Florida Department of Education

School Improvement Plan (SIP)

Form SIP-1

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Lake Magdalene Elementary	District Name: Hillsborough
Principal: Dodi Davenport	Superintendent: MaryEllen Elia
SAC Chair: Shannon O'Sullivan	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.
School Grades Trend Data (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)
High School Feedback Report

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

Highly Qualified Administrators

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Dodi Davenport	M.S. – Ed Leadership B.S. – Elementary Ed ESOL School Principal Elementary 1-6	3	8	Roland Park K-8 (as Assistant Principal) 2006-2007 Grade – B -AYP -No 2007-2008 Grade – C -AYP - No 2008-2009 – C -AYP – No 2009-2010 - A – AYP 95% Lake Magdalene 2009-2010 - A – AYP 95% 2010-2011 – A 2011-2012 - A
Assistant Principal	Delia Gadson-Yarbrough	M.S. – Ed Leadership B.S. – Elementary Ed ESOL	16	4	2009-2010 - A – AYP 95% 2010-2011 – A 2011-2012 - A

Highly Qualified Instructional Coaches

List your school's highly qualified instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment performance (Percentage data for Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Sharon Bugg	Primary Education, ESOL	1	7 years at Forest Hills Elementary	2011-2012 – C 2010-2011 – C

Highly Qualified Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1. Teacher Interview Day	General Directors	June	
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. Regular Time for Teacher Collaboration	Principal	Ongoing	

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	**Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective**
11	Complete ESOL Coursework and/or add endorsement to certificate. Complete Hearing Impaired Certification Coursework and add to certificate

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Qualified Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers

77	4	27	43	26	20	86	1	4	65

Teacher Mentoring Program

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Jessica Willman	Brandy Turner	Jessica Willman is a district Mentor in the EET Program.	Twice weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.

Jessica Willman	Stephanie Kaufmann	Jessica Willman is a district Mentor in the EET Program.	Twice weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Jessica Willman	Lauren DeCabia	Jessica Willman is a district Mentor in the EET Program.	Twice weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

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

Job Training
Other

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team. The leadership team includes: ● Principal – Dodi Davenport ● Assistant Principal – Delia Gadson-Yarbrough ● Guidance Counselor - Ashley Martin ● School Psychologist – Kimberly Kotula ● Social Worker – Chris Montejo ● ESE teacher – Allison Manulak ● ESE teacher – Emily Kanoza ● ESE Specialist – Brenda Thompson ● Representatives from the PLCs for each grade level, K-5 ● SAC Chair – Shannon O'Sullivan ● ELL Representative – Michelle Muniz

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

The PSLT is considered the main leadership team in our school. The PSLT will meet weekly and use the problem solving process to:

- Oversee the multi-layered model of service delivery (Tier 1/Core, Tier 2/Supplemental and Tier 3/Intensive)
- Based on student data, recommend, coordinate and implement supplemental services (Tiers 2 and 3) that match students' non-mastery of skills through:
    - Tutoring during the day in small group pull-outs in reading, math and science
    - Extended Learning Programs during and after school
    - Create, manage and update the school resource map
- Determine scheduling needs, curriculum materials and intervention resources based on identified needs derived from data analysis
- Determine the school-wide professional development needs of faculty and staff and arrange trainings aligned with the SIP goals
- Review and interpret student data (academic, behavior and attendance) at the school and grade levels
- Organize and support systematic data collection as needed
- Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction through the:
    - Implementation and support of PLCs
    - Use of school-based *Reinforcement Instructional Calendars, Mini-Lessons* and *Mini-Assessments*
    - Use of Mini Assessments (data will be collected by PLCs and entered and compiled for analysis by members of the PSLT)
    - Implementation of research-based, scientifically validated instructional strategies and/or interventions (e.g., Differentiated Instruction)

- Communication with major stakeholders (e.g., parents, business partners, etc.) regarding student outcomes through data summaries and conferences

- At the end of each nine weeks, assist in the evaluation of teacher fidelity data and student achievement data collected during the nine weeks.
- Assist with planning, implementing, and evaluating the outcomes of supplemental and intensive interventions in conjunction with PLCs.
- Work collaboratively with the PLCs in the implementation of the C-CIM (Core Continuous Improvement Model) and F-CIM (Florida Continuous Improvement Model on specific tested benchmarks) and progress monitoring.
- Coordinate/collaborate with other working committees, such as the Literacy Leadership Team (which is charged with developing a plan for embedding/integrating reading and writing strategies across all other content areas).
- Use intervention planning forms to communicate initiatives between the PSLT and PLCs

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

- The Chair of SAC is a member of the PSLT.
- The PSLT and SAC were involved in the School Improvement Plan development that was initiated prior to the end of the 2011-12 school year and during preplanning for the 2012-13 school year.
- The School Improvement Plan is the working document that guides the work of the PSLT. 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 PSLT will monitor the effectiveness of the strategies developed in problem solving plans by reviewing student data as well as data related to various levels of fidelity. Using data gathered from PLCs, the team will monitor the data and make progress statements on the School Improvement Plan at the end of the first, second and third nine weeks. The PSLT will use the following rubric to evaluate Strategy Fidelity of Implementation and Strategy Effectiveness:

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

Highly Functional	Teacher monitoring indicates that all of the intended teachers are implementing the strategy with fidelity. Evidence exists that the strategy is fully integrated and effectively/ consistently implemented.	Student data indicate that strategy implementation is showing a significant positive effect on student achievement.

