solving leadership team reviews school wide FAIR and common assessment data to determine student progress	5C.2. - FAIR On-going Progress Monitoring Tool (Scaffolded Discussion Templates) -ELL assessments. During the nine weeks - End-of-unit/segment tests (All Content Areas) -Program generated assessments -LA embedded assessments

			6. As a Professional Development activity, PLCs come to consensus on the vocabulary standards/benchmark to be addressed within each content area. 7. As a Professional Development activity, PLCs study the process of scaffolding lessons to move students to perform more complex vocabulary acquisition tasks. 8. As a Professional Development activity, PLCs design specific scaffolded lessons essential in creating appropriate vocabulary acquisition. 9. Teachers implement the scaffolded lessons. 10. Teachers implement the common assessments. 11. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. PLCs study students' responses to the scaffolded lessons. 12. Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps in their vocabulary acquisition implementation. 13. Administrators will participate in PLC activities with teachers. 14. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs. 15. Reading Coach provides vocabulary training			
		5C.3. -Bilingual Education Paraprofessionals at varying levels of expertise in providing heritage language support. -Allocation of Bilingual Education Paraprofessional dependent on	5C.3. Reading comprehension will improve by Bilingual Education Paraprofessionals providing heritage language support in core content courses per master schedule. Support includes:	5C.3. Site Administrator and ERT use ELL Program guidelines and walk through fidelity checks.	5C.3. See CALLA strategy. 5C1	5C.3. See CALLA strategy. 5C1

			membership of ELLs -Administrators at varying levels of expertise in being familiar with the ELL Program guidelines and job responsibilities of EFT and Bilingual paraprofessional.	1. Translation of instruction in heritage language 2. Supervision during extended time lesson/testing accommodation			
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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5D.1. - No electronic accessibility to FAA data (instructional planning tool, mainframe, etc.) -Collecting data with fidelity -Understanding data and the students' disability to make instructional decisions -For general education teachers, understanding the IEP and instructional accommodations -Teachers at varying skill levels (ACP, content knowledge, certification) -Multiple preparations -Lack of common planning time -Lack of understanding of the IEP and instructional accommodations	5D.1. SWDs reading comprehension will improve by **connecting individual needs to instruction as outlined in the IEP**. Actions Steps 1. General ed. and/or SWD teachers will familiarize themselves with each student's IEP goals, strategies and accommodations. 2. Every nine weeks the General Ed and/or SWD teacher reviews students' IEPs to ensure that all students' IEP goals, strategies and accommodations are being implemented with fidelity. 3. Using student data, every nine weeks (along with the report card) SWD students will receive an Individual Education Plan Progress Report to inform parents of the students' progress toward mastering their IEP goals and strategies. 4. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers discussing implementation of IEP strategies and modifications. 5. PLC teachers instruct students implementing IEP strategies and accommodations. 6. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 7. Teachers bring SWD assessment data back to the PLCs. 8. Based on the data, teachers discuss techniques that were effective for SWD students. 9. Based on the data, teachers decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students using DI	5D.1. Who Principal, Site Administrator, Assistance Principal How -IEP Progress Reports reviewed by APC. -PSLT will identify and/or create a fidelity monitoring tool designed to check implementation of this specific strategy. Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	5D.1. PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of SWD 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. *1st Grading Period Check* *SWD-FAIR AP1* 3rd-20% above 40th%ile 4th-31% above 40th %ile 5th-33.3% above 40%ile *2nd Grading Period Check* *SWD-FAIR AP2* 3rd-39% above 40th%ile 4th-27% above 40th %ile 5th-33.9% above 40%ile	5D.1. 3x per year - FAIR On-going Progress Monitoring in comprehension During the nine weeks - Unit assessments for SWD students - Nine weeks grades for SWD students
Reading Goal #5D: In grades 3-5, **86% SWD** All Curriculum students will score a Level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 10% in 2013. ***(Safe Harbor Target- 40%)***	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 19%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 41%					

				techniques. 10. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment). 11. PLCs record their work in logs.			
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.
Reading Goal #5E: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 40%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 52%					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities 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 (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Vocabulary/Comprehension Toolkit	K-5	Misti Rakowitz	K-5	January	Walkthroughs, observations	Administration
HOT Questions	K-5	Misti Rakowitz	K-5	January	Walkthroughs, observations	
Strategies and Structures to Impact Overall Comprehension	K-5	Misti Rakowitz	K-5	November	Walkthroughs, observations	
Easy CBM	3-5	Misti Rakowitz	3-5	October	Walkthroughs, observations	
IStation Data	K-5	Misti Rakowitz	K-5	December	Walkthroughs, observations	
Miscue Analysis	K-5	Misti Rakowitz	K-5	January	Walkthroughs, observations	
Independent reading book study	K-5	Misti Rakowitz	K-5	February	Walkthroughs, observations	

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.		1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
CELLA Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
CELLA Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*					
		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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
CELLA Goal #3: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary 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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			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. - Need additional training to implement effective PLCs. - Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students). -have been unsuccessful at filling Math Resource position -short one ESE teacher	1.1. **Tier 1** - The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills 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 70% or above on each unit of instruction.) 2. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling researched-based DI best-practice strategies. In addition, math teachers visit math demonstration classrooms where DI is emphasized. 3. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions. 4. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 6. Based on the data, teachers	1.1. Who -Principal -AP -ART -Math Resource How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. 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. -PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This walk-through form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty. -Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check*	1.1. PLC unit assessment data will be recorded in a course-specific PLC data base (excel spread sheet). 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. Incentive notebooks Think Central *1st Grading Period Check* *Form 1-* *3rd-44% at 70% or higher* *4th--47% at 70% or higher* *5th-51% at 70% or higher* *2nd Grading Period Check* *Form2-* *3rd-56% at 70% or higher* *4th--51% at 70% or higher* *5th-47% at 70% or higher* *3rd Grading Period Check*	1.1. 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During the Nine Weeks -Chapter Tests -Benchmark mini assessments
Mathematics Goal #1A: In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 34% to 37%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 34%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 37%					

