Florida Department of Education



P.L. Sheehy Elementary School Improvement Plan (SIP)

Form SIP-1

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

| School Name: P.L. Sheehy Elementary | District Name: Hillsborough |
|---|---------------------------------|
| Principal: Patricia McCants | Superintendent: Mary Ellen Elia |
| SAC Chair: Deena Ham, Krista Mack, Stacie Lonsway | 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

Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised January 2013

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 | Patricia McCants | Masters Degree in Educational Leadership | 3 | 9 | 2008-09 A 2011-2012 D 2009-10 C AYP 85% 2010-2011 C | |
| Assistant Principal | Kathryn Dickens | Elementary Education, Educational Leadership, ESOL and Gifted | 9 | 9 | 2008-09 B AYP 92% 2011-2012 D 2009-10 C AYP 85% 2010-11 C | |

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 | Name | Degree(s)/ | Number of | Number of Years as | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ |
|---------|------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|--|
| | | | Years at | an | Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, |
| Area | | Certification(s) | Current School | | Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated |
| | | | | Instructional Coach | school year) |

| Reading | Stacie Lonsway | Elementary Education K-6 | 3 | 3 | 2009-2010 C 85% |
|---------|----------------|-------------------------------|------------|------------|---|
| | | | | | 2010-2011 C |
| | | | | | 2011-2012 46% 3 and above, 64 point learning gains, 82 point gain lowest 25% |
| Science | Krista Mack | Elementary Education K-6 | First year | First year | N/A |
| | | M.Ed Curriculum & Instruction | | | |
| Math | Deena Ham | Elementary Education K-6 | 1 | 1 | 2011-2012 40% 3 and above, 51 points learning gains, 31 point gain lowest 25% |

Highly Qualified Teachers

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

| Description of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date | Not Applicable |
|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| | | | (If not, please explain why) |
| 1. Teacher Interview Day | District staff | June | |
| 2. Salary Differential (Renaissance Schools) | General of Federal Programs | ongoing | |
| 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 |
|--|---|
| Teachers | Depending on the needs of the teacher, one or more of the following strategies are implemented. |
| • 1 out of Field | <u>Administrators</u> |
| | Meet with the teachers four times per year to discuss progress on: |
| | Preparing and taking the certification exam |
| | Completing classes need for certification |
| | District will provide peer mentor |
| | |

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)).

| To | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|-----|------|-----|------|------|
| tal | of | of | of | of | of | Hi | Re | Na | |
| Nu | Fir | Te | Te | Te | Te | gh | ad | tio | ES |
| m | st- | ach | ach | ach | ach | ly | ing | nal | OL |
| ber | Ye | ers | ers | ers | ers | Qu | En | Во | End |
| of | ar | with | with | with | wi | alif | dor | ard | orse |
| In | Te | 1-5 | 6- | 15+ | th | ied | sed | Ce | d |
| str | ach | Yea | 14 | Yea | Ad | Te | Te | rtif | " |
| uc | ers | rs of | Yea | rs of | van | ac | ach | ied | Tea |
| tio | | Exp | rs of | Exp | ced | her | ers | Те | cher |
| nal | | erie | Exp | erie | De | S | | ac | S |
| Sta | | nce | erie | nce | gre | | | her | |
| ff | | | nce | | es | | | S | |

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

| 4 | 1 | 30 | 40 | 13 | 36 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 68 |
|---|----|----|---------|-----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 7 | 7 | % | 40 % | % | % | 8 | % | % | % |
| | % | | | | | % | | | |
| | | (1 | (1 | (6) | (1 | | (1 | (3 | (3 |
| | (8 | 4) | 9) | | 7) | (3 |) |) | 2) |
| |) | · | | | | 2) | | | |

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 | Mentee | Rationale for | Planned |
|--------|----------|---------------|------------|
| Name | Assigned | Pairing | Mentoring |
| | | _ | Activities |

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

| M. Pringle | A. LaMothe | District | Weekly |
|------------------------|---------------|--|---|
| 111, 1111,814 | 11. 241/10410 | based | visits to |
| | | mentor is | include |
| | | through | modeling, |
| | | the EET | co- |
| | | initiative. | teaching, |
| | | The School | analyzing |
| | | based | student |
| | | mentor has | data, |
| | | strengths | developing |
| | | in the areas | assess |
| | | they are | ments, |
| | | mentoring | conferen |
| | | in to help | cing and |
| | | increase | problem |
| | | student | solving |
| | | achievement. | to move |
| | | | students |
| | | | forward. |
| | I | | 101 wara. |
| J. Whitmore- | C. Simmons | The School | Weekly |
| J. Whitmore- Felder | C. Simmons | based | |
| | C. Simmons | | Weekly |
| | C. Simmons | based | Weekly visits to |
| | C. Simmons | based mentor has | Weekly visits to include |
| | C. Simmons | based mentor has strengths | Weekly visits to include modeling, |
| | C. Simmons | based mentor has strengths in the areas | Weekly visits to include modeling, co- |
| | C. Simmons | based mentor has strengths in the areas they are | Weekly visits to include modeling, co- teaching, |
| | C. Simmons | based mentor has strengths in the areas they are mentoring | Weekly visits to include modeling, co- teaching, analyzing student data, |
| | C. Simmons | based mentor has strengths in the areas they are mentoring in to help | Weekly visits to include modeling, co- teaching, analyzing student |
| | C. Simmons | based mentor has strengths in the areas they are mentoring in to help increase | Weekly visits to include modeling, co- teaching, analyzing student data, |
| | C. Simmons | based mentor has strengths in the areas they are mentoring in to help increase student | Weekly visits to include modeling, co- teaching, analyzing student data, developing assess ments, |
| | C. Simmons | based mentor has strengths in the areas they are mentoring in to help increase student | Weekly visits to include modeling, co- teaching, analyzing student data, developing assess ments, conferen |
| | C. Simmons | based mentor has strengths in the areas they are mentoring in to help increase student | Weekly visits to include modeling, co- teaching, analyzing student data, developing assess ments, conferen cing and |
| | C. Simmons | based mentor has strengths in the areas they are mentoring in to help increase student | Weekly visits to include modeling, co- teaching, analyzing student data, developing assess ments, conferen cing and problem |
| | C. Simmons | based mentor has strengths in the areas they are mentoring in to help increase student | Weekly visits to include modeling, co- teaching, analyzing student data, developing assess ments, conferen cing and problem solving |
| | C. Simmons | based mentor has strengths in the areas they are mentoring in to help increase student | Weekly visits to include modeling, co- teaching, analyzing student data, developing assess ments, conferen cing and problem solving to move |
| | C. Simmons | based mentor has strengths in the areas they are mentoring in to help increase student | Weekly visits to include modeling, co- teaching, analyzing student data, developing assess ments, conferen cing and problem solving |

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

| A. Fowler | B. Fuller | District | Weekly |
|-------------|------------|---|---|
| 11.10,1101 | 2.1 (4.10) | based | visits to |
| | | mentor is | include |
| | | through | modeling, |
| | | the EET | co- |
| | | initiative. | teaching, |
| | | The School | analyzing |
| | | based | student |
| | | mentor has | data, |
| | | strengths | developing |
| | | in the areas | assess |
| | | they are | ments, |
| | | mentoring | conferen |
| | | in to help | cing and |
| | | increase | problem |
| | | student | solving |
| | | achievement. | to move |
| | | | students |
| | | | forward. |
| | | | TOT Wara. |
| H. Benjamin | J. LaMothe | District | Weekly |
| H. Benjamin | J. LaMothe | District based | |
| H. Benjamin | J. LaMothe | | Weekly |
| H. Benjamin | J. LaMothe | based mentor is through | Weekly visits to |
| H. Benjamin | J. LaMothe | based mentor is through the EET | Weekly visits to include modeling, co- |
| H. Benjamin | J. LaMothe | based mentor is through the EET initiative. | Weekly visits to include modeling, co- teaching, |
| H. Benjamin | J. LaMothe | based mentor is through the EET | Weekly visits to include modeling, co- teaching, analyzing |
| H. Benjamin | J. LaMothe | based mentor is through the EET initiative. | Weekly visits to include modeling, co- teaching, |
| H. Benjamin | J. LaMothe | based mentor is through the EET initiative. The School based mentor has | Weekly visits to include modeling, co- teaching, analyzing student data, |
| H. Benjamin | J. LaMothe | based mentor is through the EET initiative. The School based mentor has strengths | Weekly visits to include modeling, co- teaching, analyzing student |
| H. Benjamin | J. LaMothe | based mentor is through the EET initiative. The School based mentor has strengths in the areas | Weekly visits to include modeling, co- teaching, analyzing student data, developing assess |
| H. Benjamin | J. LaMothe | based mentor is through the EET initiative. The School based mentor has strengths in the areas they are | Weekly visits to include modeling, co- teaching, analyzing student data, developing assess ments, |
| H. Benjamin | J. LaMothe | based mentor is through the EET initiative. The School based mentor has strengths in the areas they are mentoring | Weekly visits to include modeling, co- teaching, analyzing student data, developing assess ments, conferen |
| H. Benjamin | J. LaMothe | based mentor is through the EET initiative. The School based mentor has strengths in the areas they are mentoring in to help | Weekly visits to include modeling, co- teaching, analyzing student data, developing assess ments, conferen cing and |
| H. Benjamin | J. LaMothe | based mentor is through the EET initiative. The School based mentor has strengths in the areas they are mentoring in to help increase | Weekly visits to include modeling, co- teaching, analyzing student data, developing assess ments, conferen cing and problem |
| H. Benjamin | J. LaMothe | based mentor is through the EET initiative. The School based mentor has strengths in the areas they are mentoring in to help increase student | Weekly visits to include modeling, co- teaching, analyzing student data, developing assess ments, conferen cing and problem solving |
| H. Benjamin | J. LaMothe | based mentor is through the EET initiative. The School based mentor has strengths in the areas they are mentoring in to help increase | Weekly visits to include modeling, co- teaching, analyzing student data, developing assess ments, conferen cing and problem solving to move |
| H. Benjamin | J. LaMothe | based mentor is through the EET initiative. The School based mentor has strengths in the areas they are mentoring in to help increase student | Weekly visits to include modeling, co- teaching, analyzing student data, developing assess ments, conferen cing and problem solving |

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

| N | 3.6.337'11' | D: . : . | 337 11 |
|------------|-------------|--------------|------------|
| N. | M. Williams | District | Weekly |
| Churchwell | | based . | visits to |
| | | mentor is | include |
| | | through | modeling, |
| | | the EET | co- |
| | | initiative. | teaching, |
| | | The School | analyzing |
| | | based | student |
| | | mentor has | data, |
| | | strengths | developing |
| | | in the areas | assess |
| | | they are | ments, |
| | | mentoring | conferen |
| | | in to help | cing and |
| | | increase | problem |
| | | student | solving |
| | | achievement. | to move |
| | | | students |
| | | | forward. |
| S. Lonsway | J. Krasne | The School | Weekly |
| | | based | visits to |
| | | mentor has | include |
| | | strengths | modeling, |
| | | in the areas | co- |
| | | they are | teaching, |
| | | mentoring | analyzing |
| | | in to help | student |
| | | increase | data, |
| | | student | developing |
| | | achievement. | assess |
| | | | ments, |
| | | | conferen |
| | | | cing and |
| | | | problem |
| | | | solving |
| | | | to move |
| | | | students |
| | | | forward. |

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

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

| B. Bowers | D. Williams | The School | Weekly |
|-----------|-------------|--|--|
| D. Dowers | D. Williams | based | visits to |
| | | 0 0.00 0 0.0 | |
| | | mentor has | include |
| | | strengths | modeling, |
| | | in the areas | co- |
| | | they are | teaching, |
| | | mentoring | analyzing |
| | | in to help | student |
| | | increase | data, |
| | | student | developing |
| | | achievement. | assess |
| | | | ments, |
| | | | conferen |
| | | | cing and |
| | | | problem |
| | | | solving |
| | | | to move |
| | | | students |
| | | | forward. |
| | | | |
| G. Coger | J. Denson | The School | Weekly |
| G. Coger | J. Denson | The School based | Weekly visits to |
| G. Coger | J. Denson | | |
| G. Coger | J. Denson | based | visits to |
| G. Coger | J. Denson | based mentor has | visits to include |
| G. Coger | J. Denson | based mentor has strengths | visits to include modeling, |
| G. Coger | J. Denson | based mentor has strengths in the areas | visits to include modeling, co- teaching, |
| G. Coger | J. Denson | based mentor has strengths in the areas they are mentoring | visits to include modeling, co- |
| G. Coger | J. Denson | based mentor has strengths in the areas they are | visits to include modeling, co- teaching, analyzing |
| G. Coger | J. Denson | based mentor has strengths in the areas they are mentoring in to help | visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student data, |
| G. Coger | J. Denson | based mentor has strengths in the areas they are mentoring in to help increase | visits to include modeling, co- teaching, analyzing student |
| G. Coger | J. Denson | based mentor has strengths in the areas they are mentoring in to help increase student | visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student data, developing assess |
| G. Coger | J. Denson | based mentor has strengths in the areas they are mentoring in to help increase student | visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student data, developing |
| G. Coger | J. Denson | based mentor has strengths in the areas they are mentoring in to help increase student | visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student data, developing assess ments, conferen |
| G. Coger | J. Denson | based mentor has strengths in the areas they are mentoring in to help increase student | visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student data, developing assess ments, conferen cing and |
| G. Coger | J. Denson | based mentor has strengths in the areas they are mentoring in to help increase student | visits to include modeling, co- teaching, analyzing student data, developing assess ments, conferen cing and problem |
| G. Coger | J. Denson | based mentor has strengths in the areas they are mentoring in to help increase student | visits to include modeling, co- teaching, analyzing student data, developing assess ments, conferen cing and problem solving |
| G. Coger | J. Denson | based mentor has strengths in the areas they are mentoring in to help increase student | visits to include modeling, co- teaching, analyzing student data, developing assess ments, conferen cing and problem solving to move |
| G. Coger | J. Denson | based mentor has strengths in the areas they are mentoring in to help increase student | visits to include modeling, co- teaching, analyzing student data, developing assess ments, conferen cing and problem solving |

| D. Ham | T. Jensen | The School | Weekly |
|--------|-----------|--------------|------------|
| | | based | visits to |
| | | mentor has | include |
| | | strengths | modeling, |
| | | in the areas | co- |
| | | they are | teaching, |
| | | mentoring | analyzing |
| | | in to help | student |
| | | increase | data, |
| | | student | developing |
| | | achievement. | assess |
| | | | ments, |
| | | | conferen |
| | | | cing and |
| | | | problem |
| | | | solving |
| | | | to move |
| | | | students |
| | | | forward. |

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

Title I, Part A

Services are provided to ensure students who need additional remediation are provided support through: after school and summer programs, quality teachers through professional development, content resource teachers, and mentors.

| Title I, Part C- Migrant |
|--|
| The migrant advocate provides services and support to students and parents. The advocate works with teachers and other programs to ensure that the migrant students' needs are being met. |
| Title I, Part D |
| The district receives funds to support the Alternative Education Program which provides transition services from alternative education to school of choice. |
| Title II |
| The district receives funds for staff development to increase student achievement through teacher training. In addition, the funds are utilized in the Salary Differential Program at Renaissance schools. |
| Title III |
| Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners |
| Title X- Homeless |
| The district receives funds to provide resources (social workers and tutoring) for students for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education. |
| Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) |
| SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school, reading coaches, and extended learning opportunity programs. |
| Violence Prevention Programs |
| Nutrition Programs |
| |
| Housing Programs |
| |

Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised January 2013

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.

Elementary

The leadership team includes:

- Principal
- Assistant Principal
- Guidance Counselor
- School Psychologist
- Social Worker
- Academic Coaches (Reading, Math, Science, Writing)
- ESE teacher
- Representatives from the PLCs for each grade level, K-5
- SAC Chair
- ELP Coordinator
- ELL Representative
- Speech/Language Specialist
- AIS

(Note that not all members attend every meeting, but are invited based on the goals and purpose of the meeting

Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?

The purpose of the core Leadership Team is to:

- 1. Review school-wide assessment data on an ongoing basis in order to identify instructional needs at all grade levels.
- 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels.
- 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains.
- 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams.

The Leadership team meets regularly (weekly).

- Oversee the multi-layered model of instructional delivery (Tier 1/Core, Tier 2/Supplemental and Tier 3/Intensive)
- Create, manage and update the school resource map
- Ensure the master schedule incorporates allocated time for intervention support at all grade levels.
- Determine scheduling needs, and assist teacher teams in identifying research-based instructional materials and intervention resources at Tiers2/3
- Facilitate the implementation of specific programs (e.g., Extended Learning Programs during and after school; Saturday Academies) that provide intervention support to students identified through data sorts/chats conducted by the PLCs.
- Determine the school-wide professional development needs of faculty and staff and arrange trainings aligned with the SIP goals
- Organize and support systematic data collection (e.g., district and state assessments; during-the-grading period school assessments/checks for understanding; in-school surveys)
- Assist and monitor teacher use of SMART goals per unit of instruction. (data will be collected and analyzed by PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT)
- Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction through the:

- o Implementation and support of PLCs
- Review of teacher/PLC core curriculum assessments/chapters tests/checks for understanding (data will be collected and analyzed by PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT)
- Use of Common Core Assessments by teachers teaching the same grade/subject area/course (data will be collected and analyzed by PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT)
- o Implementation of research-based scientifically validated instructional strategies and/or interventions. (as outlined in our SIP)
- o Communication with major stakeholders (e.g., parents, business partners, etc.) regarding student outcomes through data summaries and conferences.
- On a monthly basis, assist in the evaluation of teacher fidelity data and student achievement data collected during the month.
- Support the planning, implementing, and evaluating the outcomes of supplemental and intensive interventions in conjunction with PLCs and Specialty PSLT.
- Work collaboratively with the PLCs in the implementation of the C-CIM (Core Continuous Improvement Model) on core curriculum material.
- Coordinate/collaborate/integrate with other working committees, such as the Literacy Leadership Team (which is charged with developing a plan for embedding/integrating reading and writing strategies across all other content areas).

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

Elementary/Middle/High

- The Chair of SAC is a member of the Leadership Team/PSLT.
- The administration, leadership team, teachers and SAC are involved in the School Improvement Plan development and monitoring throughout the school year.
- The School Improvement Plan is the working document that guides the work of the Leadership Team and all teacher teams. The large part of the work of the team is outlined in the Expected Improvements/Problem Solving Process sections (and related professional development plans) for school-wide goals in Reading, Math, Writing, Science, Attendance and Suspension/Behavior.
- Given that one of the main tasks is to monitor student data related to instruction and interventions, the Leadership Team/PLST monitors the effectiveness of instruction and intervention by reviewing student data as well as data related to implementation fidelity (teacher walk-through data).
- The Leadership Team/PSLT communicates with and supports the PLCs in implementing the proposed strategies by distributing Leadership Team members across the PLCs to facilitate planning and implementation. Once strategies are put in place, the Leadership Team members who are part of the PLCs regularly report on their efforts and student outcomes to the larger Leadership Team/PSLT.
- The Leadership Team/PSLT and PLCs both use the problem solving process (Problem Identification, Problem Analysis, Intervention Design and Implementation and Evaluation to:
 - O Use the problem-solving model when analyzing data:
 - 1. What is the problem? (Problem Identification)
 - 2. Why is it occurring? (Problem Analysis and Barrier Identification)
 - 3. What are we going to do about it? (Action Plan Design and Implementation)
 - 4. Is it working? (Monitor Progress and Evaluate Action Plan Effectiveness)
 - o Identify the problem (based on an analysis of the data disaggregated via data sorts) in multiple areas curriculum content, behavior, and attendance
 - Develop and test hypotheses about why student/school problems are occurring (changeable barriers).
 - Develop and target interventions based on confirmed hypotheses.

- o Identify appropriate progress monitoring assessments to be administered at regular intervals matched to the intensity of the level of instructional/intervention support provided.
- Develop grading period or units of instruction//intervention goals that are ambitious, time-bound, and measureable (e.g., SMART goals).
- Review progress monitoring data at regular intervals to determine when student(s) need more or less support (e.g., frequency, duration, intensity) to meet established class, grade, and/or school goals (e.g., use of data-based decision-making to fade, maintain, modify or intensity intervention and/or enrichment support).
- Each PLC develops PLC action plan for SIP strategy implementation and monitoring.
- Assess the implementation of the strategies on the SIP using the following questions:
 - 1. Does the data show implementation of strategies are resulting in positive student growth?
 - 2. To what extent are we making progress toward the school's SIP goals?
 - 3. If we are making progress, what can we do to sustain what is working?
 - 4. What barriers to implementation are we facing and how will we address them?
 - 5. What should we do next? What should be our plan of action?