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

MTSS Implementation
Supplemental/Intensive Instruction (Tiers 2 and 3)

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible for Monitoring
Extended Learning Program (ELP) Ongoing Progress Monitoring (mini-assessments and other assessments from adopted curriculum resource materials)	School Generated Database in Excel	PSLT/ ELP Facilitator
FAIR OPM	School Generated Database in Excel	PSLT/ Reading Coach
Ongoing assessments within Intensive Courses	Database provided by course materials (for courses that have one), School Generated Database in Excel	PSLT/PLC/Individual Teachers
Easy Curriculum Based Measurement	School Generated Database in Excel	PSLT/PLCs

Describe plan to train staff on MTSS.

The staff was trained during Preplanning by our school psychologist. Follow-up training will take place at our first PLC meeting, and ongoing throughout the year at faculty meetings, subsequent PLC meetings, and during PSLT (with individual teachers)..

Describe plan to support MTSS.

Provide continued trainings and support to all school personnel in problem solving, responding to student data, and the use of a systematic method to increase student achievement.

Provide designated school personnel with the necessary knowledge, training, and experience to support coordination and implementation of MTSS.

Continuously promote the shared vision of meeting the needs of all students with MTSS as the platform for integrating all school inititatives (PLC, PSLT, RtI, SAC)

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Principal – Dodi Davenport

Assistant Principal - Delia Gadson-Yarbrough

Reading Coach – Sharon Bugg

Reading Teachers

Media Specialist – Michelle Ferrera

Describe how the school-based LLT functions.

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

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

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

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

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

NCLB Public School Choice

- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

N/A

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

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

N/A

*High Schools Only

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

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

N/A

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?

N/A

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.

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5).	1.1. -Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. -Training all content area teachers	1.1. **Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas** Teachers need to understand how to **select/identify** complex text, **shift** the amount of informational text used in the content curricula, and **share** complex texts with all students. **All content area teachers are responsible for implementation.** **Action Steps** Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.	1.1. Who -Principal -AP -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How -PLC Logs -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach monthly. -Administration and coach rotate through PLCs looking for complex text discussion. -Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis.	1.1. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	1.1. 3x per year - FAIR Ongoing – Easy CBM		

Reading Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 71% to 74%. .	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	71%	**74%**					

		1.2. -Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13. -Training all content area teachers	1.2. **Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas** Common Core Questions of all types and levels are necessary to scaffold students' understanding of complex text. Teachers need to understand and use **higher-order, text-dependent questions** at the word/ phrase, sentence, and paragraph/passage levels (Webb's, Bloom, Costas). **All content area teachers are responsible for implementation**. **Action Steps** Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.	1.2. Who -Principal -AP How -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -Reading Coach observations and walk-throughs -Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency. -Administrator and Reading Coach aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation.	1.2. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	1.2. 3x per year - FAIR Ongoing – Easy CBM	

		1.3. -Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13. -Training all content area teachers	1.3. **Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas** Teachers need to understand how to **design** and **deliver** a **close reading** lesson. **All content area teachers are responsible for implementation.** **Action Steps** Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.	1.3. Who -Principal -AP How -Reading Logs -Language Arts Logs -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis. -Reading Coach observations and walk-throughs -Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency. -Administrator and Reading Coach aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy	1.3. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	1.3 3x per year - FAIR Ongoing – Easy CBM	

				implementation.			
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.	2.1. See Reading goals 1, 3, & 4	2.1. See Reading goals 1, 3, & 4	2.1. See Reading goals 1, 3, & 4	2.1. See Reading goals 1, 3, & 4	2.1. See Reading goals 1, 3, & 4		
Reading Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 47% to 50%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	47%	**50%**					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.	3.1. -PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum conversations and data analysis to deepen their leaning	3.1. **Strategy** Student achievement improves through **teachers working collaboratively** to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act** model to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: 1. What is it we expect them to learn? 2. How will we if they have learned it? 3. How will we respond if they don't learn? 4. How will we respond if they already know it?	3.1. Who -Principal -AP -Reading Coach -PLC facilitators How PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach each meeting. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs when appropriate. -Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.	3.1. PLCs will record progress in a log that is turned in to admin for discussion at the monthly school-wide data meeting.	3.1. 3x per year FAIR Ongoing – Easy CBM		

Reading Goal #3: Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 63 points to 66 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	63 pts	**66 pts**					
		3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	
		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3..3.	3.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4.1. -Scheduling time for the principal/APEI to meet with the academic coach on a regular basis. -Teachers willingness to accept support from the coach.	4.1. **Strategy Across all Content Areas** **Strategy/Task** Student achievement improves through **teachers' collaboration with the academic coach** in all content areas. **Actions/Details** ***Academic Coach*** -The academic coach and administration conducts one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the teacher's student past and/or present data. -The academic coach rotates through all grade level PLCs to: --Facilitate lesson planning that embeds rigorous tasks	4.1. Who Administration How- -Review of coach's log -Review of coach's log of support to targeted teachers. -Administrative walk-throughs of coaches working with teachers (either in classrooms, PLCs or planning sessions)	4.1. -Tracking of coach's participation in PLCs. -Tracking of coach's interactions with teachers (planning, co-teaching, modeling, de-debriefing, professional development, and walk throughs) -Administrator-Instructional Coach meetings to review log and discuss action plan for coach for the upcoming two weeks	4.1. 3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)		