				discuss strategies that were effective. 7. Based on the data, teachers a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students. 8. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment). 9. PLCs record their work in logs. 10. Brain Pop and Think Central use	*3rd Grading Period Check*		
			1.2. Not all teachers are aware of how to increase the depth and rigor necessary to meet the NGSSS.	1.2. **Tier 1** – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through participation in lessons designed to increase knowledge of depth and **rigor** of content. Teachers will also use the DOE links to the NGSSS highlighting the depth and rigor of each of the benchmarks. Action Steps: 1. Show teachers how to access www.floridastandards.org link. 2. Model for teachers how to use website. 3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers discuss specific benchmarks being addressed in class and how to increase the rigor of the benchmark in classroom. Teachers will also use the DOE links to the NGSSS highlighting the depth and rigor of each of the benchmarks. 4. Teachers implement the lessons with depth and rigor strategies discussed in their PLCs. 5. Teachers implement the common assessments. 6. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs.	1.2. Who Teacher Principal AP Math Resource/Contact District Math Team Generalist How Monitored -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing lessons designed with rigor and depth. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs -Elementary Mathematics *(available from Elementary Math)* Walk-through Form -Mathematics PLC Recording Document *(available from Elementary Math)*	1.2 PLCs – Periodic (monthly) progress monitoring of assessment scores, daily teacher observations, and response through modification of lesson plans based on data are reviewed to determine the number of students demonstrating proficiency toward benchmark attainment. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. District Math Team-Monthly meetings to support progress is discussed at Resource Teacher/Lead Teacher meetings Individual site support is provided as needed based on data..	1.2 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing -BOY test -MYT tests -EOY test During the Nine Weeks -Chapter Tests -Benchmark mini assessments.

			7. Using the data, teachers discuss the effectiveness of the rigor and depth strategies that were implemented. 8. Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of rigor and depth lesson planning. 9. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.			
		1A.3.	1.3. **Tier 2/3** - Students' math skills will improve through the use of **during-the-day tutorials** for supplemental instruction. The frequency and duration of supplemental instruction depends on individual progress monitoring data. Action Steps 1. School will utilize ELP funds to hire retired teachers to provide supplemental instruction. 2. Identify students in lowest quartile and/or level 1 3. Schedule students into appropriate intensive math groups. 4. Utilize hands-on practice during the group sessions.	1.3. Who Administration Math Teachers Math Resource Teachers How Monitored Data Reports	1.3. Review of District level baseline and midyear assessments, chapter tests and Instructional planning tool data First nine week check Second nine week check Third nine week check	1.3 Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM) *(From District RtI/Problem Solving Facilitators.)* .
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. 2012 Current Level of Performance:* 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*		1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.

		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1. -Not all teachers know how to identify student needs from assessments administered to students. -Not all teachers know how to ask higher order/open-ended questions during instruction. -Not all teachers are able to attend mathematics trainings on dates available by the district	2A.1. **Tier 1** – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through participation in **HOTS** activities. Teachers will analyze data, plan instruction based on data, include HOT questions designed to increase rigor in lesson plans. Action Steps: 1.Offer Assessment and Data Analysis in the Elementary Mathematics Classroom training 2. .Take strategies learned from training and discuss in PLC 3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers discuss HOT strategies and how they can be implemented in the upcoming lessons. 4. Teachers implement the targeted higher order questioning strategies in their lessons. 5. Teachers implement the common assessments. 6. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 7. Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of higher order strategy implementation. 8. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs. 9. Gifted teacher to share lesson ideas for high level students 10. Teachers use ongoing	2A.1. Who Teacher Principal AP ART Math Resource/Contact District Math Team Generalist How Monitored -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. -Elementary Mathematics Walk-through Form *(available from Elementary Math)* -Mathematics PLC Recording Document *(available from Elementary Math)* *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	2A.1. PLCs – Periodic (weekly or bi-weekly) progress monitoring of assessment scores to determine the number of students demonstrating proficiency toward benchmark attainment. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	2A.1. 2x per year District Baseline - During the Nine Weeks -Chapter Tests -Benchmark mini assessments
Mathematics Goal #2A: Mathematics Goal #1B: In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 13% to 14%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 13%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 14%					

				assessment, anecdotal records, and data from lesson to provide feedback and direct the lesson in the moment			
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Mathematics Goal #2B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3A.1. Lack of infrastructure to support technology -Lack of technology hardware -Teachers at varying understanding of the intent of the NGSSS	3A.1. **Tier 1** – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through the use of **technology and hands-on activities** to implement the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. 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 Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling technology and hands-on strategies. 3. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating 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. 7. As a Professional Development activity, teachers use data to discuss strategies that were effective. 8. Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of planning technology and hands-on strategies. 9. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.	3A.1. Who - Principal - Technology Specialist - Math Resource Teacher How Monitored -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This walk-through form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty. Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. -HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	3A.1. 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 will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	3A.1. 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing Semester Exams During the Nine Weeks -Chapter Tests -Benchmark mini assessments
Mathematics Goal #3A: In grades 3-5, the percentage of All Curriculum students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 49% to 54%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 49%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 54%					
			3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.