MTSS Implementation

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

Core Curriculum (Tier 1)

| Data Source | Database | Person (s) Responsible |
|---|---------------------------------|---|
| | | |
| FCAT released tests | School Generated Excel Database | Reading Coach/Math Coach/Science Coach/Writing Coach/AP |
| Baseline and Midyear District Assessments | Scantron Achievement Series | Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers |
| | Data Wall | |
| District generated assessments from the Office of Assessment and Accountability | Scantron Achievement Series | Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers |
| Reading Form A,B,C | Data Wall | |
| | | |
| Monthly Demand Writes | | |
| Math Form 1, Form 2, MOC Test | | |
| Science Form1,2 | | |
| Subject-specific assessments generated by District-level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Language Arts, Math, | Scantron Achievement Series | Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers |
| Writing and Science | Data Wall | |
| | PLC Logs | |
| | | |

| FAIR | Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network | Reading Coach |
|---|---|--|
| | Data Wall | |
| CELLA | Sagebrush (IPT) | ELL PSLT Representative |
| Teachers' common core curriculum assessments on units of instruction/big ideas. | PLC logs | Individual Teachers/ Team Leaders/ PLC Facilitators/Leadership Team Member |
| DRA-2 | School Generated Excel Database | Individual Teacher |
| | | |
| | | |

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

Elementary Middle/High

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

Core Curriculum (Tier 1)

| Data Source | Database | Person (s) Responsible |
|---|--|---|
| FCAT released tests | School Generated Excel Database | Reading Coach/ Math Coach/AP |
| Baseline and Midyear District Assessments | Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall | Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers |
| District generated assessments from the Office of Assessment and Accountability | Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall | Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers |
| (Name the assessments) | | |

| Subject-specific assessments generated by District-level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Language Arts, Math, Writing and Science Reading 2.0 Form A,B,C Monthly Demand Writes Math Form 1,2 Science Form 1,2 | Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall PLC Logs | Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers | |
|---|--|---|--|
| Science Form 1,2 FAIR | Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network | Reading Coach/ Teacher/ Reading PLC Facilitator | |
| | Data Wall | | |
| CELLA | Sagebrush (IPT) | ELL PSLT Representative | |
| Teachers' common core curriculum assessments on units of instruction/big ideas. | PLC Database PLC logs | Individual Teachers/ Team Leaders/ PLC Facilitators/ Leadership Team Member | |

| DRA-2 | School Generated Excel Database | Individual Teacher |
|---|------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Reports on Demand/Crystal Reports | District Generated Database | Administration |

Supplemental/Intensive Instruction (Tiers 2 and 3)

| Data Source | Database | Person (s) Responsible for Monitoring |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| Extended Learning | School Generated | Leadership |
| Program (ELP)* | Database in Excel | Team/ ELP |
| Ongoing Progress | | Facilitator |
| Monitoring (mini- assessments and | | |
| other assessments | | |
| from adopted | | |
| curriculum | | |
| resource materials) | | |
| Easy CBM | | |
| Differentiated mini | Individual teacher | Individual |
| assessments based | data base | Teachers/PLCs |
| on core curriculum | | |
| assessments. | PLC/Department data base | |
| | | |

| Other Curriculum Based Measurement | Easy CBM School Generated Database in Excel | Leadership Team/PLCs/ Individual Teachers | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| Research-based Computer-assisted Instructional Programs | Assessments included in computer-based programs | PLCs/ Individual Teachers | | |
| I-station, Waterford, SuccessMaker | | | | |
| | | | | |

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The Leadership Team/will continue to work to build consensus with all stakeholders regarding a need for and a focus on school improvement efforts. The Leadership Team will work to align the efforts of other school teams that may be addressing similar identified issues.

As the District's RtI Committee/RtI Facilitators develop(s) resources and staff development trainings on PS/RtI, these tools and staff development sessions will be conducted with staff when they become available. Professional Development sessions, as identified by teacher needs assessment and/or EET evaluation data, will occur during faculty meeting times or rolling faculty meetings. The Leadership Team will send school team representatives to ongoing PS/RtI trainings/support sessions that are offered district-wide. Our school will invite our area RtI Facilitator to visit quarterly (or as needed) to review our progress in implementation of PS/RtI and provide on-site coaching and support to our Leadership Teams/ PLCs. New staff will be directed to participate in trainings relevant to PLCs and PS/RtI as they become available.

Easy CBM Training 10/9/12, Intermediate 10/16/12 Primary

Describe plan to support MTSS.

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

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

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The Literacy Leadership Team serves as the school's literacy Professional Learning Community. The team is comprised of:

- Principal
- Assistant Principal
- Reading Coach
- Reading Teachers
- Media Specialist
- Teachers across content areas (Language Arts, Math, Science, Social Studies and Electives) who have demonstrated effective reading instruction as reflected through positive student reading gains
- AIS

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

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

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

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

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

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

NCLB Public School Choice

• Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

In Hillsborough County Public schools, all kindergarten children are assessed for Kindergarten Readiness using the FLKRS (Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screener.) This state-selected assessment contains a subset of the Early Childhood Observation System and the first two measures of the Florida Assessments in Reading (FAIR). The instruments used in the screening are based upon the Florida Voluntary Prekindergarten (VPK) Education Standards. Parents are provided with a letter from the Commissioner of Education, explaining the assessments. Teachers will meet with parents after the assessments have been completed to review student performance. Data from the FAIR will be used to assist teachers in creating homogeneous groupings for small group reading instruction. Children entering Kindergarten may have benefited from the Hillsborough County Public Schools' Voluntary Prekindergarten Program. This program is offered at elementary schools in the summer and during the school year in selected Head Start classrooms and as a blended program in several Early Exceptional Learning Program (EELP) classrooms. Starting in the 2012-2013 school year, students in the VPK program will be given the state-created VPK Assessment that looks at Print Knowledge, Phonological Awareness, Mathematics and Oral Language/Vocabulary. This assessment will be administered at the start and end of the VPK program. A copy of these assessments will be mailed to the school in which the child will be registered for kindergarten, enabling the child's teacher to have a better understanding of the child's abilities from the first day of school. Parent Involvement events for Transitioning Children into Kindergarten include Kindergarten RoundUp. This event provides parents with an opportunity to meet the teachers and hear about the academic program. Parents are encouraged to complete the school registration procedure at this time to ensure that the child is able to start school on time.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

| Reading Goals | Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achieveme nt | | | | | |
|---|---|----------|--|--|-------------------------|--|
| 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' | | Who | | | |
|--|------------------|----------------------|--|---|--------------------------|---|
| | | | Who | | | |
| reading (Level 3-3). | | | VV 11O | Teacher Level | x per year | |
| | | | | reaction Devel | A per year | |
| | | Common Core | -Principal | Teachers reflect on lesson | FAIR | |
| | knowledge | Reading Strategy | 1 | outcomes and use this | | |
| | base of this | Across all Content | | knowledge to drive future | | |
| | strategy needs | Areas | 1 | instruction. | | |
| | professional | | -Instruction Coaches | | | |
| | development. | Reading | | -Teachers use the on-line | | |
| | Training for | comprehension | | | Ouring the Grading | |
| | this strategy is | improves when | Subject in the Education | | eriod_ | |
| | being rolled out | students are | -PLC facilitators of | progress towards their PLC | <u> </u> | |
| | in 12-13. | engaged in | | and/or individual SMART | Common assessments | |
| | | grappling with | | | pre, post, mid, section, | |
| | -Training all | complex text. | | | nd of unit, intervention | |
| | content area | Teachers need to | | | hecks) | |
| | teachers | understand how | | | | |
| | | to select/identify | <u>How</u> | -Using the individual teacher | | |
| | | complex text, | | data, PLCs calculate the | | |
| | | shift the amount | -Reading PLC Logs | SMART goal data across all | | |
| | | of informational | | classes/courses. | | |
| | | text used in the | -Language Arts PLC | | | |
| | | | Logs | -PLCs reflect on lesson | | |
| | | and share complex | | outcomes and data used to | | |
| | | texts with all | Social Studies PLC | drive future instruction. | | |
| | | students. <u>All</u> | Logs | | | |
| | | content area | | -For each class/course, PLCs | | |
| | | teachers are | -Elective PLC Logs | chart their overall progress | | |
| | | responsible for | DI CC | towards the SMART Goal. | | |
| | | implementation. | -PLCS turn their logs | <u>j</u> | | |
| | | | into administration and/ | Leadership Team Level | | |
| | | | or coach after a unit of | [| | |
| | | A ation Stone | instruction is complete. | -PLC facilitator/ Subject | | |
| | | Action Steps | Administration | Area Leader/ Department | | |
| | | A ation stone for | -Administration and coach rotate | Heads shares SMART Goal | | |
| | | | through PLCs looking | data with the Leadership | | [|
| | | | for complex text | Team. | | |
| | | | discussion. | Dutation and to 1.1 | | [|
| | | PLC action plans. | u150u551011. | -Data is used to drive | | |
| | | Le action plans. | Administration shares | | | |
| | | | | supplemental instruction. | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | meetings on a monthly | | | |
| | | i LC action plans. | -Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC | teacher support and student supplemental instruction. | | |

| | | | basis | | |
|--|-----|--------------------------------------|-------|--|--|
| Reading Goal #1: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | |
| The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 46% to 49%. | | | | | |
| | 46% | 49% | | | |

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

| 1.2. | 11.2 | 1 2 | 1.2. | 1 2 | \neg |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--------|
| 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.4. | 1.2. | |
| | | | | | |
| Teachers | Common Core | Who_ | Teacher Level | 3x per year | |
| knowledge base | Reading Strategy | | | | |
| of this strategy | Across all Content | -Principal | -Teachers reflect on | - FAIR | |
| needs professiona | Areas | | lesson outcomes and use | | |
| development. | | -AP | this knowledge to drive | | |
| Training for this | Common Core | | future instruction. | | |
| strategy is being | | -Instruction Coaches | | | |
| rolled out in 12-13 | Questions of all types | | Teachers use the on-line | | |
| | and levels are | -Resource Teachers | grading system data to | During the Grading Period | |
| -Training all | necessary to scaffold | | calculate their students' | | |
| content area | students' | -Subject Area Leaders/ | progress towards the | - Common assessments (pre, | |
| teachers | understanding of | Department Heads | development of their | post, mid, section, end of unit, | |
| | complex text. Teachers | 1 * | individual/PLC SMART | intervention checks) | |
| | need to understand and | | Goal | _ | |
| | use <u>higher-order, text</u> - | : | | | |
| | dependent questions | <u>How</u> | PLC Level | | |
| | at the word/phrase, | | | | |
| | sentence, and | Reading PLC Logs | -Using the individual | | |
| | paragraph/passage | | teacher data, PLCs | | |
| | levels (Webb's, | -Language Arts PLC Logs | calculate the SMART | | |
| | Bloom, Costas). | | goal data across all | | |
| | Student reading | -Social Studies PLC Logs | classes/courses. | | |
| | comprehension | | - 145505/ COUISCS. | | |
| | improves when | -Elective PLC Logs | -PLCs reflect on lesson | | |
| | students are required to | | outcomes and data used to | | |
| | provide evidence to | -PLCS turn their logs into | drive future instruction. | | |
| | support their answers | administration and/or coach | arry future monuction. | | |
| | to text-dependent | after a unit of instruction is | -For each class/course, | | |
| | questions. Scaffolding | | PLCs chart their overall | | |
| | of students' grappling | F | progress towards the | | |
| | with complex text | -PLCs receive feedback on | SMART Goal. | | |
| | through well-crafted | their logs. | DIVITAICI GUAI. | | |
| | text-dependent | | Leadership Team Level | | |
| | question assists | -Reading Coach | Leadership ream Level | | |
| | | observations and walk- | -PLC facilitator/ | | |
| | | throughs | Subject Area Leader/ | | |
| | understanding of the | | 3 | | |
| | author's meaning. All | -Administrative walk- | Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with | | |
| | content area teachers | | | | |
| | are responsible for | implementation of | the Problem Solving | | |
| | implementation. | strategy with fidelity and | Leadership Team. | | |
| | impicincitation. | consistency. | Data in and to 1: | | |
| | | consistency. | -Data is used to drive | | |
| | | | teacher support and | | |

| | | -Administrator and Reading | student supplemental | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|--|
| | Action Steps | Coach aggregate the walk- | instruction. | |
| | | through data school- | | |
| | Action steps for this | wide and shares with staff | | |
| | strategy are outlined on | the progress of strategy | | |
| | grade level/content area | implementation. | | |
| | PLC action plans. | | | |

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

| 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
|-------------------|--------------------------|---|---------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1.5. | 1.3. | 1.5. | 1.5. | μ.σ. |
| | ~ ~ | L | | [|
| -Teachers | Common Core | Who_ | Teacher Level | 3x per year |
| knowledge ba | e Reading Strategy | | | 1 |
| of this strategy | | -Principal | Teachers reflect on | - FAIR |
| needs professi | onal Areas | | lesson outcomes and use | |
| development. | . L | -AP | this knowledge to drive | |
| Training for the | | l | future instruction. | |
| strategy is being | | -Instruction Coaches | I | |
| rolled out in 1 | | | -Teachers maintain their | L |
| | a <u>close reading</u> | -Subject Area Leaders | | During the Grading Period |
| -Training all | lesson. Student | | grading system. | |
| content area | | PLC facilitators of like | <u></u> | - Common assessments (pre, |
| teachers | improves when | grades and/or like courses | Teachers use the on-line | post, mid, section, end of unit, |
| | students are engaged | | grading system data to | intervention checks) |
| | in close reading | | calculate their students' | |
| | instruction using | How | progress towards the | |
| | complex text. Specific | now_ | development of their | |
| | close reading strategies | -Reading Logs | individual/PLC SMART | |
| | include: 1) multiple | -Reading Logs | Goal. | |
| | readings of a passage | I amazza a A esta I a aa | | |
| | 2) asking higher- | -Language Arts Logs | PLC Level | |
| | order, text-dependent | Canial Ctudian I and | | |
| | questions, 3) writing | -Social Studies Logs | -Using the individual | |
| | in response to reading | Election I are | teacher data, PLCs | |
| | and 4) engaging | -Elective Logs | calculate the SMART | |
| | in text-based class | DI CS turn their less into | goal data across all | |
| | | PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach | classes/courses. | |
| | area teachers are | | . | |
| | responsible for | after a unit of instruction is | -PLCs reflect on lesson | |
| | implementation. | complete. | outcomes and data used to |) |
| | | -PLCs receive feedback on | drive future instruction. | |
| | | | L | |
| | | their logs. | - For each class/course, | |
| | Action Steps | A deministration above the | PLCs chart their overall | |
| | | Administration shares the | progress towards the | |
| | Action steps for this | positive outcomes observed | SMART Goal. | |
| | strategy are outlined or | in PLC meetings on a | L | |
| | grade level/content are | monthly basis. | Leadership Team Level | |
| | PLC action plans | Destine Great | | |
| | | -Reading Coach | -PLC facilitator/ | |
| | | observations and walk- | Subject Area Leader/ | |
| | | throughs | Department Heads shares | |
| | | | SMART Goal data with | |
| | | -Administrative walk- | the Problem Solving | |

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

| | | | | consistency. | Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. | |
|---|-------------|--------------|------------------------|---|--|--|
| Based on the analysis of student | Anticipated | Strategy | Fidelity Check | Fidelity Check | Student Evaluation Tool | |
| achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Barrier | | fidelity be monitored? | Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | | |
| | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | |
| scoring Achievement | | | | | | |
| Levels 4 or 5 in reading. | | See 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 16% to 19%. | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|---|------|--|-------------------------|------|--|
| | 16% | 19% | | | | | |
| | | 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 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 | 3.1. | 3.1. | 3.1. | 3.1. | 3.1. | |
|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|--|---------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| students making Learning | | 5.1. | | 5.11 | J.1. | |
| | -PLCs struggle | Stratogy | Who | School has a system for | 3x per year | |
| | with how | Strategy | WIIO | PLCs to record and report | bx pci year | |
| | | Student | -Principal | during-the-grading period | - FAIR | |
| | curriculum | achievement | Timeipui | SMART goal outcomes to | 171110 | |
| | conversations | | -AP | | Reading 2.0, Form A,B,C | |
| | and data | teachers working | 711 | and/or leadership team. | recuting 2.0, 1 orm 71,B,C | |
| | analysis to | collaboratively | -Instruction Coaches | and of foundship tourn. | | |
| | deepen their | to focus on | | | | |
| | leaning. To | student learning. | -Subject Area Leaders | | During the Grading | |
| | | Specifically, they | | | Period | |
| | barrier, this | use the Plan- | -PLC facilitators of | | | |
| | | Do-Check-Act | like grades and/or like | | - Common assessments | |
| | being trained | model and log to | courses | | (pre, post, mid, section, | |
| | to use the Plan- | structure their way | | | end of unit, intervention | |
| | | of work. Using | | | checks) | |
| | | the backwards | L. | | | |
| | Unit" log. | 4401911110401101 | How_ | | | |
| | | units of instruction, | DI CC 4 and 41 also 1 also | | | |
| | | teachers rocas on | PLCS turn their logs into administration and | , | | |
| | | the following four | or coach after a unit of | | | |
| | | questions: | instruction is complete. | | | |
| | | 1 W/h a4 in i4 | instruction is complete. | | | |
| | | 1. What is it we | -PLCs receive feedback | | | |
| | | learn? | on their logs. | ` | | |
| | | learn? | on then 10go. | | | |
| | | 2. How will we | -Administrators and | | | |
| | | if they have | coaches attend targeted | | | |
| | | learned it? | PLC meetings | | | |
| | | learned it: | | | | |
| | | 3. How will we | -Progress of PLCs | | | |
| | | respond if | discussed at Leadership | · I | | |
| | | they don't | Team | | | |
| | | learn? | | | | |
| | | | -Administration shares | | | |
| | | 4. How will we | the data of PLC visits | | | |
| | | respond if | with staff on a monthly | | | |
| | | they already | basis. | | | |
| | | know it? | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | A ations/Datails | | | | |
| | | Actions/Details | | | | |