		--Facilitate the identification, selection, development of rigorous core curriculum common assessments --Facilitate core curriculum assessment data analysis --Facilitate the planning for interventions and the intentional grouping of the students. -Using walk-through data, the academic coach and administration identify teachers for support in co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing and debriefing. -Throughout the school year, the academic coach/ administration conducts one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the data gathered from walk-through tools. This data is used for future					

		professional development. ***Leadership Team and Coach*** -The academic coach meets with the principal/APEI to map out a high-level summary plan of action for the school year. -Monthly, the academic coach meets with the principal/APEI to: --Review log and work accomplished and --Develop a detailed plan of action for the next month.					

Reading Goal #4: Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 70 points to 73 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	70	**73**					

		4.2 -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 students is missing in the regular classroom and the instruction received during ELP. -Minimal communication between regular and ELP teachers.	4.2 Strategy Students' reading comprehension improves through receiving **ELP supplemental instruction on targeted skills** that are not at the mastery level. **Action Steps** -Classroom teachers communicate with the ELP teachers regarding specific skills that students have not mastered. -ELP teachers identify lessons for students that target specific skills that are not at the mastery level. -Students attend ELP sessions. -Progress monitoring data collected by the ELP teacher on a weekly or biweekly basis and communicated back to the regular classroom teacher. -When the students have mastered the	4.2 Who Administrators How Monitored Administrators will review the communication logs and data collection used between teachers and ELP teachers outlining skills that need remediation.	4.2 Supplemental data shared with leadership and classroom teachers who have students.	4.2 Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM) *(From District RtI/Problem Solving Facilitators.)*	

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

5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**	5A.1. See Reading goals 1, 3, & 4	5A.1. See Reading goals 1, 3, & 4	5A.1. See Reading goals 1, 3, & 4	5A.1. See Reading goals 1, 3, & 4	5A.1. See Reading goals 1, 3, & 4		
Reading Goal #5A: The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Reading will increase from 41% to 44%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	White: 76% Black:41% Hispanic:67% Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A	White:79% Black: 44% Hispanic: 70% Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A					
		5A.2.	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2	
		5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5B.1. See Reading goals 1, 3, & 4	5B.1. See Reading goals 1, 3, & 4	5B.1. See Reading goals 1, 3, & 4	5B.1. See Reading goals 1, 3, & 4	5B.1. See Reading goals 1, 3, & 4		

Reading Goal #5B: The percentage of FRL students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Reading will increase from 61% to 64%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	FRL 61%	FRL 64%					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5C.1 -The majority of the teachers are unfamiliar with the CALLA strategy. To address this barrier, the school will schedule professional development delivered by the school's ERT. -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/	5C.1 ELLs (LYs/LFs) comprehension of course content/standard improves through participation in the **Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA)** strategy across Reading, Language Arts, Math, Social Studies and Science. **Action Steps** -ESOL Resource Teacher (ERT) provides professional development to all content area teachers on how to embed CALLA into core content lessons. -ERT models lessons using CALLA. -ERT observes content area teachers using CALLA and provides feedback,	5C.1 Who -School based Administrators -District Resource Teachers -ESOL Resource Teachers How -Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the walkthrough form from: The CALLA Handbook, p. 101, Table 5.4 "Checklist for Evaluating CALLA Instruction.	5C.1 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual ELL SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -ERTs meet with Reading, Language Arts, Social Studies and Science PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the ELL SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares ELL SMART	5C.1 -FAIR -CELLA During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for ELL performance		

	in order to effectively conduct a CALLA fidelity check walk-through.	coaching and support. -District Resource Teachers (DRTs) provide professional development to all administrators on how to conduct walk-through fidelity checks for use of CALLA. -Core content teachers set SMART goals for ELL students for upcoming core curriculum assessments. -Core content teachers administer and analyze ELLs performance on assessments. -Teachers aggregate data to determine the performance of ELLs compared to the whole group. -Based on data core content teachers will differentiate instruction to remediate/enhance instruction.		Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. -ERTs meet with RtI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs)			

Reading Goal #5C: The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Reading will increase from 20% to 23%. .	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **20**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **23**					