<table>
<tr><td></td><td colspan="2"></td><td>3A.3.</td><td>3A.3.</td><td>3A.3.</td><td>3A.3.</td><td>3A.3.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</td><td>3B.1.</td><td>3B.1.</td><td>3B.1.</td><td>3B.1.</td><td>3B.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Mathematics Goal #3B:

Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td></tr>
<tr><td>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</td><td>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2" rowspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td>3B.2.</td><td>3B.2.</td><td>3B.2.</td><td>3B.2.</td><td>3B.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>3B.3.</td><td>3B.3.</td><td>3B.3.</td><td>3B.3.</td><td>3B.3.</td></tr>
</table>

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1. - Teachers at varying skill levels with the FCIM model. - Teachers' implementation of the FCIM model is not consistent across math classes. - Lack of common planning time to develop/identify PLC based mini lessons and mini assessments (using curriculum based materials) geared toward on-going progress monitoring. - Lack of common planning time to analyze mini lesson data. - Lack of understanding of when and how to implement the mini lessons within the District pacing guide.	4A.1. **Tier 1** – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through teachers using the **FCIM** strategy on identified tested benchmarks Action Steps 1. Through data analysis of FCAT, baseline data, classroom assessments and student performance, PLCs identify essential tested benchmarks for their students that need reinforcement and/or remediation. 2. Based on the data, PLCs develop a 10 day projected timeline/calendar for re-teaching the essential skills and/or standards covered in the core curriculum. 3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers identify and/or develop mini lessons and mini assessments for benchmarks. PLCs use a combination of District and school-generated mini lessons/assessments. 4. Teachers implement the mini lessons and mini assessments. 5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 6. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers use the mini assessment data and classroom assessments to adjust the timeline/calendar. Based on mini assessment data, skills are moved to a maintenance or re-teaching schedule. 7. As a PLC, teachers develop a school-based assessment that covers all mini lesson skills taught within the nine week period. PLCs record their work in logs.:	4A.1. Who Teacher Principal AP How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This walk-through form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty. Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. -Another fidelity tool will be the PLC calendars/timeline/ logs of targeted skills reviewed by the administration and/or Math Coach. - PSLT will review the calendars/logs and make progress statements at the end of each nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	4A.1. -PLCs will review mini-assessment data. Mini-assessment data recorded in a course specific PLC data base (excel spread sheet). -For the mini-assessments, PLCs will chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on each mini-assessment. PLCs will review evaluation data. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team reviews data that includes all skills covered during the nine week period. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	4A.1. 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing Semester Exams During the Nine Weeks -Benchmark mini assessments -Unit and/or Segment assessments - School-generated nine week assessment of all mini lesson skills covered during the nine weeks.
Mathematics Goal #4: In grades 3-5, the percentage of All Curriculum students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 55% to 61%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 55%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 61%					

		4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.
		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**							
Mathematics Goal #5A: In grades 3-5, **86%** of the following All Curriculum student subgroups will score a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 10%. **(Safe Harbor Targets: White – 75%, and Hispanic – 60%)**								
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**			5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: The Extended Learning Program (ELP) does not always target the specific skill weaknesses of the students or collect data on an ongoing basis. -Not always a direct correlation between what the student is missing in the regular classroom and the instruction received during ELP. -Minimal communication between regular and ELP teachers.	5B.1. **Tier 2/3:** Students' math skills will improve through receiving **ELP supplemental instruction on targeted skills** that are not at the mastery level. Action Steps 1. Classroom teachers will communicate with the ELP teachers regarding specific skills that students have not mastered.. 2. ELP teachers identify lessons for students that target specific skills that are not at the mastery level. 3. Students attend ELP sessions. *Mon & Thurs. after school 2 hours a day.* 3. Progress monitoring data will be collected by the ELP teacher on a weekly or biweekly basis and communicated back to the regular classroom teacher. 4. When the students have	5B.1. Who Administrators How Monitored Administrators will review the communication logs and data collection used between teachers and ELP teachers outlining skills that need remediation. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	5B.1. Administrators will review the ELP data for each group on a monthly basis and present this information to the PSLT. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	5B.1. Mini-Assessments - K-8 Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM	
Mathematics Goal #5B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White:44 Black:24 Hispanic:31 Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White:68 Black:46 Hispanic:48 Asian: American Indian:						

				mastered the specific skill, they are exited from the ELP program.			
			5B.2. Teacher support for planning remediation and enrichment activities -Teacher support for the strategy -Will need to approve Non-Standard Waiver for additional period of instruction.	5B.2. **Tier 2/3** - Students' math skills will improve through the implementation of a **50 minute supplemental instruction period per week** for re-teaching and enrichment. Action Steps 1. Weekly, teams will collaborate and regroup students across the four teachers based on student need. Teachers will determine the math skills targeted for the weekly sessions based on student performance during the previous week. 2. Students will attend either a re-teach or enrichment session. 3. Re-teach sessions will be assed with a mini-assessment to demonstrate mastery. 4. PLCs record their work in logs. .	5B.2. Who Math Coach AP Principal How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Team re-grouping of students by teacher and topic/lesson turned into APC weekly. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. First Nine Week Check Second Nine Week Check Third Nine Week Check	5B.2. Teachers analyze mini assessment data on skills taught/reviewed in supplemental instructional period. Mini-assessment data recorded in team data base (excel spread sheet). Excel spread sheet turned into APC every three weeks. Teachers review data at PLC meetings. 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.	5B.2. 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing Semester Tests During the Nine Weeks -Chapter Tests -Benchmark mini assessments
			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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1. Teachers at varying skill levels regarding the use of CALLA. -Teachers implementation of CALLA is not consistent across math teachers. -ELLs at varying levels of English language acquisition and acculturation is not consistent across math teachers. -Administrators at varying skill levels regarding use of CALLA in order to effectively conduct a CALLA fidelity check walk-through. -DRTs are at varying levels of interpreting district level assessments	5C.1. ELLs (LYs/LFs) math skills will improve through math teachers implementing the **Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA)** Action Steps 1. ESOL Resource Teacher (ERT) provides professional development to all math teachers on how to imbed CALLA into core content lessons. 2. ERT models lessons using CALLA. 3. ERT observes math teachers using CALLA and provides feedback, coaching and support. 4. Math PLCs write ELL SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the **ELL** students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) 5. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing and modeling CALLA strategies 6. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating CALLA strategies from their PLC discussions. 4. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 5. Teachers bring ELL assessment data back to the PLCs. 6. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective for ELL students. 7. Based on the data, teachers decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students using DI techniques. 8. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students	5C.1. Who -School based Administrators -ESOL Resource Teachers How -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form *(EET tool – CALLA strategy will be added to the form under Instructional Practices.)* -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This walk-through form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty. Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. First Nine Week Check Second Nine Week Check Third Nine Week Check	5C.1. -ERTs are on the problem-solving leadership teams in order to update the team on ELLs (inclusive of LFs) performance data. -ERTs meet with Language Arts PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data. -ERTs meet with math teachers during PLC meetings to review ELL (inclusive of LF's) performance data. -ERTs meet with PSLT to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs). PLC facilitator will share ELL 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. -DRTs meet with administration/designee to review ELLs performance data and progress of ELLs (FAIR/CELLA/district-wide baseline and mid-year test). First Nine Week Check Second Nine Week Check	5C.1. 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing Semester Exams During the Nine Weeks -Benchmark mini assessments -Unit and/or Segment assessments
Mathematics Goal #5C: In grades 3-5, **86% ELL** All Curriculum students will score a Level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT Math Test or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 10% in 2013. **(Safe Harbor Target- 55%)**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 29%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 43%					