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

| | | -Grade level/ like-course PLCs use a Plan-Do- Check-Act "Unit | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | of Instruction" log to guide their discussion and way of work. Discussions are summarized on log. | | | |
| | | -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans. | | | |
| Reading Goal #3 | 2012 Current level of performance* | 2013 Expected level of performance* | | | |
| Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT reading will increase from 64 points to 67 points. | | | | | |
| | | 67 | | | |
| | points | points | | | |

| h 2 | 1 | 3.2. | 3.2. | h 2 | |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| 3.2. | 3.2. | P.2. | D.4. | 3.2. | |
| | | ĺ | | | |
| T 1 | Strategy/Task_ | <u>Who</u> | Teacher Level | School has a system for | |
| -Teachers tend to | June 1/ 1 usk | ĺ | | PLCs to record and report | |
| only differentiate | Student achievement | -Principal | -Teachers reflect on | during-the-grading period | |
| after the lesson | improves when | ĺ | lesson outcomes and use | SMART goal outcomes to | |
| is taught instead | teachers use on- | -AP | this knowledge to drive | administration, coach, SAL, | |
| of planning how | | | future instruction. | and/or leadership team. | |
| to differentiate | going student data | -Instruction Coaches | | · | |
| the lesson when | to <u>differentiate</u> | | Teachers maintain their | | |
| new content is | instruction. | -Subject Area Leaders | assessments in the on-line | | |
| presented. | | Sacject filea Deaders | grading system. | | |
| | | -PLC facilitators of like | Brading System. | | |
| Tanahamana | | grades and/or like courses | -Teachers use the on-line | | |
| -Teachers are | Actions/Details | grades and/or like courses | grading system data to | | |
| at varying | | ĺ | calculate their students' | | |
| levels of using | Within PLCs <u>Before</u> | | | | |
| Differentiated | Instruction and | How | progress towards the | | |
| Instruction | During Instruction of | 110w | development of their | | |
| strategies. | New Content | DI C logg turned into | individual/PLC SMART | | |
| | | -PLC logs turned into | Goal. | | |
| -Teachers tend to | -Using data from | administration, SAL and/or | | | |
| give all students | previous assessments | coaches. | PLC Level | | |
| the same lesson, | and daily classroom | l | | | |
| handouts, etc. | | -PLCS turn their logs into | -Using the individual | | |
| | r , , | administration and/or coach | teacher data, PLCs | | |
| | | after a unit of instruction is | calculate the SMART | | |
| | plan Differentiated | complete. | goal data across all | | |
| | Instruction groupings | ĺ | classes/courses. | | |
| | and activities for the | -PLCs receive feedback on | | | |
| | delivery of new content | their logs. | -PLCs reflect on lesson | | |
| | in upcoming lessons. | l - | outcomes and data used to | l l | |
| | L | -Administrators attend | drive future instruction. |] | |
| | In the classroom | targeted PLC meetings | arry o future monucilon. | | |
| | | | - For each class/course, | | |
| | -During the lessons, | -Progress of PLCs discussed | DI Cs chart their overall | | |
| | students are involved | at Leadership Team. | | | |
| | in flexible grouping | Loudership ream. | progress towards the SMART Goal. | | |
| | techniques | -Administration shares the | PIVIAKT GOAL | | |
| | 1 ^ | | | | |
| | PLCs <u>After</u> Instruction | in DI C meetings on s | Leadership Team Level | | |
| | | monthly basis | Dr. G. G. W. | | |
| | Teachers reflect and | monthly basis. | -PLC facilitator/ | | |
| | discuss the outcome of | ĺ | Subject Area Leader/ | | |
| | their DI lessons. | ĺ | Department Heads shares | | |
| | men Di lessons. | ĺ | SMART Goal data with | | |
| | | ĺ | the Problem Solving | | |
| | • | • | | | |

| | | | Teachers use student data to identify successful DI techniques for future implementation. Teachers, using a problem-solving question protocol, identify students who need re-teaching/interventions and how that instruction will be provided. Questions are listed in the 2012-2013 Technical Assistance Document under the Differentiation Cross Content strategy). Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLCs. | | Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. | | |
|--|------------------------|----------|--|--|--|------|--|
| | | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. | 33. | 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 be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | | |

| 4.1. 4.1. 4.1. 4.1. 4.1. 4.1. 4.1. 4.1. |
|---|
| making learning gains in reading. Scheduling time for the principal/APC to meet with the academic coach on a regular basis -Scheduling time for the principal/APC to meet with the academic coach on a regular basis -Scheduling time for the principal Scheduling time for the principal Content Areas -Principal 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 -AP administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team -Instruction Coaches |
| time for the principal/APC to meet with the academic coach on a regular basis regular basis time for the principal during-the-grading period during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team |
| principal/APC to meet with the academic coach on a regular basis principal/APC to meet with the academic coach on a regular basis -Principal during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team -AP administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team -Instruction Coaches |
| to meet with the academic coach on a coach on a regular basis regular ba |
| the academic coach on a Strategy/Task - Instruction Coaches - Inst |
| coach on a Strategy/Task and/or leadership team regular basis Instruction Coaches |
| regular basis - Instruction Coaches |
| regular basis. Instruction Coaches |
| |
| Student Student |
| -Teachers achievement -Subject Area Leaders During the Grading |
| willingness to improves through Period |
| accept support teachers' - PLC facilitators of |
| from the coach collaboration like grades and/or like grades and/or like like grades and/or like grades and |
| with the academic courses (pre, post, mid, section, |
| coach in all content end of unit, intervention |
| areas. |
| |
| How_ |
| |
| Actions/Details PLCS turn their logs |
| into administration and/ |
| Academic Coach or coach after a unit of |
| instruction is complete. |
| -The academic |
| coach and -PLCs receive feedback |
| administration on their logs. |
| conducts one-on- |
| one data chats with -Administrators and |
| individual teachers coaches attend targeted |
| using the teacher's PLC meetings |
| student past and/or |
| present dataProgress of PLCs |
| discussed at Leadership |
| -The academic Team |
| coach rotates |
| through all -Administration shares |
| subjects' PLCs to: the data of PLC visits |
| with staff on a monthly |
| Facilitate lesson basis. |
| planning that |
| embeds rigorous |
| tasks |
| Hacks |
| Facilitate |

| development, | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| writing, selection | | |
| of higher-order, | | |
| text-dependent | | |
| text-dependent | | |
| questions/activities, | | |
| with an emphasis | | |
| on Webb's Depth | | |
| of Knowledge | | |
| question hierarchy | | |
| question includeny | | |
| E Title of | | |
| Facilitate the | | |
| identification, | | |
| selection, | | |
| development | | |
| of rigorous | | |
| core curriculum | | |
| | | |
| common | | |
| assessments | | |
| | | |
| Facilitate core | | |
| curriculum | | |
| assessment data | | |
| analysis | | |
| anarysis | | |
| l | | |
| Facilitate the | | |
| planning for | | |
| interventions and | | |
| the intentional | | |
| grouping of the | | |
| students. | | |
| students. | | |
| | | |
| -Using walk- | | |
| through data, the | | |
| academic coach | | |
| and administration | | |
| identify teachers | | |
| | | |
| for support in | | |
| co-planning, | | |
| modeling, co- | | |
| teaching, observing | | |
| and debriefing. | | |
| | | |
| -The academic | | |
| coach trains each | | |
| | | |
| subject area PLC | | |

| on how to facilitate | | |
|----------------------|--|--|
| their own PLC | | |
| using structured | | |
| protocols. | | |
| Î l | | |
| -Throughout the | | |
| school year, the | | |
| academic coach/ | | |
| administration | | |
| conducts one-on- | | |
| 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, both | | |
| individually and as | | |
| a department. | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Leadership Team | | |
| and Coach | | |
| ina couch | | |
| -The academic | | |
| coach meets with | | |
| | | |
| the principal/APC | | |
| to map out a high- | | |
| level summary plan | | |
| of action for the | | |
| school year. | | |
| | | |
| -Every two weeks, | | |
| the academic | | |
| coach meets with | | |
| the principal/APC | | |
| to: | | |
| | | |
| Review log and | | |
| work accomplished | | |
| and | | |
| | | |
| | | |

| | | Develop a detailed plan of action for the next two weeks. | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 82 points to 84 points. | Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | |
| | 82 | 84 | | | |
| | points | points | | | |

| 4.2 | 1.2 | 4.2. | 4.2.See Goal 1 | 4.2. See Goal 1 | 4.2. See Goal 1 | |
|-------|---------------------|---|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| | | | | | | |
| | | Strategy | | | | |
| | Learning Program | C4 14.2 1: | | | | |
| | | Students' reading | | | | |
| | | comprehension improves through | | | | |
| | | receiving ELP | | | | |
| | | supplemental | | | | |
| l Pi | lata on an ongoing | instruction on | | | | |
| | asis. | targeted skills that are | | | | |
| l l | | not at the mastery level. | L | | | |
| | Not always a | • | | | | |
| d d | lirect correlation | _ | | | | |
| b | etween what the | | | | | |
| s | tudents is missing | Action Steps | | | | |
| ir ir | n the regular | C1 1 | | | | |
| | | -Classroom teachers | | | | |
| | nstruction received | communicate with the ELP teachers regarding | | | | |
| | | specific skills that | | | | |
|] | | students have not | | | | |
| | | mastered. | | | | |
| | etween regular | | | | | |
| | and ELP teachers. | -ELP teachers identify | | | | |
| | | lessons for students | | | | |
| | | that target specific | | | | |
| | | skills that are not at the | | | | |
| | | mastery level. | | | | |
| | | Ct. 1ttt1ELD | | | | |
| | | -Students attend ELP sessions. | | | | |
| | | 000010118. | | | | |
| | | -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 | | | | |
| | | specific skill, they are | | | | |

Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised January 2013

| | | | 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 | | 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: | | | | | | | |
| (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | | | | | | | |

| 5A. Student subgroups by | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American | White: | Can Canla 1 | | | | |
| Indian) not making | | See Goals 1, 3, & 4 | | | | |
| satisfactory progress in reading. | Hispanic: | β, & 4 | | | | |
| reading. | | | | | | |
| | Asian: | | | | | |
| | American Indian: | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Reading Goal #5A: | 2012 Current Level of | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
| | Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| The percentage of Black_ | | | | | | |
| students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT | | | | | | |
| FAA Reading will increase | | | | | | |
| from 46% to 51%. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| | White: N/A | White:N/A | | | | | |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|---|---|-------------------------|-------|--|
| | Black: 46 | Black:51 | | | | | |
| | Hispanic:50 | Hispanic:54 | | | | | |
| | Asian: N/A | 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 | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check | Strategy Data Check | Student Evaluation Tool | | |
| to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | | | |
| 5B. Economically Disadvantaged students | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | | |
| not making satisfactory progress in reading. | | See Goals 1,3 and 4 | | | | | |
| progress in reading. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| Reading Goal #5B: The percentage of Eon. Dis. students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Reading will increase from 46% to 51%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|------------------------|--|-------------------------|-------|--|
| | 46 | 51 | | | | | |
| | | 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 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

| 5C. English Language | 5C.1 | 5C.1 | 5C.1 | 5C.1 | 5C.1. | |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---|-----------------------------|--|
| | DC.1 | JC.1 | l C.1 | JC.1 | | |
| Learners (ELL) not | | | | L | . | |
| making satisfactory | | | <u>Who</u> | Teacher Level | 3x per year_ | |
| progress in reading. | | comprehension | 0 1 11 1 | | EAID | |
| | | of course | -School based | -Teachers reflect on lesson | - FAIR | |
| | in our student | content/standard | Administrators | outcomes and use this | Deciliar 2.0 Francis A.D.C. | |
| | is of high | improves through | D' D | | Reading 2.0, Form A,B,C | |
| | priority. | participation in | -District Resource | instruction. | | |
| | | the <u>Cognitive</u> | Teachers | l | | |
| | The majority | Academic_ | EGOL B | -Teachers use the on-line | Despise a the Carolina | |
| | of the teachers | <u>Language</u> | | grading system data to | During the Grading Period | |
| | are unfamiliar | <u>Learning</u> | Teachers | calculate their students' | <u>Period</u> | |
| | with this | Approach (CALLA) | | progress towards their PLC | C | |
| | strategy. To | (CALLA) strategy | | and/or individual ELL | - Common assessments | |
| | address this | across Reading, | | SMART Goal | (pre, post, mid, section, | |
| | barrier, the | | <u>How</u> | | end of unit, intervention | |
| | school will | Math, Social | | PLC Level | checks) | |
| | schedule | Studies and | -Administrative and | ** | | |
| | | Science. | | -Using the individual teacher | 1 | |
| | development | | | data, PLCs calculate the | | |
| | delivered by | | | ELL SMART goal data | | |
| | the school's | | form from: | across all classes/courses. | | |
| | ERT. | Action Steps | TI CALLA | DIG S 1 | | |
| | T 1 | EGOL D | The CALLA | -PLCs reflect on lesson | | |
| | -Teachers | -ESOL Resource | | outcomes and data used to | | |
| | implementation | | | drive future instruction. | | |
| | of CALLA is | provides | for Evaluating CALLA | FDT | | |
| | | professional | Instruction. | -ERTs meet with Reading, | | |
| | across core | development to | | Language Arts, Social | | |
| | courses. | all content area | | Studies and Science PLCs | | |
| | ELI | teachers on how | | on a rotating basis to assist | | |
| | -ELLs at | to embed CALLA | | with the analysis of ELLs performance data. | | |
| | varying levels of | into core content | | performance data. | | |
| | 01 | lessons. | | - For each class/course, | | |
| | English | -ERT models | | PLCs chart their overall | | |
| | _ | lessons using | | progress towards the ELL | | |
| | language acquisition and | | | SMART Goal. | | |
| | acquisition and acculturation is | CALLA. | | DIVIANT GUAL | | |
| | | -ERT observes | | Leadership Team Level | | |
| | across core | content area | | Leadership Team Level | | |
| | | teachers using | | -PLC facilitator/ Subject | | |
| | courses. | CALLA and | | Area Leader/ Department | | |
| | Administrators | provides feedback, | | Heads shares ELL SMART | | |
| | at varying | coaching and | | Goal data with the Problem | | |
| | ai vaiyilig | Coaching and | | Ooai data witii tile Fioblelli | | |

Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised January 2013

| skill levels | support. | Solving Leadership Team. | | |
|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| regarding use | oupport. | sorving zeadership realin | | |
| of CALLA/ | -District Resource | -Data is used to drive | | |
| in order to | Teachers | teacher support and student | | |
| effectively | (DRTs) provide | supplemental instruction. | | |
| conduct a | professional | suppremental instruction. | | |
| CALLA | development to | -ERTs meet with RtI team to | | |
| | all administrators | review performance data and | | |
| walk-through. | on how to conduct | progress of ELLs (inclusive | | |
| waik-unough. | walk-through | of LFs) | | |
| | fidelity checks for | of LFS) | | |
| | use of CALLA. | | | |
| | use of CALLA. | | | |
| | C | | | |
| | -Core content | | | |
| | teachers set | | | |
| | SMART goals | | | |
| | for ELL students | | | |
| | for upcoming | | | |
| | core curriculum | | | |
| | assessments. | | | |
| | | | | |
| | -Core content | | | |
| | teachers administer | | | |
| | and analyze ELLs | | | |
| | performance on | | | |
| | assessments. | | | |
| | L | | | |
| | -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. | | | |

| Reading Goal #5C: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | |
|-------------------|---|---|--|--|--|
| | 54 Target met | | | | |

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

| 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2 | 5C.2. | 5C.2. |
|-------|-------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|---|
| JC.2. | 5C.2. | DC.2. | PC.2 | BC.2. | DC.2. |
| | | L., | ĺ | L | L |
| | | | <u>Who</u> | Teacher Level | 3x per year |
| | | LYC) comprehension | | | |
| | | of course content/ | -School based | -Teachers reflect on | - FAIR |
| | | | Administrators | lesson outcomes and use | |
| | priority. | in reading, language | | this knowledge to drive | Reading 2.0, Form A,B,C |
| | | arts, math, science and | -District Resource Teachers | future instruction. | |
| | | social studies through | | | |
| | the teachers are | the use of the district's | -ESOL Resource Teachers | Teachers use the on-line | |
| | unfamiliar with | on-line program | | grading system data to | During the Grading Period |
| | this strategy. | A+Rise located on | | calculate their students' | |
| | | IDEAS under Programs | | progress towards their | - Common assessments (pre, |
| | | for ELL. | How | PLC and/or individual | post, mid, section, end of unit, |
| | will schedule | | | ELL SMART Goal | intervention checks) |
| | professional | | ĺ | | ĺ , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , |
| | development | | ĺ | PLC Level | |
| | | Action Steps | -Administrative and | | |
| | school's ERT. | TOTAL DEEPS | - Administrative and | -Using the individual | |
| | Jenoor 5 Liker. | -ESOL Resource | ERT walk-throughs using | teacher data, PLCs | |
| | -Teachers | Teacher (ERT) | the CRISS walkthrough | calculate the ELL | |
| | | provides professional | form | SMART goal data across | |
| | | development to all | 101111 | all classes/courses. | |
| | consistent across | content area teachers | ĺ | an ciasses/courses. | |
| | core courses. | on how to access and | ĺ | -PLCs reflect on lesson | |
| | | | ĺ | outcomes and data used to | |
| | | use A+ Rise Strategies | ĺ | | |
| | | for ELLs at http:// | ĺ | drive future instruction. | |
| | | arises2s.com/s2s/ into | ĺ | EDT (:d | |
| | | core content lessons. | ĺ | -ERTs meet with | |
| | use of A+ Rise in | | ĺ | Reading, Language | |
| | | -ERT models lessons | ĺ | Arts, Social Studies | |
| | | using A+ Rise | ĺ | and Science PLCs on a | |
| | | Strategies for ELLs. | ĺ | rotating basis to assist | |
| | walk-through. | | ĺ | with the analysis of ELLs | |
| | | -ERT observes content | ĺ | performance data. | |
| | | area teachers using | ĺ | | |
| | | A+Rise and provides | ĺ | - For each class/course, | |
| | 5C.3 | feedback, coaching and | ĺ | PLCs chart their overall | |
| | | support. | ĺ | progress towards the ELL | |
| | -Lack of | | ĺ | SMART Goal. | |
| | understanding | -District Resource | ĺ | | |
| | teachers can | Teachers (DRTs) | ĺ | Leadership Team Level | |
| | provide ELL | provide professional | ĺ | | |
| | accommodations | development to all | ĺ | -PLC facilitator/ Subject | |
| | | administrators on | ĺ | Area Leader/ Department | |
| | - | | | r a Deader, Department | |

Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised January 2013

| testing. | how to conduct walk- | Heads shares ELL | |
|---------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| | through fidelity checks | SMART Goal data with | |
| -Bilingual | for use of A+ Rise | the Problem Solving | |
| Education | strategies for ELLs. | Leadership Team. | |
| Paraprofessionals | | _ | |
| at varying levels | | -Data is used to drive | |
| of expertise in | | teacher support and | |
| providing support | . | student supplemental | |
| | | instruction. | |
| -Allocation | | | |
| of Bilingual | | -ERTs meet with RtI team | |
| Education | | to review performance | |
| Paraprofessional | | data and progress of ELLs | |
| dependent on | | (inclusive of LFs) | |
| number of ELLs. | | | |
| | | | |
| -Administrators | | | |
| at varying levels | | | |
| of expertise in | | | |
| being familiar | | | |
| with the ELL | | | |
| guidelines and jol | | | |
| responsibilities of | | | |
| ERT and Bilingua | d [| | |
| paraprofessional. | | | |

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

| 50 | C.3 | 5C.3 | 5C.3 | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | |
|------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|-------|----------------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | |
| I E | LLs (LYA, | Who_ | Analyze core curriculum and | | 3x per year | |
| | YB & LYC) | | district level assessments | | | |
| | | -School based | for ELL students. Correlate | | - FAIR | |
| ot | f course content/ | Administrators | to accommodations to | | | |
| | tandards | | determine the most effective | | Reading 2.0, Form A,B,C | |
| | | | approach for individual | | | |
| | | Teachers | students. | | | |
| | ne following | | | | L | |
| | ay-to-day | | | | During the Grading Period | |
| | <u>ccommodations</u> | | | | Common and a second of | |
| | | <u>How</u> | | | - Common assessments (pre, | |
| | nd district | | | | post, mid, section, end of unit, | |
| | | -Administrative and | | | intervention checks) | |
| | Leading, LA, | EDT11- 411 | | | | |
| | ocial Studies: | ERT walk-throughs using the walk- | | | | |
| | ociai Studies. | throughs look for | | | | |
| 1. | | Committee Meeting | | | | |
| | | Recommendations. In | | | | |
| | | addition, tools from | | | | |
| | | the RtI Handbook and | | | | |
| | | ELL RtI Checklist, | | | | |
| | | and ESOL Strategies | | | | |
| | | Checklist can be used | | | | |
|] 3. | . Para support | as walk-through forms | | | | |
| | (lesson and | | | | | |
| | assessments) | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 4. | | | | | | |
| | heritage | | | | | |
| | language | | | | | |
| | dictionary | | | | | |
| | (lesson and | | | | | |
| | assessments) | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student | 5C 4 | 5C.4 | 5C.4 | 5C.4 | Student Evaluation Tool | |
|----------------------------------|----------------|---------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| achievement data, and reference | BC.4 | PC.4 | PC.4 | DC.4 | Staucht Evaluation 1001 | |
| to "Guiding Questions", identify | | | | | | |
| and define areas in need of | -Improving the | | <u>Who</u> | <u> Teacher Level</u> | | |
| improvement for the following | proficiency of | | | | | |
| subgroup: | | comprehension | -School based | -Teachers reflect on lesson | | |
| | | of course content/ | | outcomes and use this | | |
| | | standards improves | | knowledge to drive future | | |
| | | in reading, | -ESOL Resource | instruction. | | |
| | | language arts, | Teachers | | | |
| | | math, science | | -Teachers use the on-line | | |
| | | and social | -PLC Facilitators | grading system data to | | |
| | | studies through | | calculate their students' | | |
| | | teachers working | | progress towards their PLC | | |
| | | collaboratively | | and/or individual ELL | | |
| | | to focus on ELL | How_ | SMART Goal | | |
| | | student learning. | | | | |
| | | Specifically, they | PLC logs (with specific | PLC Level | | |
| | | use the Plan-Do- | ELL information) for | | | |
| | | Check-Act model | | -Using the individual teacher | | |
| | | to structure their | | data, PLCs calculate the | | |
| | | way of work for | | ELL SMART goal data | | |
| | | ELL students. | | across all classes/courses. | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | -PLCs reflect on lesson | | |
| | | | | outcomes and data used to | | |
| | | Action Steps | | drive future instruction. | | |
| | | T 1 1 | | | | |
| | | -Teachers analyze | | -ERTs meet with Reading, | | |
| | | CELLA data to | | Language Arts, Social | | |
| | | identify ELL | | Studies and Science PLCs | | |
| | | students who need | | on a rotating basis to assist | | |
| | | assistance in the | | with the analysis of ELLs | | |
| | | areas of listening/ | | performance data. | | |
| | | speaking, reading | | For each along/street BLC | | |
| | | and writing. | | -For each class/course, PLCs | | |
| | | T 1 | | chart their overall progress | | |
| | | -Teachers use | | towards the ELL SMART | | |
| | | time during PLCs | | Goal. | | |
| | | to reinforce and | | Landarship Tarra Larra | | |
| | | strengthen targeted | | Leadership Team Level | | |
| | | ELL effective | | DI C fo cilitatan/ Sorbi | | |
| | | teaching strategies | | -PLC facilitator/ Subject | | |
| | | (CALLA and | | Area Leader/ Department | | |
| | | A+ Rise) in the | | Heads shares ELL SMART | | |
| | | areas of listening/ | | Goal data with the Problem | | |

| | speaking, reading | Solving Leadership Team. | |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| | and writing. | | |
| | J | -Data is used to drive | |
| | -Teachers use | teacher support and student | |
| | | teacher support and student | |
| | time during PLCs | supplemental instruction. | |
| | to reinforce and | | |
| | strengthen targeted | -ERTs meet with RtI team to | |
| | ELL Differentiated | review performance data and | |
| | Instruction lessons | progress of ELLs (inclusive | |
| | using the district | | |
| | using the district | of LFs) | |
| | provided ELL | | |
| | Differentiated | | |
| | Instruction binders | | |
| | (provided by the | | |
| 1 | ELL Department) | | |
| | in Panding | | |
| | in Reading, | | |
| | Language Arts, | | |
| | Math, Science and | | |
| | Social Studies. | | |
| | | | |
| | -PLCs generate | | |
| | SMART goals for | | |
| | | | |
| | ELL students for | | |
| | upcoming units of | | |
| | instruction. | | |
| | | | |
| | -PLCs/teachers | | |
| | plan for upcoming | | |
| | lessons/units | | |
| | using targeted | | |
| 1 | | | |
| | CALLA and A+ | | |
| | Rise strategies | | |
| | and Differentiated | | |
| | Instruction | | |
| | strategies based on | | |
| | ELLs needs in the | | |
| 1 | areas of listening/ | | |
| | | | |
| | speaking, reading | | |
| | and writing. | | |
| | | | |
| | -PLCs/teachers | | |
| | plan for | | |
| | accommodations | | |
| | for core curriculum | | |
| | | | |
| | content and | | |

| assessment. | | |
|---|--|--|
| -When conducting data analysis on core curriculum assessments, PLCs aggregate the ELL data. | | |
| -Based on the data, PLCs/teachers plan interventions for targeted ELL students using the resources from CALLA, A+ Rise, and Differentiated instruction binders. | | |