		5C.2. -Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our school is of high priority. -The majority of the teachers are unfamiliar with this strategy. To address this barrier, the school will schedule professional development delivered by the school's ERT. -Teachers implementation of A+ Rise is not consistent across core courses. -Administrators at varying skill levels regarding use of A+ Rise in order to effectively conduct an A+ Rise fidelity check walk-through.	5C.2. ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/ standards increases in reading, language arts, math, science and social studies through the use of the district's on-line program **A+Rise** located on IDEAS under Programs for ELL. **Action Steps** -ESOL Resource Teacher (ERT) provides professional development to all content area teachers on how to access and use A+ Rise Strategies for ELLs at http://arises2s.com/s2s/ into core content lessons. -ERT models lessons using A+ Rise Strategies for ELLs. -ERT observes content area teachers using A+Rise and provides feedback, coaching and support. -District Resource Teachers (DRTs) provide professional development to all	5C.2. Who -School based Administrators -District Resource Teachers -ESOL Resource Teachers How -Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using content-specific "look fors" and ELL Strategies checklist.	5C.2 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual ELL SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -ERTs meet with Reading, Language Arts, Social Studies and Science PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the ELL SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject	5C.2 -FAIR -CELLA During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for ELL performance	

			administrators on how to conduct walk-through fidelity checks for use of A+ Rise strategies for ELLs.		Area Leader/ Department Heads shares ELL SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. -ERTs meet with RtI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs)		

		5C.3 -Lack of understanding teachers can provide ELL accommodations beyond FCAT testing. -Bilingual Education Paraprofessionals at varying levels of expertise in providing support. -Allocation of Bilingual Education Paraprofessional dependent on number of ELLs. -Administrators at varying levels of expertise in being familiar with the ELL guidelines and job responsibilities of ERT and Bilingual paraprofessional.	5C.3 ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/ standards improves through participation in the following **day-to-day accommodations on core content and district assessments across** Reading, LA, Math, Science, and Social Studies: 1. Extended time (lesson and assessments) 2. Small group testing 3. Para support (lesson and assessments) 4. Use of heritage language dictionary (lesson and assessments)	5C.3 Who -School based Administrators -ESOL Resource Teachers How -Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the walk-throughs look for Committee Meeting Recommendations. In addition, tools from the RtI Handbook and ELL RtI Checklist, and ESOL Strategies Checklist can be used as walk-through forms	5C.3 Analyze core curriculum and district level assessments for ELL students. Correlate to accommodations to determine the most effective approach for individual students.	5C.3 During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5D.1. -Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs by both the general education and ESE teacher. To address this barrier, the APC will put a system in place for this school year.	5D.1. **Strategy** SWD student achievement improves through the effective and **consistent implementation of students' IEP** goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations. -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/ SWD strategies and modifications into lessons.	5D.1. Who Principal, Site Administrator, Assistance Principal ESE Specialist How IEP Progress Reports reviewed by ESE Specialist	5D.1. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	5D.1. -FAIR During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for SWD performance		

Reading Goal #5D: The percentage of SWD students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Reading will increase from 23% to 26%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	23	**26**					

		5D.2. -Improving the proficiency of SWD in our school is of high priority. -Teachers need support in drilling down their core assessments to the SWD level. -General educational teacher and ESE teacher need consistent, on-going co-planning time.	5D.2. **Strategy/Task** SWD student achievement improves through **teachers' implementation of the Plan-Do-Check-Act model** in order to plan/carry out lessons/ assessments with appropriate strategies and modifications. **Actions** ***Plan*** For an upcoming unit of instruction determine the following: -What do we want our SWD to learn by the end of the unit? -What are standards that our SWD need to learn? -How will we assess these skills/standards for our SWD? -What does mastery look like? -What is the SMART goal for this unit of instruction for our SWD?	5D.2 Who -School based Administrators -PLC Facilitators How PLC logs (with specific SWD information) for like courses/grades.	5D.2 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SWD SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SWD SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SWD SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SWD SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and	5D.2 -FAIR During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for SWD performance	

			Plan for the "Do" What do teachers need to do in order to meet the SWD SMART goal? -What resources do we need? -How will the lessons be designed to maximize the learning of SWD? -What checks-for-understanding will we implement for our SWD? -What teaching strategies/best practices will we use to help SWD learn? -Specifically how will we implement the _____strategy during the lesson? -What are teachers going to do during the lesson for SWD? -What are SWD going to do during the lesson to maximize learning? ***Reflect on the "Do"/***		student supplemental instruction.		

			Analyze Checks for Understanding and Student Work <u>during</u> the unit. For lessons that have already been taught within the unit of instruction, teachers **<u>reflect</u>** and discuss one or more of the following regarding their SWD: -What worked within the lesson? How do we know it was successful? Why was it successful? -What didn't work within the lesson? Why? What are we going to do next? -For the implementation of the _____ strategy, what worked? How do we know it was successful? Why was it successful? What checks for understanding were used during the lessons? -For the implementation of the _____ strategy, what didn't work? Why? What are we going to do next?				

			-What were the outcomes of the checks for understanding? And/or analysis of student performance? -How do we take what we have learned and apply it to future lessons? ***Reflect/Check – Analyze Data*** Discuss one or more of the following: -What is the SWD data? -What is the data telling us as individual teachers? -What is the data telling us as a grade level/ PLC/department? -What are SWD not learning? Why is this occurring? -Which SWD are learning? **Act on the Data** After data analysis, develop a plan to act on the data.				