				(remediation and enrichment). 9. PLCs record their work in logs. :			
			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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1. - No electronic accessibility to FAA data (instructional planning tool, mainframe, etc.) -Collecting data with fidelity -Understanding data and the students' disability to make instructional decisions -For general education teachers, understanding the IEP and instructional accommodations -Teachers at varying skill levels (ACP, content knowledge, certification) -Multiple Preps. -Lack of common planning time	5D.1. SWDs math skills will improve by **connecting individual needs to instruction as outlined in the IEP**. Actions Steps 1. Math General ed. and/or SWD teachers will familiarizing themselves with each student's IEP goals, strategies and accommodations. 2. Every nine weeks the Math General Ed and/or SWD teacher reviews students' IEPs to ensure that all students' IEP goals, strategies and accommodations are being implemented with fidelity. 3. Using student data, every nine weeks (along with the report card) SWD students will receive an Individual Education Plan Progress Report to inform	5D.1. Who Principal, Site Administrator, Assistance Principal How -IEP Progress Reports reviewed by APC. -PSLT will identify and/or create a fidelity monitoring tool designed to check implementation of this specific strategy. Monitoring parents of the students' progress toward mastering their IEP goals and strategies. 4. Math PLCs write **SWD** SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the **SWD** students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) 5. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers discussing implementation of IEP strategies and modifications. 6. PLC teachers instruct students implementing IEP strategies and accommodations. 4. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 5. Teachers bring SWD assessment data back to the PLCs.	5D.1. Teacher Level PLC/Department Level Leadership Team Level *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* data will be reviewed every nine weeks. *3rd Grading Period Check* First Nine Week Check Second Nine Week Check Third Nine Week Check	5D.1. 2-3x Per Year During Grading Period
Mathematics Goal #5D: In grades 3-5, **86% SWD** All Curriculum students will score a Level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT Math Test or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 10% in 2013. **(Safe Harbor Target-51%)**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 29%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 46%					

					6. Based on the data, teachers discuss techniques that were effective for SWD students. 7. Based on the data, teachers decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students using DI techniques. 8. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment). 9. PLCs record their work in logs.		
			5D.2. See 5A.1 See 5A.2	5D.2. See 5A.1 See 5A.2	5D.2. See 5A.1 See 5A.2	5D.2. See 5A.1 See 5A.2	5D.2. See 5A.1 See 5A.2
			5D.3. See 4.1	5D.3. See 4.1	5D.3. See 4.1	5D.3. See 4.1	5D.3. See 4.1

<table>
<tr><td colspan="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:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</td><td>5B.1.
See 5A.1</td><td>5B.1.
See 5A.1</td><td>5B.1.
See 5A.1</td><td>5B.1.
See 5A.1</td><td>5B.1.
See 5A.1</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Mathematics Goal #5E:

In grades 3-5, 86% Economically Disadvantaged All Curriculum students will score a Level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT Math or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 10%. (Safe Harbor Target-60%).</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*
32%</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*
50%</td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3"></td><td>5B.2.
See 5A.2</td><td>5B.2.
See 5A.2</td><td>5B.2.
See 5A.2</td><td>5B.2.
See 5A.2</td><td>5B.2.
See 5A.2</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3"></td><td>5B.3.
See 4.1</td><td>5B.3.
See 4.1</td><td>5B.3.
See 4.1</td><td>5B.3.
See 4.1</td><td>5B.3.
See 4.1</td></tr>
</table>

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle 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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
Mathematics Goal #1A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Mathematics Goal #1B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.
Mathematics Goal #2A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Mathematics Goal #2B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.
Mathematics Goal #3A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Mathematics Goal #3B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

<table>
<tr><th colspan="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:</th><th>Anticipated Barrier</th><th>Strategy</th><th>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</th><th>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</th><th>Evaluation Tool</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</td><td>4A.1.</td><td>4A.1.</td><td>4A.1.</td><td>4A.1.</td><td>4A.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Mathematics Goal #4:

Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td></tr>
<tr><td>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</td><td>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3"></td><td>4A.2.</td><td>4A.2.</td><td>4A.2.</td><td>4A.2.</td><td>4A.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3"></td><td>4A.3.</td><td>4A.3.</td><td>4A.3.</td><td>4A.3.</td><td>4A.3.</td></tr>
</table>