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

| | | 1 | I | | T | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|---|-------|-------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | |
| 5D. Students with | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | |
| Disabilities (SWD) not | | G4 4 | | | | |
| making satisfactory | 11000 10 | <u>Strategy</u> | | | | |
| L ! P | orovide school | SWD student | | | | |
| | organization | achievement | | | | |
| S | tructure and | improves through | | | | |
| | procedure for | the effective | | | | |
| | egular and on | and <u>consistent</u> implementation | | | | |
| | going review of students' | of students' IEP | | | | |
| | EPs by both | goals, strategies, | | | | |
| ti ti | he general | modifications, and | | | | |
| | aucation and | accommodations. | | | | |
| | ESE teacher. To address this | -Throughout | | | | |
| | parrier, the | the school year, | | | | |
| | APC will put a | teachers of SWD | | | | |
| l s | ystem in place | review students' IEPs to ensure | | | | |
| | or this school | that IEPs are | | | | |
| y | ear. | implemented | | | | |
| 1 | | 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. | | | | |
| | | iessuiis. | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| Reading Goal #5D: | 2012 | 2013 | | | |
|---|------|------|--|--|--|
| The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 15% to 24%. | | | | | |
| | 15 | 24 | | | |

| 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | |
|-------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| DD.2. | 5D.2. | 56.2. | 55.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | |
| | | | | | | |
| | -Improving the | Strategy/Task_ | | | | |
| | proficiency of | | | | | |
| | SWD in our school | SWD student | | | | |
| | is of high priority. | achievement improves | | | | |
| | is or ingli priority. | through <u>teachers'</u> | | | | |
| | -Teachers need | implementation of | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | support in drilling | the Plan-Do-Check- | | | | |
| | | Act model in order to | | | | |
| | | plan/carry out lessons/ | | | | |
| | SWD level. | assessments with | | | | |
| | | appropriate strategies | | | | |
| | -General | and modifications. | | | | |
| | educational teacher | | | | | |
| | and ESE teacher | | | | | |
| | need consistent, on- | | | | | |
| | need consistent, on- | | | | | |
| | | <u>Actions</u> | | | | |
| | time. | | | | | |
| | | Plan | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | For an upcoming unit | | | | |
| | | of instruction determine | | | | |
| | | the following: | | | | |
| | | ine reme wang. | | | | |
| | | -What do we want our | | | | |
| | | SWD to learn by the | | | | |
| | | 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? | | | | |
| | | IOI OUT SWD! | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | -What does mastery | | | | |
| | | look like? | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | -What is the SMART | | | | |
| | | goal for this unit of | | | | |
| | | instruction for our | | | | |
| | | SWD? | | | | |
| | | ישאט! | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised January 2013

| | Plan for the "Do" | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | 1 | | |
| | What do teachers need | | |
| | to do in order to meet | | |
| | the SWD SMART | | |
| | goal? | | |
| | Ī | | |
| | -What resources do we | | |
| | need? | | |
| | 1 | | |
| | -How will the lessons | | |
| | be designed to | | |
| | maximize the learning | | |
| | of SWD? | | |
| | 015115. | | |
| | -What checks-for- | | |
| 1 | understanding will | | |
| | we implement for our | | |
| | SWD? | | |
| | SWD! | | |
| | -What teaching | | |
| | twite cacining | | |
| | strategies/best practices | | |
| | will we use to neip | | |
| | SwD learn? | | |
| | G | | |
| | -Specifically now will | | |
| | we implement the | | |
| | strategy during | | |
| | the lesson'? | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 1 | going to do during the | | |
| | lesson for SWD? | | |
| | | | |
| | -What are SWD going | | |
| | to do during the lesson | | |
| | to maximize learning? | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | Reflect on the "Do"/ | | |
| | Analyze Checks for | | |
| | Understanding and | | |
| | will we use to help SWD learn? -Specifically how will we implement thestrategy 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"/Analyze Checks for Understanding and | | |

| Student Work during | i | |
|---|---|--|
| the unit. | | |
| ne unu. | | |
| For lessons that have | | |
| | | |
| already been taught within the unit of | | |
| within the unit of | | |
| instruction, teachers | | |
| reflect and discuss | | |
| one or more of the | | |
| following regarding | | |
| their SWD: | | |
| W/I / 1 1 1/1 1 | | |
| -What worked within | | |
| the lesson? How | | |
| do we know it was | | |
| successful? Why was it | | |
| successful? | | |
| W/L + 4 1 1 - 24 1 | | |
| -What didn't work | | |
| within the lesson? | | |
| Why? What are we | | |
| going to do next? | | |
| | | |
| -For the | | |
| implementation of | | |
| thestrategy, | | |
| what worked? How | | |
| do we know it was | | |
| successful? Why | | |
| was it successful? | | |
| What checks for | | |
| understanding were | | |
| used during the | | |
| lessons? | | |
| For the | | |
| -For the | | |
| implementation of the | | |
| strategy, what | | |
| didn't work? Why? | | |
| What are we going to | | |
| do next? | | |
| Will at | | |
| -What were the | | |
| outcomes of the checks | | |
| for understanding? | | |

| | And/or analysis of | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| | student performance? | | | |
| | periormance. | | | |
| | l | | | |
| | -How do we take | | | |
| | what we have learned | | | |
| | and apply it to future | | | |
| | and apply it to future | | | |
| | lessons? | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | D C ./C! 1 | | | |
| | Reflect/Check — | | | |
| | Analyze Data | | | |
| | | | | |
| | Discuss one or more of | I | | |
| | about the control of | I | | |
| | the following: | I | | |
| | | I | | |
| | -What is the SWD | I | | |
| | data? | I | | |
| | data: | | | |
| | | | | |
| | -What is the data | | | |
| | telling us as individual | | | |
| | teachers? | | | |
| | teachers? | | | |
| | | | | |
| | -What is the data telling | | | |
| | us as a grade level/ | | | |
| | PLC/department? | | | |
| | i Ec/department: | | | |
| | | | | |
| | -What are SWD not | | | |
| | learning? Why is this | | | |
| | occurring? | | | |
| | pecuring: | I | | |
| | I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I | I | | |
| | -Which SWD are | I | | |
| | learning? | I | | |
| | | I | | |
| | 1 1 | I | | |
| | 1 1 | I | | |
| | 1 1 | I | | |
| | Act on the Data | I | | |
| | | I | | |
| | A D 1.1 | I | | |
| | After data analysis, | I | | |
| | develop a plan to act on | I | | |
| | the data. | I | | |
| | | I | | |
| | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | I | | |
| | -What are we going | I | | |
| | to do about SWD not | I | | |
| | learning? | I | | |
| | rounning. | | | |

| | -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.

Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised January 2013

| PD Content /Topic | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator | PD Participants | Target Dates and Schedules | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|---|---|------------------------------------|---|
| and/or PLC Focus | | and/or | (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of | | |
| \/ (° 17 | | PLC Leader | 2.1 1 11 | meetings) | 01 | |
| Vertical Teams | Int. / Primary | Subject Area Coaches | School wide | Every other month | Observations | Administration |
| | K-5 | Lonsway | Teachers, Readers Worksho Overview Reading Coach | p Sept. 2012 | Observations/Coaching Cycles | Lonsway, Administration |
| Shared Reading | 3-5 | Lonsway | Teachers, Reading Coach | Sept. 2012 | Observations/Coaching Cycles | Lonsway, Administration |
| DRA 2/Running Records | K-5 | Lonsway | Teachers,Reading Coach | Sept. 2012 | Observations/Coaching Cycles | Lonsway, Administration |
| I-station | K-3 | Lonsway | Teachers, Reading Coach | Sept. 2012 | Observations/Coaching Cycles | Lonsway, Administration |
| Easy CBM | K-5 | Lonsway/ Densen | Teachers, Reading Coach, School Psychologist | Sept. 2012 | Observations, Data Chats, Coach | Lonsway, Densen, Administration, RTI Team |
| Team Planning | K, 5 | Lonsway | Grade Level Teachers | Nov. 2012, Dec. 2012 | Observations, Data Chats | Administration |
| Guided Reading | 3-5 | Lonsway | Teachers, Reading Coach | Sept. 2012 | Observations/Coaching Cycles | Lonsway, Administration |
| Text Dependent Questions | K-5 | Lonsway/ Churchwell | Teachers, Reading Coach, Writing Coach | Jan. 2013 | Observations/Coaching Cycles | Lonsway, Churchwell, Administration |
| K-1 CCSS Deepenin & Applying | ngK-1 | District Trainers | Grade Level Teachers | Dec. 2012 | Lesson Plans/Observations | Administration |
| CCSS Deepening | 2-5 | District Trainers | Grade Level Teachers | July 31, 2013 | Observations/Lesson Plans | Administration |

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 Achieveme nt | | | | |
|--|---|------------------------|--|-------------------------|--|
| 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 | 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 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | |
|--------------------------|----------------|----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------|--|
| scoring proficient in | 1.1 | 1.1 | | | *** | |
| | | a | XX/1 _{0.00} | Calcal bas a sustain fair | | |
| mathematics (Level 3-5). | | <u>Strategy</u> | Who_ | School has a system for | | |
| | infrastructure | a | Dula da d | PLCs to record and report | | |
| | | Students' math | -Principal | during-the-grading period | | |
| | technology | achievement | | SMART goal outcomes to | | |
| | | improves | -AP | administration, coach, SAL, | | |
| | -Lack of | through the use | l | and/or leadership team. | | |
| | technology | of <u>technology</u> | -Instruction Coaches | | | |
| | hardware | and hands- | l | | | |
| | | on activities to | -Subject Area Leaders | | | |
| | -Teachers | implement the | | | | |
| | at varying | Common Core | -PLC facilitators of | | | |
| | | | like grades and/or like | | | |
| | | addition, student | courses | | | |
| | the CCSS | practice taking on- | | | | |
| | | line assessments | | | | |
| | | to prepare students | L | | | |
| | | for on-line state | <u>How</u> | | | |
| | | testing. | L | | | |
| | | | PLCS turn their logs |] | | |
| | | | into administration and | | | |
| | | Action Steps | or coach after a unit of | | | |
| | | | instruction is complete. | | | |
| | | -PLCs use their | l | | | |
| | | core curriculum | -PLCs receive feedback | C | | |
| | | information | on their logs. | | | |
| | | to learn more | | | | |
| | | about hands-on | -Administrators and | | | |
| | | and technology | coaches attend targeted | | | |
| | | activities. | PLC meetings | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | -Additional | -Progress of PLCs | | | |
| | | action steps for | discussed at Leadership | | | |
| | | this strategy are | Team | | | |
| | | outlined on grade | | | | |
| | | level/content area | -Administration shares | | | |
| | | PLC action plans. | the data of PLC visits | | | |
| | | F-3310. | with staff on a monthly | | | |
| | | | basis. | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| Mathematics Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 40% to 45%. | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance | | | |
|---|-----|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | 40% | 45% | | | |

| | | I | 1 | | | |
|------|--------------------|---------------------------|------|------|------|--|
| 1.2. | 1.2 | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | | | | | |
| | -Teachers are | Strategy/Task_ | | | | |
| | | Strategy/ rask | | | | |
| | at varying skill | G. 1 | | | | |
| | | Students math | | | | |
| | | achievement improves | | | | |
| | techniques. | through frequent | | | | |
| | 1 | participation in higher | | | | |
| | -PLC meetings | order questions/ | | | | |
| | need to focus on | discussion activities | | | | |
| | identifying and | to deepen and extend | | | | |
| | identifying and | student knowledge. | | | | |
| | writing higher | | | | | |
| | order questions to | These quality | | | | |
| | deliver during the | questions/prompts and | | | | |
| | lessons. | discussion techniques | | | | |
| | | promotes thinking | | | | |
| | -Finding time to | by students, assisting | | | | |
| | conduct Webb's | them to arrive at new | | | | |
| | Depth of | understandings of | | | | |
| | Knowledge walk- | complex material. | | | | |
| | Kilowieuge walk- | complex material. | | | | |
| | throughs is | | | | | |
| | sometimes | | | | | |
| | challenging. | l | | | | |
| | | Actions/Details | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | Within PLCs | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | -Teachers work to | | | | |
| | | improve upon both | | | | |
| | | individually and | | | | |
| | | collectively, the ability | | | | |
| | | to acceptional 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. | | | | |
| | | acmevement. | | | | |
| | | I | | | | |
| | | -Teachers plan for | | | | |
| | | scaffolding questions | | | | |

| | | and activities to meet | |
|---|---|--------------------------|-----|
| | | the differentiated needs | |
| | | of students. | |
| | | of students. | |
| | | | |
| | | -After the lessons, | |
| | | teachers examine | |
| | | cachers examine | |
| | | student work samples | |
| | | and classroom | |
| | | questions using | |
| | | Webb's Depth of | |
| | | West Septimo | |
| | | Knowledge to evaluate | |
| | | the sophistication/ | |
| | | complexity of students' | |
| | 1 | thinking. | |
| | 1 | | |
| | 1 | | |
| I | 1 | -Use student | - [|
| 1 | | data to identify | - 1 |
| I | | successful higher | - [|
| I | | order questioning | - [|
| | | order questioning | |
| | | techniques for future | |
| | | implementation. | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | In the classroom | |
| | | | |
| | | During the lessons. | |
| | | teachers: | |
| | | <u>teachers.</u> | |
| | | | |
| I | 1 | -Ask questions and/ | - [|
| | | or provides activities | - 1 |
| | 1 | that require students | |
| I | 1 | inat require students | - [|
| | 1 | to engage in frequent | |
| | | higher order thinking | - 1 |
| I | 1 | as defined by Webb's | - [|
| | | Depth of Knowledge. | - 1 |
| | 1 | popul of Kilowicage. | - [|
| | | | - 1 |
| I | | -Wait for full attention | - [|
| I | 1 | from the class before | - [|
| | | asking questions. | - 1 |
| | | Francisco | - 1 |
| | | | - 1 |
| | 1 | -Provide students with | - [|
| | 1 | wait time. | - [|
| I | 1 | | - [|
| 1 | 1 | -Use probing questions | |
| | | | |

| | |
|-------------|--|
| | to encourage students |
| | to elaborate and |
| | humout occartions and |
| | support assertions and |
| | claims drawn from the |
| | text/content. |
| | |
| | |
| | -Allow students to |
| | "unpack their thinking" |
| | by describing how they |
| | by describing now they |
| | arrive at an answer. |
| | |
| | -Encourage discussion |
| | Elicotrage discussion |
| | by using open-ended |
| | questions. |
| | |
| | |
| | -Ask questions with |
| | multiple correct |
| | answers or multiple |
| | answers of multiple |
| | approaches. |
| | |
| | -Scaffold questions |
| | to halo attractors |
| | to help students with |
| | incorrect answers. |
| | |
| | -Engage all students |
| | Engage an students |
| | in the discussion and |
| | ensure that all voices |
| | are heard. |
| | are neard. |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | During the lessons. |
| | students: |
| | Production . |
| | |
| | -Have opportunities to |
| | formulate many of the |
| | high-level questions |
| | ingii-ievei questions |
| | based on the text/ |
| | content. |
| | |
| | The second of th |
| | -Have time to reflect on |
| | classroom discussion |
| | to increase their |
| | 10 Herenov 111911 |

| | | | understanding (and without teacher mediation). | | | | |
|--|------------------------|----------|--|--|-------------------------|------|--|
| | | | School Leadership | | | | |
| | | | -The coach/resource teacher/PLC member/ administrator collects higher order questioning walk- through data using Webb's Depth of Knowledge wheel. | | | | |
| | | | -Monthly, school leaders conduct one- on-one data chats with individual teachers using the data gathered from walk-through tools. This teacher data/chats guides the leadership's team professional development plan (both individually and whole faculty). | | | | |
| | | 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 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

| scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics. | | See Goals 1, 3 & 4 | | 2.1. | 2.1. | | |
|---|---------------------------|---|------|------|------|------|--|
| Mathematics Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 11% to 14%. | Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance.* 14% | | | | | |
| | | 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: | | 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 | 3.1. | 3.1. | 3.1. | 3.1. | 3.1. | |
|--------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------|--|
| students making learning | | | | | | |
| gains in mathematics. | -PLCs struggle | Strategy | Who | School has a system for | | |
| gums m muchemutes. | with how | | | PLCs to record and report | | |
| | | Students' math | -Principal | during-the-grading period | | |
| | curriculum and | | | SMART goal outcomes to | | |
| | | | -AP | administration, coach, SAL, | | |
| | discussion to | teachers working | | and/or leadership team. | | |
| | deepen their | collaboratively | -Instruction Coaches | • | | |
| | leaning. To | to focus on | | | | |
| | | student learning. | -Subject Area Leaders | | | |
| | | Specifically, they | | | | |
| | | use the <u>Plan-</u> | -PLC facilitators of | | | |
| | | Do-Check-Act | like grades and/or like | | | |
| | | model and log to | courses | | | |
| | | structure their way | | | | |
| | | of work. Using | | | | |
| | | the backwards | TT | | | |
| | | 4401911111044011101 | <u>How</u> | | | |
| | | units of instruction, | PLCS turn their logs | | | |
| | | cachers rocas on | into administration and | | | |
| | | une rome ming roun | or coach after a unit of | | | |
| | | questions: | instruction is complete. | | | |
| | | 1. What is it we | instruction is complete. | | | |
| | | avnect them to | -PLCs receive feedback | | | |
| | | learn? | on their logs. | | | |
| | | icarii: | | | | |
| | | 2. How will we | -Administrators and | | | |
| | | know if they | coaches attend targeted | | | |
| | | have learned | PLC meetings | | | |
| | | it? | | | | |
| | | | -Progress of PLCs | | | |
| | | 3. How will we | discussed at Leadership | 1 | | |
| | | respond if | Team | | | |
| | ĺ | they don't | l | | | |
| | | learn? | -Administration shares | | | |
| | ĺ | | the data of PLC visits | | | |
| | ĺ | 110 | with staff on a monthly | | | |
| | ĺ | respond ii | basis. | | | |
| | | they already | | | | |
| | | know it? | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | ĺ | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