			-What are we going to do about SWD not learning? -What are the skills/ concepts/standards that need re-teaching/ interventions (either to individual SWD or small groups)? -How are we going to re-teach the skill differently? -How we will know that our re-teaching/ interventions are working?				
		5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	

Reading Professional Development

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Planning Using Backwards Design	All	Principal	Pre-K thru 5 teachers	Once/month at faculty meetings beginning Oct 2	Lesson Plan Checks, Classroom Walkthroughs, Informal/Formal Observations	Principal, APEI
Easy CBM Use	All	Principal	Pre-K thru 5 teachers	Faculty Mtg Oct, then in PLC groups 2xs /month	PLC Logs	Principal, APEI, PSLT Liaisons
Close Reading	All	Reading Coach	Pre-K thru 5 teachers	Two Mondays (November and January)	Lesson Plans, CWT, EET	Principal, APEI, Reading Coach

End of Reading Goals

Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in mathematics (Level 3-5).	1.1 -Lack of infrastructure to support technology -Lack of technology hardware -Teachers at varying understanding of the intent of the CCSS	1.1 **Strategy** Students' math achievements improves through the use of **technology and hands-on activities** to implement the Common Core State Standards. In addition, student practice taking on-line assessments to prepare students for on-line state testing. **Action Steps** -PLCs use their core curriculum information to learn more about hands-on and technology activities. -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level PLC action plans.	1.1 Who - Principal -Math DH/SAL -Technology Specialist -Math Coach -Math Resource Teacher How Monitored -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. -Administrator and coach aggregates the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation	1.1 PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 75% 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.	1.1 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During the Grading Period -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, etc.)		

Mathematics Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 62% to 65%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	62%	**65%**					

		1.2. -Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques. -PLC meetings need to focus on identifying and writing higher order questions to deliver during the lessons.	**1.2** **Strategy/Task** Students math achievement improves through frequent participation in **higher order questions/ discussion activities** to deepen and extend student knowledge. These quality questions/prompts and discussion techniques promotes thinking by students, assisting them to arrive at new understandings of complex material. **Actions/Details** ***Within PLCs*** -Teachers work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively use higher order questions/ activities. -Teachers plan higher order questions/ activities for upcoming lessons to increase the lessons' rigor and promote student achievement. -Teachers plan for	Who -Principal -Math DH/SAL -Technology Specialist -Math Coach -Math Resource Teacher How Monitored -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their Logs. -Administrator and coach aggregates the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation	1.1 PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 75% 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.	1.1 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During the Grading Period -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, interventions etc.)	

			scaffolding questions and activities to meet the differentiated needs of students. -Use student data to identify successful higher order questioning techniques for future implementation. ***In the classroom*** **<u>During the lessons, teachers:</u>** -Use probing questions to encourage students to elaborate and support assertions and claims drawn from the text/content. -Allow students to "unpack their thinking" by describing how they arrive at an answer. -Encourage discussion by using open-ended questions. -Ask questions with multiple correct answers or multiple approaches. -Scaffold questions to help students with incorrect answers.				

			-Engage all students in the discussion and ensure that all voices are heard. <u>School Leadership</u> _ -Monthly, school leaders conduct data chats with groups of teachers during leadership meetings, PLCs, and school-wide PSLT, using the data gathered from walk-through tools.				
		1.3.				1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics.	2.1. See Mathematics goals 1, 3 & 4	2.1. See Mathematics goals 1, 3 & 4	2.1. See Mathematics goals 1, 3 & 4	2.1. See Mathematics goals 1, 3 & 4	2.1. See Mathematics goals 1, 3 & 4		
Mathematics Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 32% to 35%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	32%	**35%**					

	2.2. 2.3	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making learning gains in mathematics.	3.1. -PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum and data analysis discussion to deepen their leaning.	3.1. **Strategy** Students' math achievement improves through **teachers working collaboratively** to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act model** and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction. **Actions/Details** -This year, PLCs will administer common end-of-chapter assessments. The assessments will be identified/ generated prior to the teaching of the unit. -Grade level PLC discussions are summarized on log. -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade	3.1. Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How PLCS turn their logs into administration and/ or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.	3.1. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team.	3.1. 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing Semester Exams During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)		

		level/content area PLC action plans.					
Mathematics Goal #3: Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 65 points to 68 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	65	**68**					

		3.2. -Teachers tend to only differentiate after the lesson is taught instead of planning how to differentiate the lesson when new content is presented. -Teachers are at varying levels of using Differentiated Instruction strategies. -Teachers tend to give all students the same lesson, handouts, etc. 3.3.	3.2. **Strategy/Task** Students' math achievement improves when teachers use on-going student data to **differentiate instruction**. **Actions/Details** ***Within PLCs Before Instruction and During Instruction of New Content*** -Using data from previous assessments and daily classroom performance/ work, teachers plan Differentiated Instruction groupings and activities for the delivery of new content in upcoming lessons. ***In the classroom*** -During the lessons, **students** are involved in flexible grouping techniques ***PLCs After Instruction*** -Teachers reflect and discuss the outcome of their DI lessons.	3.2. Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How	3.2. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	3.2. 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)	