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**						
Mathematics Goal #5A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**		5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	
Mathematics Goal #5B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	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:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
Mathematics Goal #5D: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="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:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</td><td>5E.1.</td><td>5E.1.</td><td>5E.1.</td><td>5E.1.</td><td>5E.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Mathematics Goal #5E:

Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td></tr>
<tr><td>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</td><td>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2"></td><td colspan="2" rowspan="2"></td><td>5E.2.</td><td>5E.2.</td><td>5E.2.</td><td>5E.2.</td><td>5E.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td>5E.3.</td><td>5E.3.</td><td>5E.3.</td><td>5E.3.</td><td>5E.3.</td></tr>
</table>

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">High School Mathematics Goals</th><th colspan="4">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="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:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</td><td>1.1.</td><td>1.1.</td><td>1.1.</td><td>1.1.</td><td>1.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Mathematics Goal #1:

Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*

Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*

Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</td><td colspan="4" rowspan="3"></td></tr>
<tr><td>1.2.</td><td>1.2.</td><td>1.2.</td><td>1.2.</td><td>1.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td>1.3.</td><td>1.3.</td><td>1.3.</td><td>1.3.</td><td>1.3.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="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:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.</td><td>2.1.</td><td>2.1.</td><td>2.1.</td><td>2.1.</td><td>2.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Mathematics Goal #2:

Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*

Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*

Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</td><td colspan="4" rowspan="3"></td></tr>
<tr><td>2.2.</td><td>2.2.</td><td>2.2.</td><td>2.2.</td><td>2.2.</td></tr>
</table>

		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

<table>
<tr><th colspan="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:</th><th>Anticipated Barrier</th><th>Strategy</th><th>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</th><th>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</th><th>Evaluation Tool</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</td><td>3.1.</td><td>3.1.</td><td>3.1.</td><td>3.1.</td><td>3.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Mathematics Goal #3:

Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td></tr>
<tr><td>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</td><td>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2" rowspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td>3.2.</td><td>3.2.</td><td>3.2.</td><td>3.2.</td><td>3.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>3.3.</td><td>3.3.</td><td>3.3.</td><td>3.3.</td><td>3.3.</td></tr>
</table>

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

Algebra 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Algebra I EOC)*

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Algebra Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.

		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years</td><td>2011-2012</td><td>2012-2013</td><td>2013-2014</td><td>2014-2015</td><td>2015-2016</td><td>2016-2017</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</td><td>Baseline data 2010-2011</td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Algebra 1 Goal #3A:

Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="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 subgroups:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td colspan="2">Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3" rowspan="4">3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.

Algebra 1 Goal #3B:

Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</td><td>3B.1.
White:
Black:
Hispanic:
Asian:
American Indian:</td><td>3B.1.</td><td>3B.1.</td><td>3B.1.</td><td colspan="2">3B.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*
Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.
White:
Black:
Hispanic:
Asian:
American Indian:</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*
Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.
White:
Black:
Hispanic:
Asian:
American Indian:</td><td colspan="4"></td></tr>
<tr><td>3B.2.</td><td>3B.2.</td><td>3B.2.</td><td>3B.2.</td><td colspan="2">3B.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td>3B.3.</td><td>3B.3.</td><td>3B.3.</td><td>3B.3.</td><td colspan="2">3B.3.</td></tr>
</table>

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3C: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.
			3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3D: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3E: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Geometry EOC)*

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

Geometry EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Geometry Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Geometry Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.

		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years</td><td>2012-2013</td><td>2013-2014</td><td>2014-2015</td><td>2015-2016</td><td>2016-2017</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</td><td>Baseline data 2011-2012</td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Geometry Goal #3A:

Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="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 subgroups:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.</td><td>3B.1.
White:
Black:
Hispanic:
Asian:
American Indian:</td><td>3B.1.</td><td>3B.1.</td><td>3B.1.</td><td>3B.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Geometry Goal #3B:

Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td></tr>
<tr><td>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.
White:
Black:
Hispanic:
Asian:
American Indian:</td><td>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.
White:
Black:
Hispanic:
Asian:
American Indian:</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3"></td><td>3B.2.</td><td>3B.2.</td><td>3B.2.</td><td>3B.2.</td><td>3B.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3"></td><td>3B.3.</td><td>3B.3.</td><td>3B.3.</td><td>3B.3.</td><td>3B.3.</td></tr>
</table>

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.
Geometry Goal #3C: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.
			3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.
Geometry Goal #3D: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.
Geometry Goal #3E: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities 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 (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle 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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.			1A.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 of the inquiry model. -Teachers are at varying skill levels with the use of achievement series to accurately analyze student data	1A.1. **Tier 1** – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students will develop problem-solving and creative thinking skills while constructing new knowledge. To achieve this goal, science teachers will increase the number of **inquiry based instruction** (such as student engagement, explore time, accountable talk and higher order questioning) per unit of instruction. Action Steps 1. Teachers will attend District Science training and share information with their PLCs. 2. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) 3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling inquiry based instruction strategies and integration. 4. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum and inquiry based instruction strategies. 5. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 6. Teachers bring assessment data	1A.1. Science Resource PLC Meetings- Data Chats (Elementary) District Science Team – 5th grade Area Data Chats 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 will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. *from Elementary Science Department.)* -PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This walk-through form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty. Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.	1A.1. 2x per year District-level baseline and mid-year tests Semester Exams During the nine weeks - Mini Assessments -Unit assessments	1A.1.
Science Goal #1A: In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 27% to 30%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 27%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 30%					