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

| Actions/Details | | |
|---|--|------|
| | | |
| -This year, the | | |
| like-course PLCs | | |
| will administer | | |
| common end- | | |
| of-chapter assessments. The | | |
| assessments will | | |
| be identified/ | | |
| generated prior to | | |
| the teaching of the | | |
| unit. | | |
| | | |
| -Grade level/ | | |
| like-course PLCs | | |
| use a Plan-Do- | | |
| Check-Act "Unit | | |
| of Instruction" | | |
| log to guide their | | |
| discussion and | | |
| way of work. | | |
| Discussions are | | |
| summarized on log. | | |
| A 1177 1 | | |
| -Additional | | |
| action steps for | | |
| this strategy are | | |
| outlined on grade level/content area | | |
| PLC action plans. | | |
| Le action plans. | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

| Mathematics Goal #3: | | 2013 Expected Level | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|--|--|--|
| | <u>Level of</u> | of Performance:* | | | |
| | Performance:* | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Points earned from students | | | | | |
| making learning gains on the | | | | | |
| 2013 FCAT Math will increase | | | | | |
| from 51 points to 56 points. | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | 51 | 56 | | | |
| | D1 | Pu | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | l • | l | | | |
| | points | points | | | |

| 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | |
|------|--------------------|-------------------------------|---|----------------------------|----------|--|
| | 3.2. | r | | - · - · | [| |
| | | Strategy/Task | Who | Teacher Level | | |
| | Teachers tend to | Strategy/ rask | <u>wno</u> | reaction Level | | |
| | only differentiate | Students' math | -Principal | -Teachers reflect on | | |
| | after the lesson | achievement improves | -i iliicipai | lesson outcomes and use | | |
| | is taught instead | when teachers use | -AP | this knowledge to drive | | |
| | of planning how | on-going student | -Ar | future instruction. | | |
| | to differentiate | | Instruction Cooches | luture mstruction. | | |
| | the lesson when | data to differentiate | -Instruction Coaches | Teachers maintain their | | |
| | new content is | instruction. | Calainet Aman I and ama | assessments in the on-line | | |
| | presented. | | -Subject Area Leaders | | | |
| | | | DI C C - 114-4 C111 - | grading system. | | |
| | -Teachers are | L | -PLC facilitators of like | T 1 11 11 | | |
| | at varying | Actions/Details_ | grades and/or like courses | -Teachers use the on-line | | |
| | levels of using | Heat Dic D c | | grading system data to | | |
| | Differentiated | Within PLCs <u>Before</u> | | calculate their students' | | |
| | Instruction | Instruction and | How | progress towards the | | |
| | strategies. | During Instruction of | <u>How</u> | development of their | | |
| | | New Content | PLCS turn their logs into | individual/PLC SMART | | |
| | Teachers tend to | | administration and/or coach | Goal. | | |
| | give all students | -Using data from | | | | |
| | the same lesson, | previous assessments | after a unit of instruction is | PLC Level | | |
| | handouts, etc. | and daily classroom | complete. | | | |
| | | performance/ | DI Committee Continued | -Using the individual | | |
| | | work, teachers | -PLCs receive feedback on | teacher data, PLCs | | |
| | | plan Differentiated | their logs. | calculate the SMART | | |
| | | Instruction groupings | | goal data across all | | |
| | | and activities for the | -Administrators and | classes/courses. | | |
| | | delivery of new content | coaches attend targeted PLC | | | |
| | | in upcoming lessons. | meetings | -PLCs reflect on lesson | | |
| | | | n chica ii | outcomes and data used to | | |
| | | In the classroom | -Progress of PLCs discussed | drive future instruction. | | |
| | | | at Leadership Team | | | |
| | | -During the lessons, | A 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | - For each class/course, | | |
| | | students are involved | | PLCs chart their overall | | |
| | | m memore grouping | data of PLC visits with staff | progress towards the | | |
| | | techniques | on a monthly basis. | SMART Goal. | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | PLCs <u>After</u> Instruction | | Leadership Team Level | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | -Teachers reflect and | | -PLC facilitator/ | | |
| | | discuss the outcome of | | Subject Area Leader/ | | |
| | | their DI lessons. | | Department Heads shares | | |
| | | | | SMART Goal data with | | |
| | | -Use student data to | | the Problem Solving | | |

| | | | identify successful DI techniques for future implementation. -Using a problem-solving question protocol, identify students who need re-teaching/interventions and how that instruction | | Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. | | |
|--|------------------------|------|---|--|--|------|--|
| | | | will be provided. (Questions are listed in the 2012-2013 Technical Assistance Document under the Differentiation Cross Content strategy)Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/ content area PLCs. | | | | |
| | | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. | 33. | 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 | | 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 | 4.1. | 4.1. | 4.1. | 4.1. | 4.1. | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|---|--------|--|
| | 7.1. | 7.1. | π.1. | | т. 1 . | |
| students in Lowest 25% | 0.11.15 | C4 4 A | X X 71 | T1:612 | | |
| making learning gains in | | | <u>Who</u> | -Tracking of coach's | | |
| mathematics. | time for the | all Content Areas | Administration | participation in PLCs. | | |
| | principal/APC | | Administration | T1:612 | | |
| | to meet with | | | -Tracking of coach's | | |
| | the academic | Strategy/Task_ | | interactions with teachers | | |
| | couch on a | | тт. | (planning, co-teaching, | | |
| | regular basis. | Students' math | | modeling, de-debriefing, professional development, | | |
| | -Teachers | achievement | | | | |
| | | improves through | -Review of coach's log | and walk infoughs. | | |
| | willingness to | teachers' | Darriana af a a a la 'a 1a a | -Administrator-Instructional | | |
| | accept support from the coach. | <u>collaboration</u> | | | | |
| | from the coach. | with the academic | of support to targeted | Coach meetings to review log and discuss action plan | | |
| | | coach in all content | | for coach for the upcoming | | |
| | | areas. | | two weeks. | | |
| | | | throughs of coaches | iwo weeks. | | |
| | | | working with teachers | | | |
| | | | (either in classrooms, | | | |
| | | Actions/Details | PLCs or planning | | | |
| | | | sessions) | | | |
| | | Academic Coach | 565510115) | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | 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 | | | | |
| | | subjects' PLCs to: | | | | |
| | | l | | | | |
| | | Facilitate lesson | | | | |
| | | planning that | | | | |
| | | embeds rigorous | | | | |
| | | tasks | | | | |
| | | B 333 | | | | |
| | | Facilitate | | | | |

| development, | | |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| writing, selection | | |
| of higher-order, | | |
| text-dependent | | |
| and at it and a stimition | | |
| questions/activities, | | |
| with an emphasis | | |
| on Webb's Depth | | |
| of Knowledge | | |
| question hierarchy | | |
| <u> </u> | | |
| Facilitate the | | |
| identification, | | |
| selection, | | |
| 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 | | |
| through data, the | | |
| academic coach | | |
| and administration | | |
| identify teachers | | |
| for support in | | |
| co-planning, | | |
| modeling, co- | | |
| teaching, observing | | |
| and debriefing. | | |
| and deorioning. | | |
| -The academic | | |
| and trains and | | |
| coach trains each | | |
| subject area PLC | | |

| | on how to facilitate | | |
|-----|----------------------|--|--|
| | their own PLC | | |
| | using structured | | |
| | protocols. | | |
| | protocois. | | |
| | | | |
| | -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 | | |
| | in used for fatare | | |
| | is used for future | | |
| | professional | | |
| | development, both | | |
| | individually and as | | |
| | a department. | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | L | | |
| | Leadership Team | | |
| | and Coach | | |
| | | | |
| | -The academic | | |
| | coach meets with | | |
| | the principal/APC | | |
| | to man out a bigh | | |
| | to map out a high- | | |
| | level summary plan | | |
| | of action for the | | |
| | school year. | | |
| | | | |
| | -Every two weeks, | | |
| | the academic | | |
| | coach meets with | | |
| | the main aireal/A DC | | |
| | the principal/APC | | |
| | to: | | |
| | | | |
| | Review log and | | |
| | work accomplished | | |
| | and | | |
| | | | |
| 1 I | | | |

| | points | points | | | |
|--|--------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | 31 | 34 | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| FCAT Math will increase from 31 points to 34 points. | | | | | |
| Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 | | | | | |
| Daints corned from students | Performance:* | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #4: | 2012 Current Level of | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | |
| | | detailed plan of action for the next two weeks. | | | |
| | | Develop a | | | |

| 4.2 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2. | 4.2. | |
|-----------|---|--|--------------------------|------|--|
| | I | | | | |
| The Ex | xtended <u>Strategy</u> | Who | Supplemental data shared | | |
| | ng Program | | with leadership and | | |
| (ELP) c | does not Students' math | Administrators | classroom teachers who | | |
| always | | | have students. | | |
| | cific skill through receiving | | | | |
| | esses of the ELP supplemental | L | | | |
| | ts or collect instruction on | How Monitored | | | |
| | an ongoing targeted skills that are | 1 4 1 | | | |
| basis. | not at the mastery leve | l. Administrators will review the communication logs and | | | |
| -Not al | waye a | data collection used between | | | |
| | correlation | teachers and ELP teachers | | | |
| | n what the Action Steps | outlining skills that need | | | |
| | ts is missing | remediation. | | | |
| in the ro | | | | | |
| classroo | om and the communicate with the | | | | |
| instruct | tion received ELP teachers regardin | g | | | |
| during 1 | | | | | |
| | students have not | | | | |
| -Minim | | | | | |
| | inication | | | | |
| | n regular -ELP teachers identify | | | | |
| and EL | P teachers. lessons for students | | | | |
| | that target specific skills that are not at the | | | | |
| | mastery level. | | | | |
| | 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. | | | | |
| | teacher. | | | | |
| | -When the students | | | | |
| | have mastered the | | | | |
| | specific skill, they are | | | | |
| | exited from the ELP | | | | |

| | | l | nrogram | i | i | | |
|---|-------------|-----------|----------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|--|
| | | | program. | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 4.3 | 4.3. | 4.3. | 4.3. | 4.3. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student | Anticipated | Strategy | Fidelity Check | Strategy Data Check | Student Evaluation Tool | | |
| achievement data, and reference | Barrier | [g | | | | | |
| to "Guiding Questions", identify | | | Who and how will the | How will the evaluation tool | | | |
| and define areas in need of | | | | data be used to determine the | | | |
| improvement for the following subgroup: | | | | effectiveness of strategy? | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Based on Ambitious but | | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | |
| Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and | | | | | | | |
| Math Performance Target | | | | | | | |
| 5. Ambitious but | | | | | | | |
| Achievable Annual | | | | | | | |
| Measurable Objectives | | | | | | | |
| (AMOs). In six year | | | | | | | |
| school will reduce their | | | | | | | |
| achievement gap by 50%. | | | | | | | |
| Math Goal #5: | | | | | | | |
| iviam Goai π3. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | I | I | ĺ | I | | |

| satisfactory progress in | White: Black: | See goals 1, 3 & 4 | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | |
|--|---------------------------|-----------------------|-------|-------|--|
| | Hispanic: Asian: | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | American Indian: | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Reading Goal #5A: | 2012 Current | 2013 Expected Level | | | |
| | Level of Performance:* | of Performance:* | | | |
| | | | | | |
| The percentage of Black_ | | | | | |
| students scoring proficient/ | | | | | |
| satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Math will increase | | | | | |
| from42 % to 48%. | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| | White: | White: | | | | | |
|---|------------------------|------------------|-------|--|-------------------------|-------|--|
| | Black:42 | Black48: | | | | | |
| | Hispanic:25 | Hispanic:33 | | | | | |
| | Asian: | Asian: | | | | | |
| | Indian: | American Indian: | | | | | |
| | | 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 Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | | |
| 5B. Economically Disadvantaged students | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | | |
| not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| Mathematics Goal #5B: . The percentage of Econ. Dis. students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 5% to 15%. | <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u> | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|---|--|-------------------------|-------|--|
| | 39 | 45 | | | | | |
| | | 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 | | |

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

| 5C English Language | 5C.1 | 5C.1 | 5C.1 | 5C.1 | 5C.1. | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|-------|--|
| 5C. English Language | SC.1 | PC.1 | DC.1 | SC.1 | be.1. | |
| Learners (ELL) not | | | | | | |
| making satisfactory | | | <u>Who</u> | <u> Teacher Level</u> | | |
| progress in mathematics. | proficiency of | comprehension | | | | |
| | ELL students | of course | -School based | -Teachers reflect on lesson | | |
| | in our student | content/standard | Administrators | outcomes and use this | | |
| | is of high | improves through | | knowledge to drive future | | |
| | priority. | participation in | -District Resource | instruction. | | |
| | | the Cognitive | Teachers | | | |
| | -The majority | Academic | | -Teachers use the on-line | | |
| | of the math | Language | -ESOL Resource | grading system data to | | |
| | teachers are | Learning | Teachers | calculate their students' | | |
| | unfamiliar with | Approach | | progress towards their PLC | | |
| | this strategy. | (CALLA) strategy | | and/or individual ELL | | |
| | To address | in math. | | SMART Goal | | |
| | this barrier, | | How | _ | | |
| | the school | | | PLC Level | | |
| | will schedule | | -Administrative and | | | |
| | professional | Action Steps | | -Using the individual teacher | 1 | |
| | development | 1 | ERT walk-throughs | data, PLCs calculate the | | |
| | delivered by | -ESOL Resource | using the walkthrough | ELL SMART goal data | | |
| | | Teacher (ERT) | form from: | across all classes/courses. | | |
| | ERT. | provides | | | | |
| | | professional | The CALLA | -PLCs reflect on lesson | | |
| | | | | outcomes and data used to | | |
| | implementation | math area teachers | Table 5.4 "Checklist | drive future instruction. | | |
| | | | for Evaluating CALLA | | | |
| | not consistent | CALLA into core | Instruction | -ERTs meet with Math | | |
| | across math | content lessons. | | PLCs on a rotating basis to | | |
| | courses. | | | assist with the analysis of | | |
| | | -ERT models | | ELLs performance data. | | |
| | -ELLs at | lessons using | | | | |
| | , , | CALLA. | | -For each class/course, PLCs | | |
| | of | | | chart their overall progress | | |
| | | -ERT observes | | towards the ELL SMART | | |
| | English | content area | | Goal. | | |
| | | teachers using | | | | |
| | acquisition and | | | Leadership Team Level | | |
| | | provides feedback, | | Processing to the | | |
| | | coaching and | | -PLC facilitator/ Subject | | |
| | across core | support. | | Area Leader/ Department | | |
| | courses. | D: . : . B | | Heads shares SMART | | |
| | A double to | -District Resource | | Goal data with the Problem | | |
| | -Administrators | | | Solving Leadership Team. | | |
| | at varying | (DRTs) provide | | | | |

| 1 | | | | |
|----------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| skill levels | professional | -Data is used to drive | | |
| regarding use | development to | teacher support and student | | |
| | all administrators | supplemental instruction. | | |
| in order to | on how to conduct | | | |
| effectively | walk-through | -ERTs meet with RtI team to | | |
| conduct a | fidelity checks for | review performance data and | | |
| CALLA | use of CALLA. | progress of ELLs (inclusive | | |
| fidelity check | | of LFs) | | |
| | -Math teachers | ŕ | | |
| | set SMART goals | | | |
| | for ELL students | | | |
| | for upcoming | | | |
| | core curriculum | | | |
| | assessments. | | | |
| | | | | |
| | -Math teachers | | | |
| | administer and | | | |
| | analyze ELLs. In | | | |
| | particular, teachers | | | |
| | aggregate data | | | |
| | to determine the | | | |
| | performance of | | | |
| | ELLs compared to | | | |
| | the whole group. | | | |
| | | | | |
| | -Based on data | | | |
| | math teachers | | | |
| | differentiate | | | |
| | instruction to | | | |
| | remediate/enhance | | | |
| | instruction. | | | |

| | <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u> | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| FAA Math will increase from 31% to 38%. | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | 31 | 38 | | | |

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

| 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2 | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | |
|----------|---------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|---|-------|--|
| J PC.2. | JC.2. | JC.2. | DC.2 | DC.2. | DC.2. | |
| | | | | L | | |
| | | | <u>Who</u> | <u> Teacher Level</u> | | |
| | | LYC) comprehension | | <u></u> | | |
| | | of course content/ | -School based | -Teachers reflect on | | |
| | | standards increases in | Administrators | lesson outcomes and use | | |
| | | math through the use | | this knowledge to drive | | |
| | | of the district's on- | -District Resource Teachers | future instruction. | | |
| | | line program <u>A+Rise</u> | | | | |
| | | located on IDEAS | -ESOL Resource Teachers | -Teachers use the on-line | | |
| | are unfamiliar | under Programs for | | grading system data to | | |
| | with this strategy. | ELL. | | calculate their students' | | |
| | To address this | | | progress towards their | | |
| | barrier, the school | | How | PLC and/or individual | | |
| | will schedule | | | ELL SMART Goal | | |
| | professional | Action Steps | -Administrative and | _ | | |
| | development | * | | PLC Level | | |
| | | -ESOL Resource | ERT walk-throughs looking | | | |
| | 3 | | for implementation of A+ | -Using the individual | | |
| | | \ / | Rise strategies. | teacher data, PLCs | | |
| | | development to all | | calculate the ELL | | |
| | | math area teachers on | | SMART goal data across | | |
| | | how to access and use | | all classes/courses. | | |
| | | A+ Rise Strategies | | an classes, coarses. | | |
| | | for ELLs at http:// | | -PLCs reflect on lesson | | |
| | core courses. | arises2s.com/s2s/ into | | outcomes and data used to | | |
| | | math lessons. | | drive future instruction. | 1 | |
| | at varying skill | matii iessons. | | drive ruture mistruction. | | |
| | levels regarding | - ERT models lessons | | -ERTs meet with Math | | |
| | | using A+ Rise | | PLCs on a rotating basis | | |
| | | Strategies for ELLs. | | to assist with the analysis | | |
| | conduct an A+ | Budiegies for ELLs. | | of ELLs performance | | |
| | | - ERT observes content | | data. | | |
| | | area teachers using | | data. | | |
| | | A+Rise and provides | | -For each class/course, | | |
| | | feedback, coaching and | | PLCs chart their overall | | |
| | | | | progress towards the ELL | | |
| | 5C.3 | support. | | progress towards the ELL SMART Goal. | | |
| | 1 0.5 | - District Resource | | DIVIAKT GOAL | | |
| | -Lack of | Teachers (DRTs) | | Leadership Team Level | | |
| | | | | Leadership ream Level | | |
| | <u>~</u> . | provide professional | | DI C facilitates | | |
| | | development to all | | -PLC facilitator/ | | |
| | accommodations | administrators on | | Subject Area Leader/ | | |
| | beyond FCAT | how to conduct walk- | | Department Heads shares | | |
| | beyond FCA1 | through fidelity checks | | SMART Goal data with | | |

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

| tes | sting. for use of A+ Rise | t | the Problem Solving | |
|------|------------------------------------|---|---------------------------|--|
| | Strategies for ELLs. | | Leadership Team. | |
| -Bi | Bilingual | | _ | |
| Ed | ducation | - | -Data is used to drive | |
| | nraprofessionals | | teacher support and | |
| | varying levels | | student supplemental | |
| | expertise in | i | instruction. | |
| | oviding heritage | | | |
| lan | nguage support. | | -ERTs meet with RtI team | |
| | | | to review performance | |
| | Allocation | | data and progress of ELLs | |
| | `Bilingual | | (inclusive of LFs) | |
| | ducation | | | |
| | nraprofessional | | | |
| | ependent on | | | |
| | embership of | | | |
| EL | LLs. | | | |
| 1 1, | dust interess on | | | |
| | Administrators | | | |
| | varying levels | | | |
| | expertise in | | | |
| | eing familiar with | | | |
| ine | e ELL Program iidelines and job | | | |
| gui | sponsibilities of | | | |
| | RT and Bilingual | | | |
| | iraprofessional. | | | |
| par | naprotessional. | | | |

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

| 5C.3 | 5C.3 | 5C.3 | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | |
|---------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|-------|-------|--|
| DC.3 | DC.3 | SC.3 | Je.3. | Je.3. | |
| L., | L., | | | | |
| | <u>Who</u> | Analyze math core | | | |
| LYB & LYC) | l., ,, , | curriculum and district | | | |
| | -School based | level assessments for | | | |
| | Administrators | ELL students. Correlate | | | |
| standards | | to accommodations to | | | |
| | -ESOL Resource | determine the most effective | | | |
| | Teachers | approach for individual | | | |
| the following | | students. | | | |
| day-to-day | | | | | |
| accommodations | L. | | | | |
| | <u>How</u> | | | | |
| and district | l., | | | | |
| | -Administrative and | | | | |
| math: | L | | | | |
| | ERT walk-throughs | | | | |
| | using the walk- | | | | |
| | throughs look for | | | | |
| assessments) | Committee Meeting | | | | |
| | Recommendations. In | | | | |
| | addition, tools from | | | | |
| | the RtI Handbook and | | | | |
| | ELL RtI Checklist, | | | | |
| | and ESOL Strategies | | | | |
| | Checklist can be used | | | | |
| assessments) | as walk-through forms | | | | |
| l., ,, , | | | | | |
| -Use of heritage | | | | | |
| language dictionary | | | | | |
| (lesson and | | | | | |
| assessments) | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student | 50.4 | 50.4 | 50.4 | 50.4 | Student Evaluation Tool | T | 1 |
|----------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|
| achievement data, and reference | PC.4 | 5C.4 | 5C.4 | 5C.4 | Student Evaluation 1001 | | |
| to "Guiding Questions", identify | | | | | | | |
| and define areas in need of | -Improving the | ELLs (LYA, | Who | Teacher Level | | | |
| improvement for the following | proficiency of | LYB & LYC) | | | | | |
| subgroup: | ELL students | comprehension | -School based | -Teachers reflect on lesson | | | |
| | in our school is | of course content/ | Administrators | outcomes and use this | | | |
| | | standards improves | | knowledge to drive future | | | |
| | | in math through | -ESOL Resource | instruction. | | | |
| | | teachers working | Teachers | | | | |
| | | collaboratively | | -Teachers use the on-line | | | |
| | | to focus on ELL | -PLC Facilitators | grading system data to | | | |
| | | student learning. | | calculate their students' | | | |
| | | Specifically, they | | progress towards their PLC | | | |
| | | use the Plan-Do- | | and/or individual ELL | | | |
| | the BEE level. | | How_ | SMART Goal | | | |
| | | to structure their | 110 11 | Sivir Her Gour. | | | |
| | | | PLC logs (with specific | PLC Level | | | |
| | | ELL students. | ELL information) for | I Le Level | | | |
| | | ELL students. | like courses/grades. | -Using the individual teacher | | | |
| | | | inc courses/grades. | data, PLCs calculate the | | | |
| | | | | ELL SMART goal data | | | |
| | | Action Steps | | across all classes/courses. | | | |
| | | Action Steps | | across an classes/courses. | | | |
| | | Teachers use | | -PLCs reflect on lesson | | | |
| | | time during PLCs | | outcomes and data used to | | | |
| | | to reinforce and | | drive future instruction. | | | |
| | | strengthen targeted | | drive future mistruction. | | | |
| | | ELL effective | | -ERTs meet with Math | | | |
| | | teaching strategies | | PLCs on a rotating basis to | | | |
| | | (CALLA and A+ | | assist with the analysis of | | | |
| | | Rise) in order to | | ELLs performance data. | | | |
| | | | | ELLS performance data. | | | |
| | 1 | integrate them into the math lessons. | | - For each class/course, | | | |
| | | me mam lessons. | | PLCs chart their overall | | | |
| | | Tanaharawaa | | | | | |
| | | -Teachers use | | progress towards the ELL | | | |
| | | time during PLCs | | SMART Goal. | | | |
| | 1 | to reinforce and | | Landamhia Tarre I e el | | | |
| | | strengthen targeted | | Leadership Team Level | | | |
| | | ELL Differentiated | | DI C Carillana de Cala | | | |
| | | Instruction lessons | | -PLC facilitator/ Subject | | | |
| | 1 | using the district | | Area Leader/ Department | | | |
| | | provided ELL | | Heads shares SMART | | | |
| | | Differentiated | | Goal data with the Problem | | | |
| | | Instruction binders | | Solving Leadership Team. | | | |
| | | (provided by the | I | | | I | |

| | | i i | | |
|-----|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| | | -Data is used to drive | | |
| | in math. | teacher support and student | | |
| | | supplemental instruction. | | |
| | -PLCs generate | | | |
| l | SMART goals for | -ERTs meet with RtI team to | | |
| | ELL students for | review performance data and | | |
| | upcoming units of | progress of ELLs (inclusive | | |
| | instruction. | of LFs) | | |
| | -PLCs/teachers | | | |
| | plan for upcoming | | | |
| | | | | |
| | lessons/units using | | | |
| l I | targeted CALLA, | | | |
| | A+ Rise strategies | | | |
| | and Differentiated Instruction | | | |
| | | | | |
| l I | strategies based on | | | |
| | ELLs needs. | | | |
| | -PLCs math | | | |
| | teachers plan for | | | |
| | accommodations | | | |
| | for core curriculum | | | |
| | content and | | | |
| | assessment. | | | |
| | -When conducting | | | |
| | data analysis on | | | |
| | core curriculum | | | |
| | assessments, PLCs | | | |
| | aggregate the ELL | | | |
| | | | | |
| | data. | | | |
| | -Based on the data, | | | |
| | PLCs/teachers | | | |
| | plan interventions | | | |
| | for targeted ELL | | | |
| | students using the | | | |
| | resources from | | | |
| | CALLA, A+ Rise, | | | |
| | and Differentiated | | | |
| | Instruction binders. | | | |

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

| 5D. Student with | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| Disabilities (SWD) not | D.1. | | | • • • | - · · | |
| making satisfactory | -Need to | Strategy | | | | |
| progress in mathematics. | provide | Strategy | | | | |
| progress in mathematics. | a school | SWD student | | | | |
| | | achievement | | | | |
| | | improves through | | | | |
| | procedure for | the <u>effective</u> | | | | |
| | regular and on- | and consistent | | | | |
| | going review | implementation | | | | |
| | of students' | of students' IEP | | | | |
| | IEPs by both | goals, strategies, | | | | |
| | the general | modifications, and | | | | |
| | education and | accommodations. | | | | |
| | ESE teacher. | | | | | |
| | To address this | -Throughout | | | | |
| | barrier, the | the school year, | | | | |
| | APC will put a | teachers of SWD | | | | |
| | system in place | review students' | | | | |
| | | IEPs to ensure | | | | |
| | year. | 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 | 1 | | | |
| | | modifications into | | | | |
| | | lessons. | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| Mathematics Goal #5D: | Level of | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
|---|--------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| The percentage of SWD | Performance: | | | | |
| scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 5% to15% | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | 5 | 15 | | | |

| 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | |
|-------|----------------------|-------------------------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| DD.2. | BD.2. | D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | |
| | | | | | | |
| | -Improving the | Strategy/Task_ | | | | |
| | proficiency of | | | | | |
| | SWD in our school | SWD student | | | | |
| | is of high priority. | achievement improves | | | | |
| | is of high priority. | | | | | |
| | l | through teachers' | | | | |
| | | implementation of | | | | |
| | support in drilling | the Plan-Do-Check- | | | | |
| | down their core | Act model in order to | | | | |
| | assessments to the | plan/carry out lessons/ | | | | |
| | | assessments with | | | | |
| | | appropriate strategies | | | | |
| | -General | and modifications. | | | | |
| | educational teacher | and mounications. | | | | [|
| | | | | | | |
| | and ESE teacher | | | | | |
| | need consistent, | | | | | [|
| | | <u>Actions</u> | | | | |
| | planning time. | | | | | |
| | ĺ | 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? | | | | [|
| | | l., .,, | | | | |
| | | -How will we assess | | | | |
| | | these skills/standards | | | | |
| | | for our SWD? | | | | [|
| | | | | | | |
| | | -What does mastery | | | | |
| | | look like? | | | | |
| | | ioon inc. | | | | |
| | | -What is the SMART | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | goal for this unit of | | | | |
| | | instruction for our | | | | |
| | | SWD? | | | | |

| | 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 |
| | tratagies/best practices |
| | 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 |
| | going to do during the lesson for SWD? |
| | |
| | -What are SWD student |
| | going to do during the |
| | lesson to maximize |
| | learning? |
| | |
| | |
| | Reflect on the "Do"/ |
| <u> </u> | · Variable and · · · · · |

| 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 reflect 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 | |
| 1 at a large 1 | |
| what we have learned | |
| and apply it to future | |
| lessons? | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Reflect/Check — | |
| Analyze Data | |
| որայւն քաա | |
| Diagram of the Control of the Contro | |
| Discuss one or more of | |
| the following: | |
| | |
| -What is the SWD | |
| data? | |
| | |
| -What is the data | |
| talling and an indicated | |
| 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 | |
| accounting? | |
| occurring? | |
| | |
| -Which SWD are | |
| learning? | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Act on the Data | |
| Act on the Data | |
| A from data amali- | |
| After data analysis, | |
| develop a plan to act on | |
| the data. | |
| | |
| -What are we going | |
| 0,0 | |

| to do abou learning? | at SWD not | | | |
|--|---|------|------|--|
| concepts/s that need i interventio | re-teaching/ ons (either ual SWD or | | | |
| -How are to re-teach differently | the skill | | | |
| | | | | |
| 5D.3 5D.3 | | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | |

Mathematics Professional Development

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

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

> PD Content /Topic Grade Level/ Subject

PD Facilitator

PD Participants

Target Dates and Schedules

Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring

Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

and/or PLC Focus

and/or

(e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)

(e.g., Early Release) and

Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)

PLC Leader CCSSM Deepening K-1

Math Coach

K-1 Teachers

9-12-12, 9-13-12

Walk-throughs, lesson plans

Administration

| CCSSM Deepening | 2 | Math Coach | 2 nd Grade Teachers | July 31, 2013 | Lesson Plans / Observations | Administration |
|----------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| Math Data Chats | All | Math Coach | School-wide | As needed | | Administration |
| Grade Level Planning | 1, 3 | Math Coach | Grade level teachers | Twice a month | Walk-throughs, lessons plans | Administration |
| Vertical Teams | Primary/Int. | Math Coach | Grade level teachers | Every other month | Observations | Administration |

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

| Science Goals | Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achieveme nt | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|----------------------------|--|
| 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 Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | |

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

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

| The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 35% to 40%. | | | | | |
|--|-----|-----|--|--|--|
| | 35% | 40% | | | |

| | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2 | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
|---|------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|------|--|
| | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2 | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | -PLCs struggle | Strategy_ | <u>Who</u> | School has a | | |
| | | with how | | | system for PLCs to | | |
| | | to structure | Student achievement | -Principal | record and report | | |
| | | curriculum | improves through teachers | | during-the-grading | | |
| | | | working collaboratively to | | period SMART | | |
| | | | focus on student learning | | goal outcomes to | | |
| | | | | -Instruction Coaches | administration, | | |
| | | | Model. Specifically, they | | coach, SAL, and/or | | |
| | | | use the Plan-Do-Check- | -Subject Area Leaders | leadership team. | | |
| | | | Act model to structure | Subject Tirea Deaders | leadership team. | | |
| | | | | PLC facilitators of like | | | |
| | | | | grades and/or like courses | | | |
| | | | | grades and/or like courses | | | |
| | | | design model for unit of | | | | |
| | | | instruction, teachers focus | | | | |
| | | | on the following four | How | | | |
| | | "Instructional | questions: | <u>110w</u> | | | |
| | | Unit" log. | | DI Cilerest and distant | | | |
| | | | 1. What is it we expect | -PLC logs turned into | | | |
| | | | | administration/coaches | | | |
| | | | | provides feedback | | | |
| | | 1.3 | 2. How will we know | | | | |
| | | | if they have learned | -Administrators attended | | | |
| | | -Teachers are | it? | targeted PLC meetings | | | |
| | | at varying skill | | | | | |
| | | levels in using | 3. How will we | -Progress of PLCs discussed | | | |
| | | appropriate | respond if they don't | at Leadership Team | | | |
| | | instructional, | learn? | ^ | | | |
| | | scientific and | icarii: | -Administration shares the | | | |
| | | laboratory | | data of PLC visits with staff | | | |
| | | technology | 4. How will we | on a monthly basis. | | | |
| | | (animations, | respond if they | :: <i></i> | | | |
| | | ` | already know it? | | | | |
| | | probeware, | | | | | |
| | | digital | | | | | |
| | | microscopy) | Actions/Details | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | -Administrators | Within PLCs: | | | | |
| | | are at varying | mun I LCs. | | | | |
| | | skill levels | -PLCs will use a PLC log | | | | |
| | | in using | | | | | |
| | | appropriate | to monitor the following: | | | | |
| | | instructional, | | | | | |
| | | scientific and | Guide their Plan-Do- | | | | |
| | | laboratory | Check-Act conversations | | | | |
| ţ | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | 1 | | |

| k 1 1 | |
|--------------|----------------------------|
| technology | and way of work. |
| (animations, | |
| probeware, | Monitor the frequency |
| digital | of meetings. All grade |
| microscopy) | level/subject area PLCs |
| | collaborate times |
| | per month for curriculum |
| | planning, reflection, and |
| | |
| | data analysis.) |
| | I |
| | -Working with the core |
| | curriculum, within grade |
| | level PLCs teachers will: |
| | |
| | Unpack the benchmark |
| | and identify what students |
| | need to understand, know, |
| | and do. |
| | and do. |
| | Nice Conductor Con |
| | Plan for checks for |
| | understanding during the |
| | unit. |
| | |
| | Plan for the End-of-Unit |
| | Assessment |
| | |
| | Plan upcoming lessons/ |
| | units using the 5E |
| | Instructional Model. |
| | institutional Prodes. |
| | Reflect on the outcome |
| | of lessons taught |
| | or respons taught |
| | Analysis shocks for |
| | Analyze checks for |
| | understanding and core |
| | curriculum assessments. |
| | |
| | Act on the core |
| | curriculum data by |
| | planning interventions for |
| | the whole class or small |
| | group. |
| | |
| | -PLCs will generate |
| | |
| | SMART goals for |

| upcoming units of instruction. | |
|---|--|
| -PLCs will report SMART goal data through their logs. | |
| As a Science Department | |
| -PLC, share action plan successes and challenges of the grade levels courses. | |
| -PLCs will adjust action plans based on teacher/coach walk-through data, PLC collaboration, and student data. | |

| | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3. | 1.3. | |
|-----|-----------------|--------------------------------|--|------|------|--|
| | | | | | | |
| | Strategy | Who | Teacher Level | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Student | Principal | -Teachers reflect on lesson | | | |
| | ınderstanding | | outcomes and use this | | | |
| | | APC | knowledge to drive future | | | |
| | of science | | instruction. | | | |
| | | Science Resource | | | | |
| | | Teachers (where available) | | | | |
| | mproves when | | grading system data to | | | |
| | | | calculate their students' | | | |
| | | | progress towards their PLC | | | |
| | active in | | and/or individual SMART | | | |
| | earning | | Goal | | | |
| | mportant and | TT NG '4 1 | DI CI I | | | |
| | | How Monitored | PLC Level | | | |
| | science content | Classes and smalle themes also | TTains the individual to show | | | |
| | | | -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the | | | |
| | nstructional | | SMART goal data across all | | | |
| | nethods, | | classes/courses. | | | |
| | scientific | | classes/courses. | | | |
| 1 | orocesses, | | -PLCs reflect on lesson | | | |
| | aboratory | | outcomes and data used to | | | |
| | experiences, | | drive future instruction. | | | |
| | and uses of | | | | | |
| | echnology | | - For each class/course, PLCs | | | |
| | animations, | | chart their overall progress | | | |
| | probeware, | | towards the SMART Goal. | | | |
| | ligital | | | | | |
| | nicroscopy). | | Leadership Team Level | | | |
| | | | -PLC facilitator/ Subject | | | |
| | Action Steps | | Area Leader/ Department | | | |
| j f | iction Steps | | Heads shares SMART | | | |
| | As a | | Goal data with the Problem | | | |
| | Professional | | Solving Leadership Team. | | | |
| | Development | | Borving Leadership Team. | | | |
| | activity in | | -Data is used to drive | | | |
| | heir PLCs, | | teacher support and student | | | |
| | eachers spend | | supplemental instruction. | | | |
| | ime sharing, | | 11 | | | |
| r | esearching, | | | | | |
| t | eaching, and | | | | | |

| | | |
|---------------------|--|------|
| modeling | | |
| technology | | |
| and hands-on | | |
| strategies. | | |
| strategies. | | |
| | | |
| -Within PLCs, | | |
| teachers plan | | |
| for engaging | | |
| exploration of | | |
| science content | | |
| science content | | |
| using hands- | | |
| on learning | | |
| experiences, | | |
| inquiry, labs, | | |
| technology | | |
| (such as | | |
| | | |
| probeware, | | |
| simulations and | | |
| animations) | | |
| within the 5E | | |
| Instructional | | |
| Model. | | |
| Wiodel. | | |
| -Teachers | | |
| - Teachers | | |
| implement the 5E | | |
| the 5E | | |
| Instructional | | |
| Model to | | |
| promote | | |
| learning | | |
| experiences | | |
| d. d | | |
| that cause | | |
| students to | | |
| think, make | | |
| connections, | | |
| formulate and | | |
| test hypotheses | | |
| and draw | | |
| and draw | | |
| conclusions. | | |
| <u> </u> | | |
| -Teachers | | |
| facilitate | | |
| student- | | |
| centered | | |
| learning | | |
| rearming | | |

| | | |
|-----------------|--|--|
| through the | | |
| use of the 5E | | |
| Instructional | | |
| Model. | | |
| Wiodei. | | |
| -Common | | |
| | | |
| Core Literacy | | |
| Standards for | | |
| both Reading | | |
| and Writing are | | |
| appropriately | | |
| embedded | | |
| throughout the | | |
| 5E Instruction | | |
| Model. | | |
| iviouci. | | |
| First deviation | | |
| -Each teacher | | |
| maintains a | | |
| record of the | | |
| number of | | |
| occurrences of | | |
| engagement | | |
| tasks (hands- | | |
| on-learning | | |
| experiences, | | |
| labs, and | | |
| technology) | | |
| per week. This | | |
| lada indian | | |
| data is then | | |
| reported on the | | |
| Science PLC | | |
| log. | | |
| | | |
| -Monthly, | | |
| school leaders | | |
| conduct one- | | |
| on-one data | | |
| chats with | | |
| individual | | |
| teachers | | |
| using the data | | |
| using the data | | |
| gathered from | | |
| walk-through | | |
| tools and | | |
| engagement | | |

| | | task records. These teacher data/chats guide the leadership's team professional development plan (both individually and whole | | | |
|--|------------------------|---|--|----------------------------|--|
| 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 Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | |

| 2. FCAT 2.0: Students 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 | Science PLC Resource | 2.1. | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------|--|
| scoring Achievement | | | meetings | | |
| Levels 4 or 5 in scienceNot all | Strategy | <u>Who</u> | | | |
| teachers have | | WIIO | Reading Leadership Team | | |
| received | Students' | Principal | Reading Leadership Team | | |
| the CCLS | comprehension | | | | |
| for Science | of science text | AP | | | |
| overview. | improves wher | | PLCs will track achievement | | |
| | students are | Science Coach | on the benchmark attached | | |
| -Not all | engaged in | | to the Close Reading | | |
| teachers | close reading | Reading Coach | passage comparing baseline | | |
| | owtechniques | | achievement level to 80% | | |
| to integrate | using on-grade | | mastery using the proximal | | |
| close readin | | | evaluation tool. | | |
| with the 5E | based text | CCLS Science Team | | | |
| instructional | (textbooks | | | | |
| model. | and other | Science SAL/DH | | | |
| | supplemental | | | | |
| -Not all PLC | | | | | |
| routinely loc | | | | | |
| at curriculur | | How Monitored | | | |
| materials | the <u>close</u> | | | | |
| beyond thos | | Administration, Coach, | | | |
| posted on th | | SAL walk-throughs | | | |
| curriculum | placed | DI Ciliana di manali india | | | |
| guide | within the 5E | -PLC logs turned into administration. | | | |
| | instructional model) using | administration. | | | |
| | their teythooks | -Administration provides | | | |
| | or other | feedback. | | | |
| | appropriate | l'ecuouek. | | | |
| | high-Lexile, | | | | |
| | complex | | | | |
| | supplemental | | | | |
| | texts at least | | | | |
| | times | | | | |
| | per nine weeks | . | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | F | | | | |
| | Action Steps | | | | |
| | n. c. · · | | | | |
| | Professional | | | | |
| | Development | | | | |
| | The Reading | | | | |

| Coach along | | |
|-----------------|--|--|
| with the | | |
| Departmental | | |
| Leaders/Coach/ | | |
| SAL conduct | | |
| small group | | |
| departmental | | |
| | | |
| 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. | | |
| | | |
| <u> </u> | | |

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

| | In PLCs/ | | |
|--------------|----------------------|--|--|
| | Department | | |
| | 7 | | |
| | -Teachers | | |
| | work in their | | |
| | PLCs to locate, | | |
| | discuss, and | | |
| | disseminate | | |
| | appropriate | | |
| | texts to | | |
| | texts to | | |
| | supplement | | |
| | their textbooks. | | |
| | DI G | | |
| | -PLCs review | | |
| 1 | Close Reading | | |
| | Selections to | | |
| | determine word | | |
| | count and high- | | |
| | Lexile. | | |
| | | | |
| | -PLCs assign | | |
| | appropriate NGSSS | | |
| | NGSSS | | |
| | benchmark to | | |
| | Close Reading | | |
| | passage | | |
| | | | |
| | -To increase | | |
| | stamina, | | |
| | teachers select | | |
| | high-Lexile, | | |
| | complex and | | |
| 1 | rigorous texts | | |
| 1 | that are shorter | | |
| 1 | and progress | | |
| 1 | throughout the | | |
| 1 | year to longer | | |
| 1 | texts that are | | |
| | high-Lexile, | | |
| 1 | complex and | | |
| 1 | rigorous_ | | |
| | | | |
| 1 | - Teachers | | |
| 1 | debrief lesson | | |
| | implementation | | |
| 11711 1 2012 | mprementation | | |

| | | |
|-----------------|------|------|
| 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: | | |
| icuchers. | | |
| -Guide students | | |
| through tout | | |
| through text | | |
| without reading | | |
| or explaining | | |
| the meaning of | | |
| the text using | | |
| the following: | | |
| | | |
| Introducing | | |
| critical | | |
| vocabulary | | |
| to ensure | | |
| comprehension | | |
| of text. | | |
| or text. | | |
| Ctatin a | | |
| Stating | | |
| an essential | | |
| question prior | | |
| to reading | | |
| | | |
| Using | | |
| questions | | |
| to check for | | |
| understanding. | | |
| <u>3</u> . | | |
| Using | | |
| O Sing | | |

| <u> </u> | | |
|------------------|--|--|
| question to | | |
| engage students | | |
| in discussion. | | |
| | | |
| Requiring | | |
| oral and written | | |
| 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, | | |
| 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. | | |
| evidence. | | |

| Level of Performance:* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|-------------|--|-------------|--|
| 3% | 6% | | | | |
| | | 2.2. 2.3 | | 2.2. 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 Grade Level/ Subject PD Facilitator

PD Participants

Target Dates and Schedules

Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring

Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

and/or PLC Focus

and/or
PLC Leader

(e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)

Sch

(e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of

meetings)

| Purposeful Planning | K-5 | Science Coach/ Academic Coach | Teachers, Coaches | October - reschedule | Observations/Coaching Cycles | Science Coach/Administration/Academic Coach |
|----------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|--|
| STEM Fair | K-5 | Science Coach/ Academic Coach | Teachers, Coaches | September | Observations | Science Coach/Administration |
| Grade Level | 2^{nd} , 5^{th} | Science Coach | Grade Level Teachers | Every other week | Observations, lesson plans | Administration |
| Planning Vertical Teams | Primary, Int. | Science Coach | Grade Level Teachers | Every other month | Observations | Administration |

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: | • | | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | |

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

| | specific writing | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | <u> </u> | | |
| | -Training to | | |
| | facilitate data- | | |
| | lacintate data- | | |
| | driven PLCs | | |
| | | | |
| | -Using data | | |
| | to identify | | |
| | to identify trends and drive | | |
| | instruction | | |
| | instruction | | |
| | T | | |
| | -Lesson planning | | |
| | based on the | | |
| | needs of students | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | <u>Do:</u> | | |
| | D0. | | |
| | D 11 / | | |
| | -Daily/ongoing | | |
| | models and | | |
| | application of | | |
| | appropriate mode-specific writing based on | | |
| | mode-specific | | |
| | writing based on | | |
| | to alive a sinte | | |
| | teaching points | | |
| | | | |
| | -Daily/ongoing | | |
| | -Daily/ongoing conferencing | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| I | | | |
| 1 | | | |
| I | | | |
| | <u>Check:</u> | | |
| 1 | | | |
| | Review of daily | | |
| | drafts and scoring | | |
| | monthly demand | | |
| I | writes | | |
| 1 | WIILES | | |
| | DI G II | | |
| | -PLC discussions | | |
| | and analysis of | | |
| | student writing to | | |
| | determine trends | | |
| | | | |

| | and needs | | <u>_</u> |
|-----|----------------------|--|----------|
| l l | and needs | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | 4 -4- | | |
| l l | Act: | | |
| | -Receive | | |
| | additional | | |
| | professional | | |
| | development in | | |
| l l | areas of need | | |
| l l | areas of fieed | | |
| | -Seek additional | | |
|] [| professional | | |
| | knowledge | | |
| | through book | | |
| | studies/research | | |
| | studies/research | | |
| | -Spread the | | |
| | use of effective | | |
| l [| practices across | | |
| | the school based | | |
| | on evidence | | |
| | shown in the best | | |
| | practice of others | | |
| | praedict of official | | |
| | -Use what is | | |
| | learned to begin | | |
| | the cycle again, | | |
| | revise as needed, | | |
| | increase scale if | | |
| | possible, etc. | | |
| | | | |
| | -Plan ongoing | | |
| | monitoring of the | | |
| | solution(s) | | |
| | `´ | | |
| | | | |

| | 75% | 78% | | | |
|---|------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | |
| students scoring Level 3.0 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes will increase from 75% to 78%. | | | | | |
| Writing/LA Goal #1: The percentage of | of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | |

| 1.2. | 1.2 | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
|------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|---|----------------------------|------|--|
| 1.2. | 1.2 | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | G | | | | |
| | -Improve the | <u>Strategy</u> | | Teacher Level | | |
| | teaching of | | *** | TD 1 (1) | | |
| | reading skills of | | <u>Who</u> | -Teachers reflect on | | |
| | Language Arts | writing, language, and | | lesson outcomes and | | |
| | teachers. | listening /speaking | -Principal | use this knowledge | | |
| | | skills improves through | | to drive future | | |
| | -Become more | engagement in college | -AP | instruction. | | |
| | proficient | and career preparatory | | L | | |
| | at pacing | lessons/activities/tasks | -Instruction Coaches | -Teachers maintain | | |
| | and teaching | that promote high levels | | their assessments in | | |
| | Springboard | of thinking. | - | the on-line grading | | |
| | lessons. | | | system. | | |
| | | | -PLC facilitators of like | | | |
| | 1.3. | | grades and/or like courses | -Teachers use the on- | | |
| | | Action Steps | | line grading system | | |
| | -PLCs struggle | | | data to calculate | | |
| | | Within PLCs | * * | their students' | | |
| | to structure | | <u>How</u> | progress towards | | |
| | curriculum and | Before the unit | DI CC 4 and the index a last | the development of | | |
| | data analysis | | PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach | their individual/PLC | | |
| | discussion to | | after a unit of instruction is | SMART Goal. | | |
| | deepen their | | | | | |
| | leaning. To | -Unpack an assessment and | complete. | PLC Level | | |
| | address this | rubric. | -PLCs receive feedback on | | | |
| | barrier, this year | | l | -Using the individual | | |
| | PLCs are being | Set Sivil little gould for the | | teacher data, PLCs | | |
| | trained to use the | unit of instruction. | | calculate the SMART | | |
| | Plan-Do-Check- | | -Administrators and coaches | goal data across all | | |
| | Act "Instructional | -Decide on a way to | attend targeted PLC meetings | classes/courses. | | |
| | Unit" log. | pre-assess the skills and | -Progress of PLCs discussed | DIG G | | |
| | | knowledge of students. | at Leadership Team | -PLCs reflect on | | |
| | | (* Flat pro descessification * Flat | - | lesson outcomes and | | |
| | | we all use?) | -Administration shares the | data used to drive | | |
| | | Cl | data of PLC visits with staff | future instruction. | | |
| | | Choose the uneron | on a monthly basis. | F 1 1 / | | |
| | | activities teachers will asc | • | -For each class/ | | |
| | | to assess students' | | course, PLCs chart | | |
| | | understanding along the | throughs looking for | their overall progress | | |
| | | | implementation of strategy | towards the SMART Goal. | | |
| | | | with fidelity and consistency. | Goal. | | |
| | | successes from the year | indentify and consistency. | Leadership Team | | |
| | | | -Administrator and coach | Leadership Team_ Level_ | | |
| | | before. | | <u>rever</u> | | |

| | • | 1 | | - | |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---|---|
| | | aggregates the walk-through | DI C C C TILL / | | |
| | | | -PLC facilitator/ | | |
| | | | Subject Area Leader/ | | |
| | | | Department Heads | | |
| | available). | | shares SMART Goal | | |
| | | | data with the Problem | | |
| | -Visit the pacing guide and | -Administration shares the | Solving Leadership | | |
| | determine the pacing for | | Team. | | |
| | the unit. | in PLC meetings on a | | | |
| | | monthly basis. | -Data is used to drive | | |
| | -Decide on common | | teacher support and | | |
| | terminology to use with | | student supplemental | | |
| | students and during PLC | | instruction. | | |
| | students and during PLC | | instruction. | | |
| | discussions. | | | | 1 |
| | T 1 (1) | | | | 1 |
| 1 | -Look at the grammar | | | | |
| | instruction opportunities | | | | 1 |
| | provided in the unit and | | | | |
| | determine their potential | | | | |
| | usage. | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | -Decide on | | | | |
| | which vocabulary terms | | | | |
| | need to be taught during the | | | | |
| | unit. | | | | |
| | unit. | | | | |
| | -Discuss the student's | | | | |
| | curriculum checklist. | | | | |
| | curriculum checklist. | | | | |
| | Determine here the DLC | | | | |
| 1 | -Determine how the PLC | | | | |
| | would like to grade the | | | | 1 |
| 1 | assessments in order for | | | | |
| 1 | there to be consistency | | | | |
| | among grade levels | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | L | | | | 1 |
| 1 | | | | | |
| | During the unit | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | -Determine: | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | What is working? | | | | 1 |
| | 1 | | | | |
| 1 | Is there a need to enrich th | e | | | |
| | instruction? How? | | | | 1 |
| | | | | | |

| |
|---|
| What isn't working? |
| Is there a need to supplement the instruction? How? |
| Are the needs of our ELL/ SWD being met? |
| How can civics be added into instruction? |
| Is there a need for a demonstration classroom and/or teacher swap? |
| -Conduct a pacing check. |
| -Bring anchor activities (artifacts) to assess student understanding. |
| -Discuss effective student placement (If plausible discuss how classroom environment might help a student that is struggling in a class. Could a change of class period or teacher help?) |
| -Plan strategies to differentiate. |
| -Plan higher order thinking questions. |
| -Discuss portfolio implementation (Success/Barriers). |
| -Discuss baseline date/data from anchor activities/data from EAs. |

| | -Determine whether teachers |
|--|---------------------------------|
| | want to add additional criteria |
| | to the EA rubric. |
| | |
| | -Discuss additions to the |
| | |
| | writer's checklists. |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | During the assessment |
| | |
| | A gree when a data when |
| | -Agree upon a date when |
| | all assessments need to be |
| | completed. |
| | |
| | -Discuss successes and |
| | challenges. |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | After the assessment |
| | |
| | Participate in an assessment |
| | Norming session (Data to |
| | be discussed after EAs are |
| | all scored) |
| | an scored) |
| | |
| | ⊢ I I I I |
| | |
| | After all assessments have |
| | been scored_ |
| | |
| | -Reflect on the unit. |
| | |
| | -Reflect on the |
| | Military of the DLC |
| | effectiveness of the PLC |
| | (survey). |
| | |
| | -Revisit portfolios. |
| | |
| | -Identify the skills |
| | students struggled with |
| | and determine which |
| | and determine which |
| | activities in further lessons |
| | will readdress the skills |

| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |
|---|--|
| needing to be re-taught or strengthened. | |
| | |
| -Recognize successes and | |
| celebrate. | |
| | |
| | |
| In the classroom | |
| During the lessons, | |
| teachers: | |
| Post assential questions | |
| -Post essential questions and daily objectives. | |
| | |
| -Explicitly reference | |
| connections between the following: essential | |
| questions, daily objective, | |
| and assessment. | |
| -Select learning strategies | |
| as needed. | |
| | |
| -Group students appropriately. | |
| | |
| -Scaffold instruction | |
| building towards higher complexity. | |
| | |
| -Model and provide | |
| opportunities for guided and independent practice | |
| of skills aligned with the | |
| assessment. | |
| -Select academic | |
| vocabulary from text to | |
| be used during a unit of | |
| instruction. | |
| -Use multiple types of | |
| formative assessment and | |

| provide consistent checks |
|-----------------------------|
| for student understanding. |
| |
| -Use data during the lesson |
| and after the assessment to |
| and after the assessment to |
| inform instruction. |
| |
| |
| |
| During the lessons. |
| students: |
| students. |
| |
| -Understand the criteria |
| which will be used to |
| evaluate their work. |
| |
| -Understand the purpose |
| Collection of the purpose |
| of the lesson and its |
| connection to the |
| assessment. |
| |
| -Think critically and |
| amostivaly und |
| creatively. |
| |
| -Actively draw upon prior |
| knowledge and use that |
| knowledge to connect with |
| lesson goals. |
| esson gouls. |
| War has board |
| -Know when, why, and |
| how to use strategies when |
| appropriate free of teacher |
| support. |
| |
| -Collaborate within |
| structured grouping. |
| piractured grouping. |
| |
| -Self assess understanding |
| of content. |
| |
| -Use academic vocabulary |
| in written and oral |
| |
| responses. |
| |
| |

| -Post exemplars of student work. | | After the lessons, teachers: | _ | | |
|----------------------------------|--|------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | _ | | | |
| -Self reflect on lessons. | | -Self reflect on lessons. | | | |

| | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3 | 1.3. | 1.3. | |
|---|------|------------------------------|---|--------------------|------|--|
| | 1.5. | 1.5. | 1.5 | 1.5. | 1.5. | |
| | | Gr. 4 | L | G 1 11 | | |
| | | <u>Strategy</u> | <u>Who</u> | School has a | | |
| | | | | system for PLCs to | | |
| | | Student achievement | -Principal | record and report | | |
| | | improves through teachers | | during-the-grading | | |
| | | working collaboratively to | -AP | period SMART | | |
| | | focus on student learning. | | goal outcomes to | | |
| | | Specifically, they use the | -Instruction Coaches | administration, | | |
| | | Plan-Do-Check-Act model | | coach, SAL, and/or | | |
| | | and log to structure their | -Subject Area Leaders | leadership team. | | |
| | | way of work. Using the | | | | |
| | | backwards design model | -PLC facilitators of like | | | |
| | | for units of instruction, | grades and/or like courses | | | |
| | | teachers focus on the | | | | |
| | | following four questions: | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 1 | | 1. What is it we expect | <u>How</u> | | | |
| | | them to learn? | | | | |
| | | | PLCS turn their logs into | | | |
| | | | administration and/or coach | | | |
| | | they have learned it? | after a unit of instruction is | | | |
| | | | complete. | | | |
| | | 3. How will we respond | | | | |
| | | if they don't learn? | -PLCs receive feedback on | | | |
| | | | their logs. | | | |
| | | 4. How will we respond | | | | |
| | | if they already know | -Administrators and coaches | | | |
| | | it? | attend targeted PLC meetings | 1 | | |
| | | | n cnr c r: | | | |
| | | | -Progress of PLCs discussed | | | |
| | | Actions/Details | at Leadership Team | | | |
| | | Actions/Details | A double to a double of | | | |
| | | -Grade level/like-course | -Administration shares the | | | |
| | | PLCs use a Plan-Do- | data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis. | | | |
| | | Check-Act "Unit of | on a monuny basis. | | | |
| | | Instruction" log to guide | | | | |
| | | their discussion and way | | | | |
| | | of work. Discussions are | | | | |
| | | summarized on log. | | | | |
| | | 1 | | | | |
| | | -Additional action steps for | | | | |
| | | this strategy are outlined | | | | |
| | | on grade level/content area | | | | |

| PLC action plans. | | |
|-------------------|--|--|
| | | |

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 Grade Level/ Subject

PD Facilitator

PD Participants

Target Dates and Schedules

Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring

Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

and/or PLC Focus

and/or PLC Leader (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)

(e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of

meetings)

Moodles K-5 District

Teachers

June 2013

Administration/Writing Coach

4th Grade

Writing Coach

Grade level teachers

Every other week

Observations

Administration

Grade Level Planning

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

| 4 4 1 | 1 | 1 | l | le a | l _{1 1} | |
|---------------|-------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|--|
| 1. Attendance | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1. | |
| | | | | | | |
| | -Attendance | Tier 1 | Attendance committee | Attendance committee will | | |
| | committee needs | | will keep a log and notes | monitor the attendance data | | |
| | | The school will | | from the targeted group of | | |
| | regular basis | establish an | the Principal on a monthly | students. | | |
| | | | basis and shared with | | | |
| | school year. | | faculty. | | | |
| | our your. | comprised of | | | | |
| | -Need support | Administrators, | | | | |
| | in building and | guidance | | | | |
| | maintain the | counselors, | | | | |
| | | teachers and other | | | | |
| | student database. | 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. | | | | |

| Attendance Goal #1: | 2012 Current | 2013 Expected | | | |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|--|--|--|
| Attendance Goal #1. | Attendance Rate:* | Attendance Rate:* | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 1 77 4 1 4 71 | | | | | |
| 1. The attendance rate will increase from 95.28% in | | | | | |
| 2011-2012 to in 2012- | | | | | |
| 2013. | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 2. The attendance rate | | | | | |
| will increase from 93% in 2011-2012 to 96% in | | | | | |
| 2012-2013. | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| The number of students who have 10 or more | | | | | |
| unexcused absences | | | | | |
| throughout the school year | | | | | |
| will decrease by 10% | | | | | |
| (Editor note: Multiply | | | | | |
| total of unexcused | | | | | |
| absences in 2012-2013 | | | | | |
| (122) x 10% = 12.2; Always round up – 13; | | | | | |
| Aiways round up – 13, | | | | | |
| 122 - 13 = 109) | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 3.T he number of students | | | | | |
| who have 10 or more unexcused tardies to | | | | | |
| school throughout the | | | | | |
| school year will decrease | | | | | |
| by 10%. | | | | | |
| (Editor Note: Multiply | | | | | |
| total of unexcused | | | | | |
| tardies to school in 2010- | | | | | |
| 2011 (58) x 10% = 5.8; Always round up - 6; 58 | | | | | |
| -6 = 52) | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

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

| 95.28% | 96% | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---------------------------|---------------------------------|------|------|--|
| 2012 Current | 2013 Expected | | | | | |
| Number of Students with Excessive | Number of Students with Excessive | | | | | |
| Absences | Absences | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| (10 or more) | (10 or more) | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 104 | 110 | | | | | |
| 124 | 118 | | | | | |
| 2012 Current | 2013 Expected | | | | | |
| Number of Students with | Number of | | | | | |
| Evangairo Tardina | | | | | | |
| (4.0 | Students with Excessive Tardies | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | (10 or more) | | | | | |
| 200 | 190 | | | | | |
| 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Tier 1 | Assistant Principal/Team | Principal will use | | | |
| Attendance | A 11 4 a a a la a ma | leaders/ Department | Edline nonente te escaluete | | | |
| Waiver to increase the number of | will post their | Heads will monitor Edline | teachers adherence to policy | | | |
| teachers posting | attendance to | | reactions authorotice to policy | | | |
| on a weekly basis. | EdLine at a | | | | | |
| | minimum of once | | | | | |
| 1.3 | per week allowing parents to monitor | | | | | |
| | attendance. | | | | | |
| system to | and a second a second and a second a second and a second a second and a second and a second and | | | | | |
| reinforce parents | | | | | | |
| for facilitating | | | | | | |
| improvement in attendance. | | | | | | |
| attendance. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3. | 1.3. | |
|-------|-----------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|------|------|--|
| | | | | | | |
| l l h | Γier 2 | Social Worker | The attendance committee | | | |
| l l | | Social Worker | (which is a subset of the | | | |
| | Beginning at the | Guidance Counselor | leadership Team) will | | | |
| | 5th unexcused | | disaggregate attendance data | | | |
| | | PSLT | for the "Tier 2" group along | | | |
| | Attendance | | with the guidance counselor | | | |
| | Committee (which | | and maintain communication | | | |
| is | s a subgroup of | | about these children. | | | |
| | he Leadership | | | | | |
| | Γeam) collaborate | | | | | |
| | o ensure that | | | | | |
| | a letter is sent | | | | | |
| | nome to parents | | | | | |
| | outlining the state | | | | | |
| | statute that requires | | | | | |
| | parents send | | | | | |
| | students to school. | | | | | |
| | f a student's | | | | | |
| | attendance | | | | | |
| | mproves (no | | | | | |
| | absences in a 20 | | | | | |
| | day period) a | | | | | |
| | oositive letter is | | | | | |
| | sent home to the | | | | | |
| | parent regarding | | | | | |
| | he increase in their | | | | | |
| | child's attendance. | | | | | |

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

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

PLC activity. PD Content /Topic Grade Level/

Subject

PD Facilitator

PD Participants

Target Dates and Schedules

Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring

Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

and/or PLC Focus

and/or PLC Leader (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)

(e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of

meetings)

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 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

| 4 0 | 1 | l | l | le e | 1 1 | |
|---------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|------|--|
| 1. Suspension | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1. | |
| | | | | | | |
| | There needs to be | Tier 1 | <u>Who</u> | - PSLT /Behavior Committee | | |
| | common school- | | | will review data on Office | | |
| | wide expectations | -Positive Behavior | -PSLT Behavior | Discipline Referrals | | |
| | and rules for | | Committee | ODRs and out of school | | |
| | appropriate | CHAMPS will be | | suspensions, ATOSS data | | |
| | classroom | implemented to | -Leadership Team | monthly. | | |
| | behavior. | address school- | ^ | , | | |
| | | wide expectations | -Administration | | | |
| | | 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. | | | | |
| | | and expectations. | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | -Providing teachers | | | | |
| | | with resources | | | | |
| | | for continued | | | | |
| | | teaching and | | | | |
| | | reinforcement of | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | school expectations and rules. | | | | |
| | | and rules. | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | -Leadership | | | | |
| | | team conducts | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | walkthroughs | | | | |
| | | using a PBS or | | | | |
| | | CHAMPS walk- | | | | |
| | | through form | | | | |
| | | (generated by | | | | |
| | | the district RtI | | | | |
| | | facilitators). | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised January 2013

| -The data is shared with faculty at a monthly meeting, tracking the overall improvement of the faculty. | | |
|---|--|--|
| -Where needed, administration conducts individual teacher walk- through data chats. | | |

| Suspension Goal #1: 2012 Total Num | ber 2013 Expected | | | |
|---|-------------------|--|--|---|
| of_ | Number of | | | |
| <u>01 </u> | rumber or | | | |
| | | | | |
| In –School | In- School | | | |
| | - SCHOOL | | | |
| 1. The total number of In- Suspensions | Suspensions | | | |
| School Suspensions will | | | | |
| d | | | | |
| decrease by 10%. (Editor | | | | |
| Note: Multiply total of | | | | |
| ISS in 2011-2012 (211) | | | | |
| x 10% = 21.1; Always | | | | |
| round up – 22; 211 – | | | | |
| 10unu up – 22, 211 – | | | | |
| 22 = 189 for new school | | | | |
| year.) | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| L I | | | | |
| 2. The total number | | | | |
| of students receiving | | | | |
| In-School Suspension | | | | |
| throughout the school | | | | |
| unoughout the school | | | | |
| year will decrease by | | | | |
| 10%. (Editor Note: | | | | |
| Multiply total number of | | | | |
| students receiving ISS in | | | | |
| 2011-2012 (73) x 10% = | | | | |
| $2011-2012 (/3) \times 10\% =$ | | | | |
| 7.3; Always round up – | | | | |
| 8; | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 73 - 8 = 65 for new | | | | |
| 73 - 8 - 03 101 new | | | | |
| school year.) | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 3. The total number | | | | |
| | | | | |
| of Out-of-School | | | | |
| Suspensions will decrease | | | | |
| by 10%. (Editor Note: | | | | |
| Multiply total number of | | | | |
| OSS in 2011-2012 (105) | | | | |
| USS III 2011-2012 (105) | | | | 1 |
| x 10% = 10.5; Always | | | | |
| round up – 11; 105 – | | | | |
| 11 = 94 for new school | | | | |
| year.) | | | | |
| J' | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | 1 |
| | | | | |
| 4. The total number of | | | | |
| students receiving Out- | | | | |
| of Cohool Cygnongion | | | | |
| of-School Suspensions | | | | |
| throughout the school | | | | |

| year will decrease by 10%. (Editor Note: Multiply total number of students receiving OSS in 2011-2012 (39) x 10% = 3.9; Always round up - 4; 39 - 4 = 35 for new school year) | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|---|------|------|------|------|--|
| | | 5 | | | | | |
| | Suspended | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School | | | | | |
| | | 3 | | | | | |
| | Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | | | | | |
| 1 | 32 | 27 | | | | | |
| | of Students | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended | | | | | |
| | Out- of- School | Out- of-School_ | | | | | |
| | 23 | 19 | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |

| _ | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|------|-----|---------------|------|--------|--|
| г | | 1.0 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.2 | |
| - 1 | | 113. | 15. | II 5 . | 115. | 1.3. | |
| - 1 | | | | | | - 10 1 | |
| - 1 | | | | | | | |
| - 1 | | | | | | | |

Suspension Professional Development

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

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

PD Content /Topic Grade Level/ Subject

PD Facilitator

PD Participants

Target Dates and Schedules

Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring

Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

and/or PLC Focus

and/or PLC Leader (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)

(e.g., Early Release) and

Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)

Sheehy Male Mentor All

Program

Densen

Grade Leve, Administration, Psychologist 1

Weekly beginning in November

Mentors

Psychologist Bullying ΑII Densen 11-5-12 Densen

Health and Fitness Goal(s)

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

| | Problem- | | | |
|--------------------|------------|--|--|--|
| Additional Coal(s) | Solving | | | |
| Additional Goal(s) | Process to | | | |
| | Increase | | | |

| | Student Achieveme nt | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------|----------|----------------|---|----------------------------|--|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check | Strategy Data Check | Student Evaluation Tool | |
| areas in need of improvement: | | | | How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | | |

| f | | L | La maria de la compansión de la compansi | L | L. s. see | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
|-----------------------|-----------|----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1. Health and Fitness | 1. Due to | 1.1Two Physical | 1.1. Physical education | 1.1. Data on the number of | 1.1. PACER test | |
| Goal | the lac | k Education classes | teacher | students scoring in the Healthy | component of the | |
| Guai | of a gy | m per week with | | students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ) | FITNESSGRAM | |
| | in alin | ento the Physical | | Timess Zone (111 Z) | PACER for assessing | |
| | III CIIII | ate the Physical er Education | | | FACER for assessing | |
| | | er Education | | | cardiovascular health | |
| | may | teacher | | | | |
| | decrea | se | | | | |
| | the am | | | | | |
| | of time | ount . | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | spent o | on | | | | |
| | Pacer | | | | | |
| | activit | es. | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | I | I | l l |

| 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 45% on the Pre-test to 75% on the Post-test. | Level :* | 2013 Expected Level :* | | | | | |
|---|----------|---------------------------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | 45% | 75% | | | | | |
| | (33) | (55) | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | 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)
Hillsborough 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised January 2013

or PD Activity

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

PD Content /Topic

Grade Level/ Subject PD Facilitator

PLC Leader

PD Participants

Target Dates and Schedules

Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring

Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

and/or PLC Focus

and/or

(e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)

(e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of

meetings)

Continuous Improvement Goal(s)

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

| | Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achieveme nt | | | | | |
|---|---|----------|----------------|---|----------------------------|--|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check | Strategy Data Check | Student Evaluation Tool | |
| areas in need of improvement: | | | | How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | | |

| 1. Continuous | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1. | |
|------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|------|--|
| Improvement Goal | 1.1 | 11 | 1 | | | |
| Improvement Goar | -There is still | The leadership | Who | "Quick" PLC informal | | |
| | | team will | W IIO | surveys will be administered | | |
| | | become trained | Principal | during the school year every | | |
| | | on the use of | i imeipai | two months. The Leadership | | |
| | | | Leadership Team | Team will aggregate the data | | |
| | | of Instruction" | Leadership Team | and share outcomes of the | | |
| | knowledge | log that follows | Subject Area Leaders | school-wide results with their | | |
| | | the Plan-Do- | | PLCs. The data will provide | | |
| | teachers and | | PLC facilitators | direction for future PLC | | |
| | improving | model. Subject | | training. | | |
| | student | Area Leader | | | | |
| | performance | and/or PLC | | | | |
| | by the | facilitators will | | | | |
| | implementation | guide their | | | | |
| | of the Plan- | PLCs through | | | | |
| | Do-Check-Act | | | | | |
| | model. | Check-Act | | | | |
| | | model for units | | | | |
| | -Still confusion | | | | | |
| | on how the | The work will | | | | |
| | Plan-Do- | be recorded | | | | |
| | | on PLC | | | | |
| | model works. | logs that are | | | | |
| | G:11 | reviewed by | | | | |
| | -Still some | the Leadership | | | | |
| | resistance to staff members | Team. | | | | |
| | attending PLCs | | | | | |
| | and/or arriving | | | | | |
| | on time to | | | | | |
| | meetings. | | | | | |
| | meetings. | | | | | |
| | -Teachers | | | | | |
| | asking for | | | | | |
| | more PLC | | | | | |
| | collaboration | | | | | |
| | time. | | | ĺ | | |
| | Possibility of | | | ĺ | | |
| | waiver will be | | | ĺ | | |
| | explored. | | | ĺ | | |
| | | | | ĺ | | |
| | | | | ĺ | | |
| | | | | ĺ | I | |

| Continuous Improvement | 2012 Current | 2013 Expected | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|----------------------------|-----------------|--|------|------|--|
| Goal #1: | Level :* | Level :* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| The percentage of teachers | | | | | | | |
| who strongly agree with the | | | | | | | |
| indicator that "teachers meet | | | | | | | |
| on a regular basis to discuss their students' learning, | | | | | | | |
| share best practices, problem | | | | | | | |
| solve and develop lessons/ | | | | | | | |
| assessments that improve | | | | | | | |
| student performance (under | | | | | | | |
| Teaching and Learning)" will | | | | | | | |
| increase from 60% in 2012 to | | | | | | | |
| 75% in 2013. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | 60% | 75% | | | | | |
| | 00 /0 | /3/0 | | | | | |
| | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | -Not enough | Leadership | Who | "Quick" PLC informal | | | |
| | time to meet in | team will use | <u> </u> | surveys will be administered | | | |
| | PLCs. | teacher survey | Leadership team | during the school year every | | | |
| | | information | | two months. The Leadership | | | |
| | | every nine | | Team will aggregate the data | | | |
| | | weeks to determine next | | and share outcomes of the school-wide results with their | | | |
| | | steps for PLC | | PLCs. The data will provide | | | |
| | | professional | | direction for future PLC | | | |
| | | | | training. | | | |
| | | 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

Grade Level/ Subject

PD Facilitator

PD Participants

Target Dates and Schedules

Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring

Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

and/or PLC Focus

and/or PLC Leader (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)

(e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of

meetings)

PLCs

Plan-Do-Check-Act ModelLeadership Team Leadership Team School-wide

Subject Area All teachers Leaders

PLC Facilitators

PLCs meet every three weeks Administrator and leadership team for Plan-Do-Check-Act PLCs.walk-throughs

Administrator and leadership attendance

at PLC meetings

PLC Survey data

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

Editor Note: Data for this goal can be found on The Office of Assessment's SIP Evaluation and

NEW Reading Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

| | A.1. | A.1. | A.1. | A.1. | A.1. | |
|----------------------------------|------|--------------|------|------|------|--|
| Alternate | | | | | | |
| Assessment: Students scoring | | See | | | | |
| proficient in reading (Levels 4- | | Rea | | | | |
| 9). | | ding Goal | | | | |
| | | Goal | | | | |
| | | 5d | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| Reading Goal A: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|--|---|--|------|------|------|------|--|
| | N/A | | | | | | |
| | | A.2. | A.2. | A.2. | A.2. | A.2. | |
| | | A.3. | A.3. | A.3. | A.3. | A.3. | |

| Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. | | See Rea ding Goal 5d | B.1. | B.1. | |
|--|---|--|------|------|--|
| Reading Goal B: The percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | |

| N/A | | | | | | |
|-----|------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | B.2. | B.2. | B.2. | B.2. | B.2. | |
| | | | | | | |
| | В.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 | | How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | |

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

| C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/ Speaking. | | See Reading | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | |
|--|---|----------------|------|------|------|------|
| | | ELL Goal | | | | |
| | | 5C.1, | | | | |
| | | 5C.2, 5C.3 | | | | |
| | | and 5C.4 | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| CELLA Goal #C: | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: | | | | | |
| The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from 30% to 33%. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | 30% | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |

Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised January 2013

| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|------|
| | | 1.5. | 1.3. | 1.5. | 1.5. | 1.2. |
| | | | | | | |
| Students read in English at grade | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check | Strategy Data Check | Student Evaluation Tool | |
| level text in a manner similar to | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidenty Check | Strategy Data Check | Student Evaluation 1001 | |
| non-ELL students. | | | Who and how will the fidelity be | How will the evaluation | | |
| | | | monitored? | tool data be used | | |
| | | | | to determine the | | |
| | | | | effectiveness of strategy? | | |
| D. Students scoring | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | |
| proficient in Reading. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | See | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | Reading | | | | |
| | | ncaumg | | | | |
| | | ELL Goal | | | | |
| | | ELL GUAI | | | | |
| | | 5C 1 | | | | |
| | | 5C.1, | | | | |
| | | EC 1 EC 1 | | | | |
| | | 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4 | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | and 5C.4 | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | | |

| CELLA Goal #D: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase from 22% to 25%. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: | | | | | |
|---|---|----------|---|--|-------------------------|------|
| | 22% | | | | | |
| | | 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 | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | |
|--|---|----------------|------|------|------|--|
| proficient in Writing. | | | | | | |
| | | See Reading | | | | |
| | | See Reading | | | | |
| | | ELL Goal 5C.1, | | | | |
| | | 5C.2, 5C.3 and | | | | |
| | | 5C.4 | | | | |
| | | SC.4 | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| CDL L. C. 1 //D | 2012 G | | | | | |
| CELLA Goal #E: | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing: | | | | | |
| | roneient in writing: | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| The percentage of students | | | | | | |
| The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA | | | | | | |
| Writing section of the CELLA | | | | | | |
| will increase from <u>26</u> % to 29%. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| 26% | | | | | |
|-----|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 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

Data for this goal can be found on The Office of Assessment's SIP Evaluation and Development Report

| 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: | Barrier | Strategy | fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | | | |
|--|---------|---------------------------|------------------------|--|------|--|--|
| F. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at in mathematics (Levels 4-9). | | See Math Goal 5d | F.1. | F.1. | F.1. | | |

| Mathematics Goal F: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%. | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|--|-----|--|------|------|------|------|--|
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | 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. | | See Math Goal 5d | G.1. | G.1. | G.1. | |
|--|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|--|
| Mathematics Goal G: The percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%. | Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |

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

| N/A | N/A | | | | | |
|-----|------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | 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 | Problem- | | | |
|--------------------|------------|--|--|--|
| and High Science | Solving | | | |
| Goals | Process to | | | |
| | Increase | | | |
| | Student | | | |
| | Achieveme | | | |
| | nt | | | |

| 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: | | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | |
|--|--|--|----------------------------|--|

| | T 4 | h 1 | lv 1 | lr 1 | l _{T 1} | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|------|
| | J.1. | J.1. | J.1. | J.1. | J.1. | |
| Assessment: Students | | | | | | |
| scoring at proficient in | -Need to | <u>Strategy</u> | Who_ | Teacher Level | | |
| science (Levels 4-9). | provide | | | | | |
| | | | Principal, Site | -Teachers reflect on lesson | | |
| | . 0 | | Administrator, Assistance | | | |
| | | improves | Principal | knowledge to drive future | | |
| | procedure for | through the | | instruction. | | |
| | regular and on- | effective and | | l | | |
| | going review of | consistent | | -Teachers use the on-line | | |
| | students' IEPs | implementatio | How_ | grading system data to | | |
| | To address this | n of students' | TED D | calculate their students' | | |
| | | | IEP Progress Reports | progress towards their PLC | | |
| | APC will put a | strategies, | reviewed by APC | and/or individual SMART | | |
| | system in place | inounications, | | Goal. <u> </u> | | |
| | for this school | and accommodatio | | DLC L arral | | |
| | J | | | PLC Level | | |
| | | ns. | | -Using the individual teacher | | |
| | | -Throughout | | data, PLCs calculate the | | |
| | | the school | | SMART goal data across all | | |
| | | year, teachers | | classes/courses. | | |
| | | of SWD | | ciasses/courses. | | |
| | | review | | -PLCs reflect on lesson | | |
| | | students' IEPs | | outcomes and data used to | | |
| | | to ensure | | drive future instruction. | | |
| | | that IEPs are | | | | |
| | | implemented | | - For each class/course, PLCs | | |
| | | consistently | | chart their overall progress | | |
| | | and with | | towards the SMART Goal. | | |
| | | fidelity. | | | | |
| | | | | Leadership Team Level | | |
| | | -Teachers | | _ | | |
| | | (both | | -PLC facilitator/ shares | | |
| | | individually | | SMART Goal data with the | | |
| | | and in PLCs) | | Problem Solving Leadership | | |
| | | work to | | Team. | | |
| | | improve | | | | |
| | | upon both | | -Data is used to drive | | |
| | | individually | | teacher support and student | | |
| | | and | | supplemental instruction. | | |
| | | collectively, | | | | |
| | | the ability to | | | | |
| | | effectively | | | | |
| | | implement | | | Ī | I |

| | | IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons. | | | | | |
|---|---|---|------|------|------|------|--|
| Science Goal J: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%. | | | | | | | |
| | | _ | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | | | | | J.2. | |
| | | J.3. | J.3. | J.3. | J.3. | J.3. | |
| | - | - | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

NEW Writing Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

| 1 | Writing Goals | Problem- | | | |
|---|---------------|-------------|--|--|--|
| | | Solving | | | |
| | | Process to | | | |
| | | Increase | | | |
| | | Student | | | |
| | | Achievement | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check | Strategy Data Check | Student Evaluation | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|----------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|--|
| student achievement data, | | | | | Tool | |
| and reference to "Guiding | | | Who and how will the fidelity | How will the avaluation tool | | |
| Questions", identify and | | | 9 | data be used to determine the | | |
| define areas in need of | | | | effectiveness of strategy? | | |
| improvement for the | | | | effectiveness of strategy? | | |
| following group: | | | | | | |

| M. Florida | M.1. | M.1. | M.1. | M.1. | M.1. | |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|------|--|
| Alternate | | | | | | |
| | Mandan | Strategy | Who | Teacher Level | | |
| | -Need to | Strategy | WIIO | Teacher Level | | |
| | provide a school | SWD student | Principal, Site | -Teachers reflect on lesson | | |
| | organization | achievement | Administrator, Assistance | outcomes and use this | | |
| writing (Levels 4-9). | structure and | improves through | | knowledge to drive future | | |
| | procedure for | the effective | Ппстраг | instruction. | | |
| | regular and on- going review of | and consistent | | mstruction. | | |
| | students' IEPs | implementation | | -Teachers use the on-line | | |
| | To address this | ^ | How | grading system data to | | |
| | barrier, the APC | goals, strategies, | 110W | calculate their students' | | |
| | will put a system | | IEP Progress Reports | progress towards their PLC | | |
| | in place for this | and | reviewed by APC | and/or individual SMART | | |
| | school year. | accommodations. | reviewed by 711 C | Goal | | |
| | school year. | accommodations. | | | | |
| | | -Throughout | | PLC Level | | |
| 1 | | the school year, | | | | |
| | | teachers of SWD | | -Using the individual teacher | | |
| | | review students' | | data, PLCs calculate the | | |
| | | IEPs to ensure | | SMART goal data across all | | |
| | | that IEPs are | | classes/courses. | | |
| | | implemented | | | | |
| | | consistently and | | -PLCs reflect on lesson | | |
| | | with fidelity. | | outcomes and data used to | | |
| | | | | drive future instruction. | | |
| | | -Teachers (both | | | | |
| | | individually and | | -For each class/course, PLCs | | |
| | | in PLCs) work | | chart their overall progress | | |
| | | to improve upon | | towards the SMART Goal. | | |
| | | both individually | | | | |
| | | and collectively, | | Leadership Team Level | | |
| | | the ability to | | | | |
| | | effectively | | -PLC facilitator/ Subject | | |
| | | implement IEP/ | | Area Leader shares SMART | | |
| | | SWD strategies | | Goal data with the Problem | | |
| | | and modifications | | Solving Leadership Team. | | |
| | | into lessons. | | Data in sea d to dail : | | |
| | | | | -Data is used to drive | | |
| | | | | teacher support and student | | |
| | | | | supplemental instruction. | | |

| Writing Goal M: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%. | of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|--|------------------|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | 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)

| rease Student chievement | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------|----------------------------------|---|--|
| nticipated Barrier | | fidelity be monitored? | data be used to determine the | Student Evaluation Tool |
| C | hievement | ease Student Chievement Strategy | ease Student Chievement Strategy Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | icipated Barrier Strategy Fidelity Check Strategy Data Check Who and how will the How will the evaluation tool |

| STEM Goal #1: | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1. |
|---|--------------------|--|------|--------------------------------------|------|
| Implement/expand project/problem-based learning in math and | ELA and other STEM | -Explicit direction for STEM professional learning communities to be established. | | Administrative/SAL walk- throughs | |
| | | -Documentation of planning of units and outcomes of units in logs. | | | |
| | | -Increase effectiveness of lessons through lesson study and district metrics, etc. | | | |
| | 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.

Grade Level/ PD Content /Topic

Subject

PD Facilitator PD Participants Target Dates and Schedules

Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring

Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

and/or PLC Focus

and/or PLC Leader (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)

(e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)

Hillsborough 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811 **Revised January 2013**

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

| CTE Goal(s) | Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | |
|--|--|--|------------|-------------------------|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | | <i>5</i> v | Student Evaluation Tool |

| CTE Goal #1: | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1 | 1.1. |
|--|---|--|------|----------|--|
| to understand the preparatory knowledge for a future career. | Funding New teachers to grade level | Teachers will use JBiz manual to teach the content to the students | | feedback | Student's performance on individual tasks and duties based on JBiz rubric JBiz post test |
| | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 1.2 |
| | 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

Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised January 2013

Community (PLC) or PD Activity

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

| professional development or PLC activity. PD Content /Topic | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator | PD Participants | Target Dates and Schedules | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|-------------------------|----------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| and/or PLC Focus | | and/or | (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of | | |
| | | PLC Leader | | meetings) | | |
| JBiz Town Training | 5th Grade | Biz Town | 5th Grade Teachers | May 2013 | JBiz Town Feedback | 5 th Grade Teachers |
| | | Trainers | | | | |

Administration

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 |
| Reading Goal 1, Strategy 1.1 | Text Exemplar Guided Reading Sets purchased from Scholastic | \$747.89 | \$747.89 |
| Parent Involvement Plan | Jack Hartmann Academic Family Concert | \$399.61 | \$399.61 |

| Final Amount Spent | \$1147.50 | |
|--------------------|-----------|--|
| | | |
| | | |