			-Use student data to identify successful DI techniques for future implementation. -Using a problem-solving question protocol, identify students who need re-teaching/interventions and how that instruction will be provided.				
		3.3.	3.3.	3..3.	3.3.	3.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4.1 -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 students is missing in the regular classroom and the instruction received during ELP. -Minimal communication between regular and ELP teachers.	4.1 Strategy Students' math achievement improves through receiving **ELP supplemental instruction on targeted skills** that are not at the mastery level. **Action Steps** -Classroom teachers communicate with the ELP teachers regarding specific skills that students have not mastered. -ELP teachers identify lessons for students that target specific skills that are not at the mastery level. - Students attend ELP sessions. - Progress monitoring data collected by the ELP teacher on a weekly or biweekly basis and communicated back to the regular	4.1 Who Administrators How Monitored Administrators will review the communication logs and data collection used between teachers and ELP teachers outlining skills that need remediation.	4.1 Supplemental data shared with leadership and classroom teachers who have students.	4.1 Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM) *(From District RtI/ Problem Solving Facilitators.)*		

		classroom teacher. -When the students have mastered the specific skill, they are exited from the ELP program.					
Mathematics Goal #4: Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 60 points to 63 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	60	**63**					
	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2	
		4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2011-2012**	
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.							
Math Goal #5:							
5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics**	5A.1. See Mathematics goals 1, 3 & 4	5A.1. See Mathematics goals 1, 3 & 4	5A.1. See Mathematics goals 1, 3 & 4	5A.1. See Mathematics goals 1, 3 & 4	5A.1. See Mathematics goals 1, 3 & 4		
Math Goal #5A: The percentage of White students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Math will increase from 68% to 71%. The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Math will increase from 52% to 55%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:					

	White:68% Black:41% Hispanic:52% Asian:N/A American Indian: N/A	White:71% Black:44% Hispanic:55% Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A					
		5A.2	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	
		5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5B.1. See Mathematics goals 1, 3 & 4	5B.1. See Mathematics goals 1, 3 & 4	5B.1. See Mathematics goals 1, 3 & 4	5B.1. See Mathematics goals 1, 3 & 4	5B.1. See Mathematics goals 1, 3 & 4		
Mathematics Goal #5B: The percentage of FRL students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Math will increase from 48% to 51%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:					

	48	**51**					
		5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5C.1. See Mathematics goals 1, 3 & 4	5C.1. See Mathematics goals 1, 3 & 4	5C.1. See Mathematics goals 1, 3 & 4	5C.1. See Mathematics goals 1, 3 & 4	5C.1. See Mathematics goals 1, 3 & 4		
Mathematics Goal #5C: The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Math will increase from 19% to 22%.	2012 Current Level of Performance: **19**	2013 Expected Level of Performance: **22**					

		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

5D. Student with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5D.1. See Mathematics goals 1, 3 & 4	5D.1. See Mathematics goals 1, 3 & 4	5D.1. See Mathematics goals 1, 3 & 4	5D.1. See Mathematics goals 1, 3 & 4	5D.1. See Mathematics goals 1, 3 & 4		
Mathematics Goal #5D: The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 17% to 20%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:					

	17	**20**					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	

End of Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Planning Using Backwards Design	All	Principal	Pre-K thru 5 teachers	Once/month at faculty meetings beginning Oct 2	Lesson Plan Checks, Classroom Walkthroughs, Informal/Formal Observations	Principal, APEI
Easy CBM Use	All	Principal	Pre-K thru 5 teachers	Faculty Mtg Oct, then in PLC groups 2xs /month	PLC Logs	Principal, APEI, PSLT Liaisons

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science.	1.1 -Teachers are at varying skill levels in the use of inquiry and the 5E lesson plan model. -Lack of common planning time to facilitate and hold PLCs for like courses.	1.1 **Strategy** Students' science skills will improve through participation in the **5E instructional model.** **Action Steps** -Teachers will attend District Science training and share 5 E Instructional Model information with their PLCs. -PLCs write SMART goals based for units of instruction. -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time collaboratively building 5E Instructional Model for upcoming	1.1 Who Principal APEI Content Area Representatives How Monitored -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.	1.1 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	1.1 -Teachers are at varying skill levels in the use of inquiry and the 5E lesson plan model. -Lack of common planning time to facilitate and hold PLCs for like courses.		

		lessons. -PLC teachers instruct students using the 5E Instructional Model. -At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. -Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. -Based on the data, teachers discuss effectiveness of the 5E Lesson Plans to drive future instruction.					

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

Science Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 57% to 60%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	57	**60**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science.	2.1 -Not all teachers have received the CCLS for Science overview. -Not all teachers understand how to integrate close reading with the 5E instructional model. -Not all PLCs routinely look at curriculum materials beyond those posted on the curriculum guide	2.1 **Strategy** Students' comprehension of science text improves when students are engaged in close reading techniques using on-grade-level content-based text (textbooks and other supplemental texts). Science teachers engage students in the **close reading model** (appropriately placed within the 5E instructional model) using their textbooks or other appropriate high-Lexile, complex supplemental texts at least once per nine weeks. **Action Steps** ***Professional Development***	2.1 Who Principal AP Science Coach Reading Coach Reading Leadership Team CCLS Science Team Science SAL/DH How Monitored Administration, Coach, SAL walk-throughs -PLC logs turned into administration. -Administration provides feedback.	Science PLC Resource meetings Reading Leadership Team PLCs will track achievement on the benchmark attached to the Close Reading passage comparing baseline achievement level to 80% mastery using the proximal evaluation tool.	3x-per year District level baseline, mid-year, and pre-EOC administration Semester Exams During the Grading Period -mini-assessments -unit assessments		