				back to the PLCs. 78 Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of planning inquiry based instruction strategies. 9. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs. . Based on the data, teachers discuss inquiry based instruction strategies that were effective.			
			1.2 -Teachers are at varying skill levels in the use of inquiry and the 5E lesson plan model. -Administrators are at varying skill levels with understanding inquiry and the 5E lesson model -PLC are not being implemented at all middle schools with fidelity -Lack of common planning time to facilitate and hold PLC	**1.2** **Tier 1** – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' science skills will improve through participation in the **5E lesson plan model.** Action Steps 1. Teachers will attend District Science training and share 5 E Lesson Plan Model information with their PLCs. 2. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) 3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time collaboratively building 5E Lesson Plans. 4. PLC teachers instruct students using the 5 E Lesson Plans. 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. 7. Based on the data, teachers discuss effectiveness of the 5E Lesson Plans. 8 Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of 5 E Lesson planning. 9. PLCs record their work in the	1.2 Who Principal AP Science Teachers How Monitored -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. - Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. PSLT will identify PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This walk-through form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty. First Nine Week Check Second Nine Week Check Third Nine Week Check	1.2 PLCs will review evaluation data. 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 will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. *Form 1-* *3rd-46% at 70% or higher* *4th--45% at 70% or higher* *5th-44% at 70% or higher* Second Nine Week Check Form 2 5th-47% at 70% or higher Third Nine Week Check	1.2 2x per year District-level baseline and mid-year tests Semester Exams During the nine weeks - Mini Assessments -Unit asessments

			PLC logs.			
		1.3 - Teachers at varying skills levels with the FCIM model. - Teachers' implementation of the FCIM model is not consistent across math classes. - Lack of common planning time to develop/identify PLC based mini lessons and mini assessments (using curriculum based materials) geared toward on-going progress monitoring. - Lack of common planning time to analyze mini lesson data. - Lack of understanding of when and how to implement the mini lessons within the District pacing guide.	**1.3** **Tier 1** – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' science skills will improve through teachers using the **FCIM** strategy on identified tested benchmarks Action Steps 1. Through data analysis of FCAT, baseline data, classroom assessments and student performance, PLCs identify essential tested benchmarks for their students that need reinforcement and/or remediation. 2. Based on the data, PLCs develop a 10 day projected timeline/calendar for re-teaching the essential skills and/or standards covered in the core curriculum. 3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers identify and/or develop mini lessons and mini assessments for benchmarks. PLCs use a combination of District and school-generated mini lessons/assessments. 4. Teachers implement the mini lessons and mini assessments. 5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 6. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers use the mini assessment data and classroom assessments to adjust the timeline/calendar. Based on mini assessment data, skills are moved to a maintenance or re-teaching schedule. 7. As a PLC, teachers develop a school-based assessment that covers all mini lesson skills taught within the nine week period. 8. PLCs record their work in logs.	1.3 Who Teacher Principal AP ART Science Resource How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This walk-through form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty. Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. -Another fidelity tool will be the PLC calendars/timeline/ logs of targeted skills reviewed by the administration and/or Math Coach. - PSLT will review the calendars/logs and make progress statements at the end of each nine weeks. First Nine Week Check Second Nine Week Check Third Nine Week Check	1.3 -PLCs will review mini-assessment data. Mini-assessment data recorded in a course specific PLC data base (excel spread sheet). -For the mini-assessments, PLCs will chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on each mini-assessment. PLCs will review evaluation data. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team reviews data that includes all skills covered during the nine week period. First Nine Week Check Second Nine Week Check Third Nine Week Check	1.3 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing Semester Exams During the Nine Weeks -Benchmark mini assessments -Unit and/or Segment assessments - School-generated nine week assessment of all mini lesson skills covered during the nine weeks.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.</td><td>1B.1.</td><td>1B.1.</td><td>1B.1.</td><td>1B.1.</td><td>1B.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Science Goal #1B:

Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</td><td>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2" rowspan="2"></td><td>1B.2.</td><td>1B.2.</td><td>1B.2.</td><td>1B.2.</td><td>1B.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td>1B.3.</td><td>1B.3.</td><td>1B.3.</td><td>1B.3.</td><td>1B.3.</td></tr>
</table>

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.			2A.1. - Not all teachers know how to identify student needs from assessments administered to students. - Not all teachers know how to ask higher order/open-ended questions during instruction. - Not all teachers are able to attend science trainings on dates available by the district.	2A.1. **Tier 1** – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' science skills will improve through participation in **HOTS** activities. Teachers will analyze data, plan instruction based on data, include HOT questions designed to increase rigor in lesson plans. Action Steps: 1.Offer HOTS training at District meetings. Science Contacts train PLCs. 2. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) 3.Take strategies learned from training and discuss in PLC. 4. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers discuss HOT strategies and how they can be implemented in the upcoming lessons. 5. Teachers implement the targeted higher order questioning strategies in their lessons. 6. Teachers implement the common assessments. 7. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 8. PLCs study specifically students' responses to the higher order questions to assess students' higher order thinking processes. 9. Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of higher order strategy implementation. 10. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.	2A.1. Who Teacher Principal AP Elementary Science Contacts How Monitored - PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. - Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. - Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs - Elementary Science Classroom Walk-Through form *(available from Elementary Science Department.)* - PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This walk-through form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty. Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. - HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool).	2A.1. 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 will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.	2A.1. 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During the Nine Weeks Unit Assessments
Science Goal #2A: In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 3% to 14%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 3%	2013Expected Level of Performance:* 14%					

		2.2 - 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. - Need additional training to implement effective PLCs.	**2.2** **Tier 1** – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' science comprehension will improve through teachers using the **Continuous Improvement Model** with core curriculum and providing **Differentiated Instruction** 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 Development activity, teachers use district textbook adopted materials and resources within their PLCs to plan and deliver lessons. 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 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. 7. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective. 8. Based on the data, teachers 1) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, 2) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class 3) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students (remediation and enrichment).	2.2 Who -Principal -APC How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration classroom walk-throughs -PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This walk-through form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty. First Nine Week Check Second Nine Week Check Third Nine Week Check	2.2 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. First Nine Week Check Second Nine Week Check Third Nine Week Check	2.2 .2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing Semester Exams During the Nine Weeks -Unit assessments

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td></td><td>9. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>2A.3.</td><td>2A.3.</td><td>2A.3.</td><td>2A.3.</td><td>2A.3.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.</td><td>2B.1.</td><td>2B.1.</td><td>2B.1.</td><td>2B.1.</td><td>2B.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Science Goal #2B:

Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013Expected Level of Performance:*</td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td></tr>
<tr><td>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</td><td>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>2B.2.</td><td>2B.2.</td><td>2B.2.</td><td>2B.2.</td><td>2B.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>2B.3.</td><td>2B.3.</td><td>2B.3.</td><td>2B.3.</td><td>2B.3.</td></tr>
</table>

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

High School 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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Science Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Science Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.