		-The Reading Coach conducts small group trainings to develop teachers' ability to use the close reading model. -The Reading Coach attends science departmental PLCs to co-plan with teachers, developing lessons using the close reading model. -Teachers within departments attend professional development provided by the district/ school on text complexity and close reading models that are most applicable to science classrooms and support the 5E instructional model. ***In PLCs/ Department***					

		-Teachers work in their PLCs to locate, discuss, and disseminate appropriate texts to supplement their textbooks. -PLCs review Close Reading Selections to determine word count and high-Lexile. -PLCs assign appropriate NGSSS benchmark to Close Reading passage -To increase stamina, teachers select high-Lexile, complex and rigorous texts that are shorter and progress throughout the year to longer texts that are high-Lexile, complex and rigorous - Teachers debrief lesson implementation to determine					

		effectiveness and level of student comprehension and retention of the text. Teachers use this information to build future close reading lessons. ***During the lessons, teachers:*** -Guide students through text without reading or explaining the meaning of the text using the following: --Introducing critical vocabulary to ensure comprehension of text. --Stating an essential question prior to reading --Using questions to check for understanding. --Using					

		question to engage students in discussion. --Requiring oral and written responses to text. -Ask text-based questions that require close reading of the text and multiple reads of the text. ***During the lessons, students:*** -Grapple with complex text. -Re-read for a second purpose and to increase comprehension. -Engage in discussion to answer essential question using textual evidence. -Write in response to essential question using textual evidence.					

Science Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 29% to 32%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	29	**32**					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	

Science Professional Development

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Planning Using Backwards Design	All	Principal	Pre-K thru 5 teachers	Once/month at faculty meetings beginning Oct 2	Lesson Plan Checks, Classroom Walkthroughs, Informal/Formal Observations	Principal, APEI

End of Science Goals

Writing/Language Arts Goals

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

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

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

		delivery of mode-specific writing -Training to facilitate data-driven PLCs -Using data to identify trends and drive instruction -Lesson planning based on the needs of students ***Do:*** -Daily/ongoing models and application of appropriate mode-specific writing based on teaching points -Daily/ongoing conferencing ***Check:*** Review of daily drafts and scoring monthly demand writes -PLC discussions and analysis of					

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

Writing/LA Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring **Level 3.0** or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes will increase from 86% to 89%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	86	**89**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Writing/Language Arts Professional Development

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

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

PLC activity. PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Planning Using Backwards Design	All	Principal	Pre-K thru 5 teachers	Once/month at faculty meetings beginning Oct 2	Lesson Plan Checks, Classroom Walkthroughs, Informal/Formal Observations	Principal, APEI
Updated Rubric Training	Grades 2 thru 5 APEI		Grades 2 thru 5	Ongoing October thru December	Scoring after Demand Writes	APEI

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

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

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

Attendance Goal #1: 1. The attendance rate will increase from 95.49% in 2011-2012 to 96% in 2012-2013. 2. The number of students who have 10 or more **unexcused** absences throughout the school year will decrease by 10% 3.T he number of students who have 10 or more **unexcused** tardies to school throughout the school year will decrease by 10%.	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
	95.49%	**96%**					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	108	**97**					

	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	254	**228**					
		1.2 There is no system to reinforce parents for facilitating improvement in attendance.	1.2 **Tier 2** Beginning at the 5th unexcused absence, the Attendance Committee (which is a subgroup of the Leadership Team) collaborate to ensure that a letter is sent home to parents outlining the state statute that requires parents send students to school. If a student's attendance improves (no absences in a 20 day period) a positive letter is sent home to the parent regarding the increase in their child's attendance.	1.2 Social Worker Guidance Counselor PSLT	1.2 The attendance committee (which is a subset of the leadership Team) will disaggregate attendance data for the "Tier 2" group along with the guidance counselor and maintain communication about these children.	Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/Tardy data	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

or PD Activity

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

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

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

1. Suspension	1.1 -There needs to be common school-wide expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior.	1.1 <u>Tier 1</u> -CHAMPS will be implemented to address school-wide expectations and rules, set these through staff survey, discipline data, and provide training to staff in methods for teaching and reinforcing the school-wide rules and expectations. -Providing teachers with resources for continued teaching and reinforcement of school expectations and rules. -Administration conducts walkthroughs using a EET Rubric.. -The data is shared with faculty at a monthly meeting, tracking the overall improvement of the faculty.	1.1 <u>Who</u> -PSLT -Leadership Team -Administration	1.1 - PSLT will review data on Office Discipline Referrals ODRs and out of school suspensions data monthly.	UNTIE , EASI ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data		

		-Where needed, administration conducts individual teacher walk-through data chats.					
Suspension Goal #1: 1. The total number of In-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%. 2. The total number of students receiving In-School Suspension throughout the school year will decrease by 10%. 3. The total number of Out-of-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%. 4. The total number of students receiving Out-of-School Suspensions throughout the school year will decrease by 10%.	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions					
	19	**17**					

	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					
	15	**13**					
	2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	15	**13**					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	9	**8**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Suspension Professional Development

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a

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

End of Suspension Goals

Health and Fitness Goal(s)

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

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

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

1. Health and Fitness Goal	1.1.	**1.** Health and physical activity initiatives developed and implemented by the Principal's designee.	**1.** Principal's designee.	**1.** Data on the number of students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ)	**1.** PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.		
Health and Fitness Goal #1: During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students scoring in the "Healthy Fitness Zone" (HFZ) on the Pacer for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular health will increase from 39% on the Pretest to 42% on the Posttest.	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	39%	**42%**					

		1.2.	**2.** Five physical education classes per week for a minimum of one semester per year with a certified physical education teacher.	**2.** Physical Education Teacher	**2.** Classroom walk-throughs Class schedules	**2.** PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Health and Fitness Goals Professional Development

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

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

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
<u>CTE Goal #1:</u> Sustain/Increase the number of Career Technical Student Organization chapters from # in 2011-2012 to # in 2012-2013. Increase the student membership from # in 2011-2012 to # in 2012-2013.	1.1.	1.1. Increase student participation in CTSO events.	1.1. Staff	1.1. Aggregate and analyze data each semester to develop next steps.	1.1. Log of number of CTSO events. Log of number of students who attend CTSO events.

	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

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

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

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Continuous Improvement Goal(s)

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

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

1. Continuous Improvement Goal	1.1. -There is still confusion on how to conduct PLCs that are focused on deepening the knowledge base of teachers and improving student performance by the implementation of the Plan-Do-Check-Act model. -Confusion as to how the Plan-Do-Check-Act model works. -Resistance from some staff members to attend PLCs and/or arriving on time to meetings. -Resistance from some staff members to implement the Plan-Do-Check-Act model in their classrooms.	1.1. -The Leadership Team will become trained on the use of the PLC Unit of Instruction log that follows the Plan-Do-Check-Act model. -PLC leaders will guide their PLC teams through the Plan-Do-Check-Act model for units of instruction. -PLC logs will be reviewed by the Leadership Team.	1.1. Who Principal Leadership Team PLC Facilitators How Leadership Team will aggregate data.	1.1. -Informal PLC surveys will be administered during the year to staff members. -Leadership Team will aggregate the data and share school-wide results with their PLC teams.	1.1. -PLC Surveys		

Continuous Improvement Goal #1: The percentage of teachers who strongly agree with the indicator that “”The teachers that I work with consistently communicate assessment results to students” will increase from 42.9% in 2012 to 48% in 2013.	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	43%	**48%**					

		1.2. -Not enough time to meet in PLCs.	1.2. -We will use one additional early release day per month for PLC meetings.	1.2. Who Principal PLC Leaders PLC Teams How PLC teams will meet twice per month.	1.2. Informal PLC surveys will be administered during the year to staff members. -Leadership Team will aggregate the data and share school-wide results with their PLC teams.	1.2. PLC Surveys	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development

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

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

NEW Reading Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

A. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring proficient in reading (Levels 4-9).	A.1.	A.1.	A.1.	A.1.	A.1.		
Reading Goal A: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. **N/A – No students on FAA in 2012-2013**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

		A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	
		A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	
B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.		

Reading Goal B: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	
		B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	

NEW Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

CELLA Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition					

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**	
C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/ Speaking.	1.1. **See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4**	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	
CELLA Goal #C: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from 65% to 68%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					

	65%					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**	
D. Students scoring proficient in Reading.	2.1. **See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4**	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	

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

CELLA Goal #D: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase from 29% to 32%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading : **29%**					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**	

E. Students scoring proficient in Writing.	2.1. **See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4**	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	
CELLA Goal #E: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA will increase from 17% to 20%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					

	17%					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

NEW Math Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

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

Mathematics Goal F: N/A – No FAA students in 2012-2013	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	
		F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	

G. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.		
Mathematics Goal G: N/A – No FAA students in 2012-2013	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	

		G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	

NEW Science Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

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

J. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at proficient in science (Levels 4-9).	J.1.	J.1.	J.1.	J.1.	J.1.		
Science Goal J: N/A – No FAA students in 2012-2013	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	

		J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	

NEW Writing Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

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

M. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing (Levels 4-9).	M.1.	M.1.	M.1.	M.1.	M.1.		
Writing Goal M: N/A – No FAA students in 2012-2013	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	
		M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	

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

STEM Goal(s)	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
STEM Goal #1: Implement/expand project/problem-based learning in math, science and CTE/STEM electives.	1.1 Need common planning time for math, science, ELA and other STEM teachers	1.1 -Explicit direction for STEM professional learning communities to be established. -Documentation of planning of units and outcomes of units in logs. -Increase effectiveness of lessons through lesson study and district metrics, etc.	1.1 PLC or grade level leaders	1.1 Administrative walk-throughs	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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Planning Using Backwards Design	All	Principal	Pre-K thru 5 teachers	Once/month at faculty meetings beginning Oct 2	Lesson Plan Checks, Classroom Walkthroughs, Informal/Formal Observations	Principal, APEI

End of STEM Goal(s)

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
Priority	Focus	Prevent

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

□ Yes No

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

Describe the use of SAC funds.			
Name and Number of Strategy from the School Improvement Plan	Description of Resources that improves student achievement or student engagement	Projected Amount	Final Amount
Final Amount Spent			