		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

Biology 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Biology I EOC)*

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

Biology 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Biology 1 Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Biology 1 Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.

		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

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 (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Inquiry/Investigations	3-5	Science Contacts	Science teachers	January	Administrators conduct targeted walk throughs on investigations	Administration team
Science Vocabulary	3-5	Science Contacts	Science teachers	February	Administrators conduct targeted walk throughs to monitor vocabulary	Administration team

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:

	Total:

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.			1.1 - Teachers lack skill and understanding regarding the FCAT Writing Assessment and Scoring Rubric. - Teachers new to Language Arts may not have FCAT Writing training - Teachers do not have confidence using holistic scoring methods - Teachers lack sufficient time to score student papers - Teachers lack common planning time to meet in PLCs to discuss common deficiencies in writing	**1.1** **Tier 1** – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' writing skills will improve through participation of best practices for teaching writing. Best practices include **PLC instructional calendars, Differentiated Instruction and effective holistic scoring methods**. Action Steps 1. As a Professional Development activity, teachers new to the profession and/or content area are required to attend district level trainings. 2. As a Professional Development activity, teachers participate in assessment and rubric refresher courses and practice scoring within PLCs. 3. As a Professional Development activity, PLC chairs will facilitate advanced scoring sessions. 4. As a Professional Development activity PLC discussions draw teachers to a consensus regarding student trends, needs, and scores based on connecting student writing with state anchors. 5. Based on student writing reviews and PLC discussions regarding trends and needs, teachers create monthly writing menus for craft, elaboration, and genres as a list of essential teaching points for the month ahead.	1.1 Who Principal AP PLCs How Monitored - PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. - Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. - Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). -PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This walk-through form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty. Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. - Springboard Walk-Through Observation Form First Nine Week Check Second Nine Week Check Third Nine Week Check	1.1 PLCs will identify trends (deficiencies and growth) in student writing performance and collaborate to modify the instructional calendar to provide differentiated instruction as appropriate. PLCs - Review of monthly formative writing assessments to determine number and percent of students scoring above proficiency as determined by the assignment rubric. PLCs will chart the increase in the number of students reaching 4.0 or above on the monthly writing prompt. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends. PLCs will participate in rubric Norming sessions to identify teacher barriers impeding effective holistic scoring. First Nine Week Check Second Nine Week Check 3rd-26% 3.0 or higher 4th-86% 3.0 or higher 5th 90% 3.0 or higher	1.1 Student monthly demand writes, student daily drafts, conferencing notes
Writing Goal #1A: In grades 3-5, the percentage of AYP All Curriculum (AC) students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writing will increase from 87% to 90%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 87%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 90%					

				6. Teachers implement the ideas based on specific student needs. 7. As a Professional Development activity PLCs examine student conference notes, daily drafts, and monthly demand writes and adjust the monthly writing menu of teaching points and share ideas to grow students. 8. PLCs review nine week data, set a new goal for the following nine weeks. 9. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.		<u>Third Nine Week Check</u>	
			-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 are able to attend writing trainings on dates available by the district.	**Tier 1** – 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. <u>Action Steps</u> 1. As a Professional Development activity, PLC discussions draw teachers to a consensus regarding student trends, needs, and scores based on connecting student writing with state anchors. 2. Based on student writing reviews and PLC discussions regarding trends and needs, teachers create monthly writing menus for craft, elaboration, and genres as a list of essential teaching points for the month ahead. 3. As a Professional Development activity, teachers complete the online MOODLE course, *Write on Target: Best Practice in Elementary Writing* and return to this professional development course when needing to refresh knowledge. 4. As a Professional Development activity, PLCs reconvene to discuss ideas/lessons from the online MOODLE course and share monthly writing resource/contact	<u>Who</u> Teacher Principal AP Writing Resource/Contact District Writing Team Generalist <u>How Monitored</u> - PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. - Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. - Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. - Administrator Writers' Workshop Walk-through Checklist for HCPS	PLCs – Monthly demand writes, daily drafts, and conferencing notes are reviewed to determine the number of students demonstrating proficiency in writing through scoring data and benchmark attainment. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. District Writing Team-Monthly demand write scores provided through email to Writing Supervisor followed by fourth-grade writing review meetings and support pieces provided at monthly resource/contact meetings.	Student monthly demand writes, student daily drafts, conferencing notes

			meeting information. 5. Teachers implement the ideas based on specific student needs. 6. As a Professional Development activity, PLCs examine student conference notes, daily drafts, monthly demand writes and adjust the monthly writing menu of teaching points in order to share ideas to grow students through daily Writers' Workshops. 7. PLCs review nine-week data and set a new goal for the following nine weeks. 8. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.			
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.		1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Writing Goal #1B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

Writing 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 (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Writing Reviews-District	4	Temetia Creed	Grade level/APEI	Oct./Dec./Jan.	Monthly data grids	APEI/4th grade team

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

	Subtotal:
	Total:

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(required in year 2014-2015)*

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

Civics EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Civics Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Civics Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

Civics 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 (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:

	Total:

End of Civics Goals

U.S. History End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(required in year 2013-2014)*

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

U.S. History EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
U.S. History Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
U.S. History Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

U.S. History 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 (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

U.S. History Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:

	Total:

End of U.S. History Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			1.1. -Most students with significant unexcused absences (10 or more) have serious personal or family issues that are impacting attendance. -Lack of time to focus on attendance -Lack of staff to focus on attendance	1.1. PSLT f will meet every 20 days to review the school's Attendance Plan to 1) ensure that all steps are being implemented with fidelity and 2) discuss targeted students. A data base will be maintained for students with excessive unexcused absences and tardies. This data base will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of attendance interventions and to identify students in need of support beyond school wide attendance initiatives	1.1. AP will run Attendance/Tardy meetings every 20 days with appropriate reports AP will maintain data base Social Worker Guidance Counselors	1.1. Administration Team and subset of PSLT will examine data monthly	1.1. Attendance Report Tardy Report Attendance Plan
Attendance Goal #1: The attendance rate will increase from 93% in 2011-2012 to 94% in 2012-2013. -The number of students who have 10 or more **unexcused** absences throughout the school year will decrease from 220 in 2011-2012 to 200 in 2012-2013. -The number of students who have 0 or more **unexcused** tardies to school throughout the school year will remain at 0 for 2012-2013.	2012 Current Attendance Rate:* *94%* 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) *220* 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) *0*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* *95%* 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) *200* 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) *0*					
	1.2. See 1.1		1.2. When a student reaches 15 days of unexcused absences and/or unexcused tardies to school, parents and guardians are notified via mail that future absences/tardies must have a doctor note or other reason outlined in the Student Handbook to receive an excused absence/tardy and must be approved through an administrator. A parent-	1.2. See 1.1	1.2. See 1.1	1.2. See 1.1	1.2.

		administrator-student conference is scheduled and held regarding these procedures. The goal of the conference is to create a plan for assisting the students to improve his/her attendance/tardies.				
		1.3. -Not all teachers are comfortable with EdLine -Not all teachers keep attendance updated	1.3. All teachers will post their attendance to EdLine on a regular basis, allowing parents to monitor attendance.	1.3 Random check of EdLine postings	1.3 See 1.1	1.3 EdLine

Attendance 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 (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

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

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension			1.1 There needs to be common school-wide expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior.	**1.1** CHAMPs will be implemented to address school-wide expectations and rules, set these through staff survey and discussion, and provide training to staff in methods for teaching and reinforcing the school-wide rules and expectations.	1.1 PSLT "behavior" subgroup	1.1 PSLT "behavior" subgroup with review data on Office Discipline Referrals ODRs and out of school suspensions monthly.	1.1 Crystal Report ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data
Suspension Goal #1: The total number of In-School Suspensions will decrease from 8 in 2011-2012 to7 in 2012- 2013. The total number of students receiving In-School Suspension will decrease from 8 in 2011-2012 to 7 in 2012-2013. -The total number of Out-of-Suspensions (including ATOSS) will decrease from 19 in 2011-2012 to 17 in 2012-2013. -The total number of students receiving Out-of-School Suspension will decrease from 16 in 2011-2012 to 14 in 2012- 2013.	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions					
	8	*7*					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					
	8	*7*					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	19	*17*					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	16	*14*					
			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 (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PLCs	K-5	Resource Teachers Administrators	School Wide	Ongoing/weekly	Monthly Data Review with support from PBS Coach. PSLT will review the attendance and behavior data on a weekly basis, providing mentoring to students, and establishing ongoing contact with parents.	Principal and Assistant Principal

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">Dropout Prevention Goal(s)</th><th colspan="5">Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">1. Dropout Prevention</td><td>1.1.</td><td>1.1.</td><td>1.1.</td><td>1.1.</td><td>1.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="5">Dropout Prevention Goal #1:

Enter narrative for the goal in this box.

Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</td><td>2012 Current Dropout Rate:</td><td>2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*</td><td rowspan="4"></td><td rowspan="4"></td><td rowspan="4"></td><td rowspan="4"></td><td rowspan="4"></td></tr>
<tr><td>Enter numerical data for dropout rate in this box.</td><td>Enter numerical data for expected dropout rate in this box.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2012 Current Graduation Rate:*</td><td>2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*</td></tr>
<tr><td>Enter numerical data for graduation rate in this box.</td><td>Enter numerical data for expected graduation rate in this box.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>1.2.</td><td>1.2.</td><td>1.2.</td><td>1.2.</td><td>1.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>1.3.</td><td>1.3.</td><td>1.3.</td><td>1.3.</td><td>1.3.</td></tr>
</table>

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Upload Option-For schools completing the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) please include a copy for this section.
Online Template- For schools completing the PIP a link will be provided that will direct you to this plan.

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

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.* **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:* *Enter numerical data for current level of parent involvement in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of parent involvement in this box.*	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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 (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

Parent Involvement Budget

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	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 (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of STEM Goal(s)

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
CTE Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	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 (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional 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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Additional Goal			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Additional Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level :* *Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.*	2013 Expected Level :* *Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box.*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Additional 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 (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

Additional Goal(s) Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Additional Goal(s)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.
Reading Budget
Total:
CELLA Budget
Total:
Mathematics Budget
Total:
Science Budget
Total:
Writing Budget
Total:
Civics Budget
Total:
U.S. History Budget
Total:
Attendance Budget
Total:
Suspension Budget
Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget
Total:
Parent Involvement Budget
Total:
STEM Budget
Total:
CTE Budget
Total:
Additional Goals
Total:

Grand Total:

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

Are you reward school? ☐Yes ☐No
(A reward school is any school that has improved their letter grade from the previous year or any A graded school.)

- Upload a copy of the Differentiated Accountability Checklist in the designated upload link on the *Upload* page

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

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

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount