Florida Department of Education



School Improvement Plan (SIP)

Form SIP-1

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

| School Name: Hammond Elementary School | District Name: Hillsborough County School District | |
|--|--|--|
| Principal: Lynn Rattray | Superintendent: Mary Ellen Elia | |
| SAC Chair: Veronica Botts | 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

Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised July, 2012

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

Highly Qualified Administrators

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

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ | Number of Years at | Number of Years as an | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest |
|-----------|--------------|--|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|
| Principal | Lynn Rattray | Certification(s) Elem Ed; Guidance K- 12; Administration ESOL | Current School 2 | Administrator 23 | 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year) Hammond Elementary School 10-11 Grade A, Met AYP in all subgroups except SWD, Reading Mastery: 96% Math: 96% Writing: 100% Science: 85% |
| | | | | | 11-12 School Grade A, Reading Mastery 82%, Math 80%, Writing 96%, Science 80% Bellamy Elementary |
| | | | | | State Grade "A" for past 9 years; 95% AYP 2008-09 |

| Assistant | Sheri Norkas | Masters in Educational | 5 | 5 | Hammond Elementary |
|-----------|--------------|--|---|---|---|
| Principal | | Leadership and Bachelors in Elementary and Primary Education | | | 07-08:School Grade A, Met AYP, Reading Mastery: 94%, Math: 94%, Writing: 92%, Science 80% |
| | | | | | 08-09: School Grade A, Met AYP, Reading Mastery: 92%, Math: 94%, Writing: 92%, Science 81% |
| | | | | | 09-10: School Grade A, Met AYP, Reading Mastery: 94%, Math: 95%, Writing: 96%, Science: 83% |
| | | | | | 10-11: School Grade A, Met AYP in all subgroups except SWD, Reading Mastery: 96% Math: 96% Writing: 100% Science: 85% |
| | | | | | 11-12 School Grade A, Reading Mastery 82%, Math 80%, Writing 96%, Science 80% |

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 Current School | an | Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, |
| Area | | Certification(s) | Current School | Instructional Coach | Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year) |
| | Kathryn Frankland | Elementary Education K-6 | 5 | 1 | Hammond Elementary School |
| | Traini y ii T Tunikiana | Elementary Education It o | | • | Transitiona Elementary School |
| Reading | | ESOL Endorsed | | | 09-10: School Grade A, Met AYP, Reading Mastery: 94%, Math: 95%, Writing: 96%, Science: 83% |
| | | | | | 10-11: School Grade A, Met AYP in all subgroups except SWD, Reading Mastery: 96% Math: 96% Writing: 100% Science: 85% |
| | | | | | 11-12 School Grade A, Reading Mastery 82%, Math 80%, Writing 96%, Science 80% |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Highly Qualified Teachers

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

| | | | i |
|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| Description of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date | Not Applicable |

| | | | (If not, please explain why) |
|-----------------------|---|-----------|------------------------------|
| Teacher Interview Day | General Directors | June 2013 | Teacher Interview Day |
| Recruitment Fairs | Supervisor of Teacher Recruitment | ongoing | Recruitment Fairs |
| Performance Pay | General Director of Federal Programs | July 2013 | Performance Pay |

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- | Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly qualified. |
|---|--|
| of-field/ and who are not highly qualified. | |
| 3 | Depending on the needs of the teacher, one or more of the following strategies are implemented. |
| | <u>Administrators</u> |
| | Meet with the teachers four times per year to discuss progress on: |
| | Completing classes need for certification |
| | Discussion of what teachers learned during the observation(s) |
| | Academic Coach |
| | The coach co-plans, models, co-teaches, observes and conferences with the teacher on a regular basis |
| | Team Leader/PLC Facilitator |
| | The teachers will attend PLC meetings for on-going adult learning, striving to understand how they as an individual teacher and PLC member can improve learning for all. |
| | |

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 Nu m ber of In str uc tio nal Sta ff | % of Fir st-Ye ar Te ach ers | % of Te ach ers with 1-5 Yea rs of Exp erie nce | % of Te ach ers with 6-14 Yea rs of Exp erie nce | % of Te ach ers with 15+ Yea rs of Exp erie nce | % of Te ach ers wi th Ad van ced De gre es | % Hi gh ly Qu alif ied Te ac her s | % Re ad ing En dor sed Te ach ers | % Na tio nal Bo ard Ce rtif ied Te ac her s | % ES OL End orse d Tea cher s |
|---|------------------------------|---|--|---|--|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| 60 | 10 % (6) | 26 % (16) | 53 % (32) | 10 % (6) | 30 % (18) | 10 0% (60 | 6% (4) | 6% (4) | 60 % (36) |

Teacher Mentoring Program

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

| Mentor Name | Mentee Assigned | Rationale for Pairing | Planned Mentoring Activities |
|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Tamara | Kimberly | District | TIP |
| Steele | Breitenbach | assigned | |
| Tamara | Jennifer | District | TIP |
| Steele | Gilmore | assigned | |

| Tamara | Cengiz | District | TIP |
|--------|----------|----------|-----|
| Steele | Dokumaci | assigned | |
| Tamara | Caitlin | District | TIP |
| Steele | Massey | assigned | |
| Tamara | Jennifer | District | TIP |
| Steele | Gilmore | assigned | |

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

| Title I, Part A |
|---|
| |
| Title I, Part C- Migrant |
| |
| Title I, Part D |
| |
| Title II |
| |
| Title III |
| |
| Title X- Homeless |
| |
| Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) |
| |
| |

Violence Prevention Programs

| Nutrition Programs | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| | |
| Housing Programs | |
| | |
| Head Start | 1 |
| | |
| Adult Education | |
| Career and Technical Education | |
| Job Training | - |
| Other | |
| | • |
| | |

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.

Principal – will provide common vision for data-based decision making. Ensure strategies for improvement are utilized. Communicates with parents regarding school improvement plans.

Maria Rojas – ESE Administrator – ensures that ESE staff knows and utilizes proper instructional strategies for mainstreamed ESE students, Collaborates with classroom teachers through co-instruction

Sheri Norkas- Assistant Principal, Heather Soltis – School Guidance Counselor, Nancy Welch, School Social Worker, Megan McNulty, School Psychologist and Ashley Rogale, 3rd Grade teacher - Participate in collection, interpretation and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation.

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 leadership team will be meeting once a week on Thursday afternoon. The purpose of the team in our school is to provide high quality researched based instruction/interventions matched to student needs and using progress monitoring over time to make important education decisions to guide intervention.

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

The leadership team along with faculty and SAC were involved in the SIP development activities prior to the 11-12 school year ending and during preplanning at the beginning of the 12-13 school year.

One of the main tasks of the leadership team is to monitor student data and monitor PLC effectiveness outlined in the action steps and suggest modifications as needed.

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.

Baseline Data: FAIR, FCAT, SAT 10

Mid-Year Data: FAIR, FCAT Practice, Formative Assessments, Monthly Writes

Core Curriculum (Tier 1)

| Data Source | Database | Person (s) Responsible |
|---|---|-------------------------------|
| | | |
| | | |
| FCAT practice tests | Achievement series | Reading Coach |
| | | _ |
| Baseline and Midyear District Assessments | Scantron Achievement Series | Leadership Team/Reading Coach |
| | | |
| | | |
| FAIR | Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network | Reading Coach |
| | | |
| | | |
| CELLA | Sagebrush (IPT) | Assistant Principal |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

Supplemental/Intensive Instruction (Tiers 2 & 3)

| Data Source | Database | Person (s) Responsible for Monitoring | | |
|-------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| FAIR OPM | School Generated Database in Excel | Leadership Team/Reading Coach | | |

| Leadership Team/PLCs/Individual Teachers | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| school year. | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| · | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Administration will visit PLCs to ensure student data is discussed and the MTSS process is utilized for all students. | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Megan Mierzwa, Jessica Miles, Lindsey Rottenberger, Becky Kuschmeader, Kelly McCormack, Karen Beardsley, Michelle Harrison, Cheryl Hadley and Kathryn Frankland

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

The LLT will meet in monthly PLCs and on an as needed basis. The team will gather student data and analyze areas of strength and areas where improvement is needed. They will also communicate with grade level members, update MTSS information concerning the area of reading, and any reading curriculum information that needs to be shared.

| What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? |
|---|
| The LLT will work with teachers in order to support them in the MTSS Process and reading curriculum questions. |
| |
| NCLB Public School Choice Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification |
| *Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition |
| Describe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs as applicable. |
| |
| |
| |
| *Grades 6-12 Only Sec. 1003.413 (b) F.S |
| For schools with Grades 6-12, describe the plan to ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility of every teacher. |
| |
| |
| |
| *High Schools Only |
| Note: Required for High School-Sec. 1003.413(g)(j) F.S. |
| How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future? |
| |
| |

| How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is p meaningful? | ersonally |
|---|-----------|
| | |
| | |
| Postsecondary Transition | |
| Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S. Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report . | |
| | |

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

| Reading Goals | Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student 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 DCATE 2.0 Ct. 1 | li 1 | l i 1 | 1 1 | l _{1 1} | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| 1. FCAT 2.0: Students 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | |
| scoring proficient in | | | | | |
| reading (Level 3-5). | Student | <u>Who</u> | Teacher Level | 3x per year | |
| | achievement | | | | |
| | improves through | Principal | - | - FAIR | |
| Teachers' lac | teachers working | 1 | Assess and observe | | |
| of commitmen | collaboratively | I | | | |
| | iii bi-iiibiitiiiy | 1 | students using the | | |
| Time | PLCs to focus on | | same teacher-created | | |
| constraints | student learning. | | assessments. | | |
| N. C. | Specifically, they | L . | | During the Grading | |
| PLC's are no implemented | ase the ran | <u>How</u> | | Period_ | |
| with fidelity. | Do-Check-Act | | DY CUB | | |
| with fidelity. | model and log to | -PLCs turn logs into | PLC/Department Level | - Common assessments | |
| IEP meetings | | administration on a bi- | ĺ | (pre, post, mid, section, | |
| parent | of work. Using | weekly basis | F | end of unit, intervention | |
| conferences, and | | | PLCs will review unit | checks) | |
| trainings take | design model for | I -PLCs receive feedback | assessments and chart the | | |
| time. | units of instruction, | on their logs. | increase in the number of | | |
| Teacher | teachers focus on | | students reaching at least | | |
| | the following four | -Administrators attend | 80% mastery on units of | | |
| appointments outside of scho | questions: | targeted PLC meetings | instruction. | | |
| | | | | | |
| | 1. What is it we | -Progress of PLCs | | | |
| | expect them to | discussed at Leadership | | | |
| | learn? | Team. | | | |
| | 0 11. 11 | | | | |
| | 2. How will we | | | | |
| | if they have | | | | |
| | learned it? | | | | |
| | 3. How will we | | ĺ | | |
| | respond if | | | | |
| | they don't | | ĺ | | |
| | | | | | |
| | learn? | | ĺ | | |
| | 4. How will we | | ĺ | | |
| | respond if | | | | |
| | they already | | ĺ | | |
| | know it? | | ĺ | | |
| | KIIOW It! | | ĺ | | |
| | Action | | ĺ | | |
| | Steps | | ĺ | | |
| | 5005 | | | | |

| | | Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/ content area PLC action plans. | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|-------------------------|------|--|
| reading Cour nr. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | 82% | 83% | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | | |

| 2. FCAT 2.0: Students | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| scoring Achievement | | [· · · | [| [· · | [| |
| Levels 4 or 5 in reading. | Teachers' lack | Student | <u>Who</u> | Teacher Level | 3x per year | |
| Levels 4 of 5 in reading. | | achievement | <u>vviio</u> | reacher Bever | <u> </u> | |
| | | | Deinainal | L | - FAIR | |
| | I ime | teachers working | Principal | | 171110 | |
| | constraints | collaborativaly | | Assess and observe | | |
| | PLC's are not | in bi-monthly | Assistant Principal | students using the | | |
| | | PLCs to focus on | | same teacher-created | | |
| | | student learning. | | assessments. | | |
| | | Specifically, they | | | During the Grading | |
| | | use the Plan- | <u>How</u> | | Period_ | |
| | parent | Do-Check-Act | | L | | |
| | conferences, and trainings take | model and log to | -PLCs turn logs into | PLC/Department Level | - Common assessments | |
| | time. | | administration on a bi- | | (pre, post, mid, section, | |
| | | of work. Using | weekly basis | | end of unit, intervention | |
| | Teacher | the backwards | | PLCs will review unit | checks) | |
| | appointments | design model for | PLCs receive feedback | assessments and chart the | | |
| | outside of school. | anno or monachon, | on their logs. | increase in the number of | | |
| | | teachers focus on the following four | | students reaching at least | | |
| | | | -Administrators attend | 80% mastery on units of | | |
| | | questions. | targeted PLC meetings | instruction. | | |
| | | What is it we | -Progress of PLCs | | | |
| | | | discussed at Leadership | | | |
| | | | Team. | | | |
| | | | - Committee | | | |
| | | How will we | | | | |
| | | if they have | | | | |
| | | learned it? | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | How will we | | | | |
| | | respond if | | | | |
| | | they don't | | | | |
| | | learn? | | | | |
| | | How will we | | | | |
| | | respond if | | | | |
| | | they already | | | | |
| | | know it? | | | | |
| | | KHOW It! | | | | |
| | | <u>Action</u> | | | | |
| | | Steps | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| | | Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/ content area PLC action plans. | | | | | |
|--|---|--|------------------------|--|-------------------------|------|--|
| Reading Goal #2: In grades 3-5, the percentage of students who will score a level 4 or 5 on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 59% to 60%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance.* | | | | | |
| | 59% | 60% | | | | | |
| | | | | 2.2. | | 2.2. | |
| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | fidelity 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 | | 5.1. | 5.1. | [| 5.1. | |
| | | Student | Mho | Teacher Level | 2v nor year | |
| Gains in reading. | | achievement | <u>Who</u> | reaction Level | 3x per year | |
| | | | | L | - FAIR | |
| | I ime | teachers working | Principal | Γ | - PAIK | |
| | | aallahavativaly | | Assess and observe | | |
| | | in bi-monthly | Assistant Principal | students using the | | |
| | | PLCs to focus on | | same teacher-created | | |
| | | student learning. | | assessments. | | |
| | 1 | Specifically, they | | | During the Grading | |
| | | use the Plan- | <u>How</u> | | Period | |
| | parent | Do-Check-Act | | | | |
| | | model and log to | -PLCs turn logs into | PLC/Department Level | - Common assessments | |
| | time | structure their way | administration on a bi- | | (pre, post, mid, section, | |
| | | of work. Using | weekly basis | - | end of unit, intervention | |
| | | the backwards | | PLCs will review unit | checks) | |
| | appointments | design model for | PLCs receive feedback | assessments and chart the | | |
| | outside of school. | annes or mistraction, | on their logs. | increase in the number of | | |
| | | teachers focus on | | students reaching at least | | |
| | | | -Administrators attend | 80% mastery on units of | | |
| | | questions: | targeted PLC meetings | instruction. | | |
| | | • What is it we | -Progress of PLCs | | | |
| | | | discussed at Leadership | | | |
| | | | Team. | | | |
| | | | r cum. | | | |
| | | How will we | | | | |
| | | if they have | | | | |
| | | learned it? | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | How will we | | | | |
| | | respond if they | | | | |
| | | don't learn? | | | | |
| | | ** '11 | | | | |
| | | • How will we | | | | |
| | | respond if they | | | | |
| | | already know | | | | |
| | | it? | | | | |
| | | Action | | | | |
| | | Steps Steps | | | | |
| | | 2222 | | | | |
| | | Action | | | | |

| | | steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/ content area PLC action plans. | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|------|------|------|------|--|
| Reading Goal #3: In grades 3-5, the points for students who will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 85 to 86. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | 85 | 86 | | | | | |
| | | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | |

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

| A ECHEAN B. L. A | 4 1 | I ₄₋₁ | 4 1 | 4 1 | 4.1 | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| | 4.1. | 4.1. | 4.1. | 4.1. | 4.1. | |
| students in Lowest 25% | | | | | | |
| making learning gains in | | Student | <u>Who</u> | <u> Teacher Level</u> | 3x per year | |
| reading. | | achievement | | | | |
| | Teachers' lack | improves through | Principal | ⊢ | - FAIR | |
| | | teachers working | · ' | A and abasmis | | |
| | | collaboratively | la | Assess and observe | | |
| | constraints | in di-monuny | | students using the | | |
| | | PLCs to focus on | | same teacher-created | | |
| | | student learning. | | assessments. | | |
| | implemented | Specifically, they | | | During the Grading | |
| | with fidelity. | use the Plan- | <u>How</u> | | Period | |
| | TED (| Do-Check-Act | | | | |
| | | | -PLCs turn logs into | PLC/Department Level | - Common assessments | |
| | parent conferences, and | structure their way | administration on a bi- | | (pre, post, mid, section, | |
| | trainings take | of work. Using | weekly basis | ⊢ | end of unit, intervention | |
| | time. | the backwards | 1 | PLCs will review unit | checks) | |
| | | design model for | PLCs receive feedback | assessments and chart the | | |
| | Teacher | units of instruction, | on their logs. | increase in the number of | | |
| | appointments | teachers focus on | | students reaching at least | | |
| | outside of school. | the following four | | 80% mastery on units of | | |
| | | questions: | tongotod DI C montings | instruction. | | |
| | | | | instruction. | | |
| | | What is it we | -Progress of PLCs | | | |
| | | expect them to | discussed at Leadership | | | |
| | | | Теат. | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | How will we | | | | |
| | | if they have | | | | |
| | | learned it? | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | How will we | | | | |
| | | respond if | | | | |
| | | they don't | | | | |
| | | learn? | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | How will we | | | | |
| | | respond if | | | | |
| | | they already | | | | |
| | | know it? | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | . Action | | | | |
| | | Steps | | | | |
| 1 | | Steps | | ĺ | | |

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

| | | Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/ content area PLC action plans. | | | |
|--|---------------|---|--|--|--|
| Reading Goal #4: In grades 3-5, the points for students in the lowest 25% making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 74 to 75. | Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | |
| | 74 | 75 | | | |

| | | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | |
|----------------------------------|-------------|-----------|------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|--|
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 4.3 | 4.3. | 4.3. | 4.3. | 4.3. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student | Anticipated | Strategy | Fidelity Check | Strategy Data Check | Student Evaluation Tool | | |
| achievement data, and reference | Barrier | | | | | | |
| to "Guiding Questions", identify | | | Who and how will the | How will the evaluation tool | | | |
| and define areas in need of | | | fidelity be monitored? | data be used to determine the | | | |
| improvement for the following | | | indenty of momentum. | effectiveness of strategy? | | | |
| subgroup: | | | | | | | |
| Based on Ambitious but | 2011-2012 | 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 | | | | | | ĺ | |
| achievement gap by 50%. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | - | |
| Reading Goal #5: | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | ĺ | |
| | | | | | | | |

| | | • | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| 5A. Student subgroups by | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | |
| ethnicity (White, Black, | | | | | | |
| | Teachers' lack | Student | | | | |
| Indian) not making | of commitment. | achievement | | | | |
| mulan) not making | | | <u>Who</u> | Teacher Level | 3x per vear | |
| satisfactory progress in | Time | teachers working | | | | |
| reading. | constraints | | Principal | L | - FAIR | |
| | | in bi-monthly | · ' | | | |
| | PLC's are not | DT G | | Assess and observe | | |
| | implemented | | Assistant Principal | students using the | | |
| | with fidelity. | student learning. | | same teacher-created | | |
| | IEP meetings, | Specifically, they | | assessments. | | |
| | parent | use the Plan- | | | During the Grading | |
| | conferences, and | Do-Check-Act | How | | Period Period | |
| | trainings take | and and and | 1 10 W | | I CHOU | |
| | time. | structure their way | DI Cod on localid | PLC/Department Level | - Common assessments | |
| | | U | ri Les turn logs mio | _ | (pre, post, mid, section, | |
| | Teacher | | administration on a bi- | | end of unit, intervention | |
| | appointments | | weekly basis | | checks) | |
| | outside of school. | units of instruction, | DI C : C 11 1 | PLCs will review unit | checks) | |
| | | teachers focus on | PLCs receive reedback | assessments and chart the | | |
| | | the following four | on their logs. | increase in the number of | | |
| | | questions: | | students reaching at least | | |
| | | | -Administrators attend | 80% mastery on units of | | |
| | | | targeted PLC meetings | instruction. | | |
| | | expect them to | | | | |
| | | learn? | -Progress of PLCs | | | |
| | | | discussed at Leadership | | | |
| | | - 110 11 1111 110 | Team. | | | |
| | | if they have | | | | |
| | | learned it? | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | How will we | | | | |
| | | respond if | | | | |
| | | they don't | | | | |
| | | learn? | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | How will we | | | | |
| | | respond if | | | | |
| | | they already | | | | |
| | | know it? | | | | |
| | | _ | | | | |
| | | . Action | | | | |
| | | Steps_ | | | | |
| 1 | I | Steps | I | | I | |

| | | Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/ content area PLC action plans. | | | |
|---|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Reading Goal #5A: | 2012 Current | 2013 Expected Level | | | |
| | Level of Performance:* | of Performance:* | | | |
| | | | | | |
| The percentage of | | | | | |
| white students scoring | | | | | |
| satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA will increase | | | | | |
| from 81% to 83%. | | | | | |
| | White:81% | White:83% | | | |
| | L | L | | | |
| | Black:NA | Black:NA | | | |
| | Hispanic:Y | Hispanic: | | | |
| | Asian:80% | Asian:Y | | | |
| | American | American | | | |
| | Indian:NA | Indian:NA | | | |

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

| 5B. Economically | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | |
|-------------------------|--------------|------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|
| Disadvantaged students | | | | | | |
| not making satisfactory | See Goal 5A1 | See Strategy 5A1 | See Fidelity Check for 5A1 | See Strategy Data Check for 5A1 | See Student Evaluation Tool for 5A1 | |
| progress in reading. | | | DAI | DAI | 10f 5A1 | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| Reading Goal #5B: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|--|--|-------------------------|-------|--|
| The percentage of economically disadvantaged students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA will increase from 60% to 64% | | | | | | | |
| | 60% | 64% | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | |
| | | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | | |

| | | | | La. | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | | |
| Learners (ELL) not | | | | | | | |
| Learners (EEE) not | | | | | | | |
| making satisfactory | | | | | | | |
| making satisfactory progress in reading. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Deading Coal #5C: | 2012 Current | 2012 Evpected Lavel | | | | | |
| Reading Goal #5C: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | Description * | of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | reriormance:* | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | x 7 | | | | | | |
| | \mathbf{Y} | | | | | | |
| | | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | |
| 1 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| | | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.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 | | | Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the | | | |
| improvement for the following subgroup: | | | ridenty be monitored. | effectiveness of strategy? | | | |
| | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | | |
| Disabilities (SWD) not | | | | | . | | |
| making satisfactory progress in reading. | See Goal 5A1 | | See Fidelity Check for 5A1 | | See Student Evaluation Tool for 5A1 | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| Reading Goal #5D: The percentage of SWD students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA will increase from 48% to 53%. | of Performance:* | | | | | |
|--|------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | |
| | | | | | 5D.3 | |

Reading Professional Development

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

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

| PD Content /Topic | 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) | | |
| Close Reading | All/Reading | Kathryn Frankland/ | All classroom teachers | 2x | Lesson plan submissions | Reading Coach |
| | | Michelle | | | | |
| | | Harrison | | | | |
| Words Their Way | All Reading | Kathryn Frankland | Optional for all classroom teachers | 3x | | Reading Coach |

End of Reading Goals

Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

| Elementary School Mathematics Goals | Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student 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 | |

| 1. FCAT 2.0: Students | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| scoring proficient in | | | | | | |
| mathematics (Level 3-5). | | Student | <u>Who</u> | Teacher Level | | |
| | | achievement | | | | |
| | | improves through | Principal | - | During the Grading | |
| | Teachers' lack | teachers working | i iiioipai | Assess and absents | Period | |
| | of commitment | collaboratively | Assistant Principal | Assess and observe | | |
| | | in bi-monthly | Assistant i nincipal | students using the | - Common assessments | |
| | | PLCs to focus on | | same teacher-created | (pre, post, mid, section, | |
| | constraints | student learning. | | assessments. | end of unit, intervention | |
| | DI C' | Specifically, they | . | | checks) | |
| | PLC's are not implemented | | <u>How</u> | | | |
| | with fidelity. | Do-Check-Act | l | PLC/Department Level | | |
| | With Having. | model and log to | -PLCs turn logs into | PLC/Department Level | | |
| | IEP meetings, | | administration on a bi- | L | | |
| | parent | of work. Using the backwards | weekly basis | Γ | | |
| | | design model for | DI C | PLCs will review unit | | |
| | | units of instruction, | -PLCs receive feedback | assessificites and chart the | | |
| | time. | teachers focus on | on their logs. | increase in the number of | | |
| | Teacher | | -Administrators attend | students reaching at least | | |
| | appointments | | targeted PLC meetings | 80% mastery on units of | | |
| | outside of school. | questions. | turgeted i De meetings | instruction. | | |
| | | • What is it we | -Progress of PLCs | | | |
| | | | discussed at Leadership | , | | |
| | | | Team. | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | How will we | | | | |
| | | if they have | | | | |
| | | learned it? | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | • How will we | | | | |
| | | respond if | | | | |
| | | they don't | | | | |
| | | learn? | | | | |
| | | How will we | | | | |
| | | respond if | | | | |
| | | they already | | | | |
| | | know it? | | | | |
| | | KIIOW It: | | | | |
| | | . Action | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | 1 | <u>Steps</u> | | | | |

| 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/ content area PLC action plans. | | | | | |
|---|--|------|------|------|------|--|
| 80% | 81% | | | | | |
| | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

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

| 2. FCAT 2.0: Students | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| scoring Achievement | | | | | | |
| Levels 4 or 5 in | | Student | <u>Who</u> | Teacher Level | | |
| mathematics. | | achievement | VVIIO | | | |
| mathematics. | | | Principal | L | During the Grading | |
| | | teachers working | Гіпсіраі | l | Period | |
| | | a allah aya tiyyalı | A | Assess and observe | | |
| | | in bi-monthly | | students using the | - Common assessments | |
| | | PLCs to focus on | | same teacher-created | (pre, post, mid, section, | |
| | | student learning. | | assessments. | end of unit, intervention | |
| | | Specifically, they | | | checks) | |
| | | | <u>How</u> | | | |
| | | Do-Check-Act | | | | |
| | | | -PLCs turn logs into | PLC/Department Level | | |
| | | | administration on a bi- | | | |
| | parent | of work. Using | weekly basis | 广 | | |
| | | the backwards | | PLCs will review unit | | |
| | | design model for | -PLCs receive feedback | assessments and chart the | | |
| | time. | units of monucion, | on their logs. | increase in the number of | | |
| | | teachers focus on | l | students reaching at least | | |
| | | the following four | -Administrators attend | 80% mastery on units of | | |
| | appointments outside of school. | questions: | targeted PLC meetings | instruction. | | |
| | | | D CDI C. | | | |
| | | | -Progress of PLCs | | | |
| | | learn? | discussed at Leadership Team. | | | |
| | | icarii: | ream. | | | |
| | | How will | | | | |
| | | we if they have | | | | |
| | | learned it? | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | How will we | | | | |
| | | respond if they | | | | |
| | | don't learn? | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | How will we | | | | |
| | | respond if they | | | | |
| | | already know it? | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | Action St. | | | | |
| | | <u>Steps</u> | | | | |
| | | A | | | | |
| | | Action | | | | |
| | | steps | | | | |

| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | 56% | 57% | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| O1 70. | | | | | | | |
| will increase from 56% to 57%. | | | | | | | |
| score at a level 4 or 5 on the 2013 FCAT Math | | | | | | | |
| In grades 3-5, the percentage students who | | | | | | | |
| | Performance:* | or remormance. | | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #2: | 2012 Current Level of | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | action plans. | | | | | |
| | | content area PLC | | | | | |
| | | outlined on grade level/ | | | | | |
| | | strategy are | | | | | |
| | | for this | | | | | |

| | | 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: | Barrier | | 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. | | Student | <u>Who</u> | Teacher Level | | |
| guing in machematics. | | achievement | <u> </u> | | | |
| | Teachers' lack | | Principal | _ | During the Grading | |
| | | teachers working | Гіпсіраі | l | Period | |
| | | a allah aya tiyyalı | Assistant Dringing | Assess and observe | | |
| | | in bi-monthly | | students using the | - Common assessments | |
| | Constraints | PLCs to focus on | | same teacher-created | (pre, post, mid, section, | |
| | | student learning. | | assessments. | end of unit, intervention | |
| | | Specifically, they | | | checks) | |
| | | | <u>How</u> | | | |
| | | Do-Check-Act | | | | |
| | parant | | -PLCs turn logs into | PLC/Department Level | | |
| | conferences and | | administration on a bi- | | | |
| | trainings take | of work. Using | weekly basis | Γ | | |
| | | the backwards | | PLCs will review unit | | |
| | | design model for | -PLCs receive feedback | assessments and chart the | | |
| | Teacher appointments | units of mistraction, | on their logs. | increase in the number of | | |
| | outside of school | teachers focus on the following four | | students reaching at least | | |
| | outside of senoor. | the following four | -Administrators attend | 80% mastery on units of | | |
| | | questions: | targeted PLC meetings | instruction. | | |
| | | What is it we | December of DL Co | | | |
| | | | -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership | | | |
| | | . ^ . | Team. | | | |
| | | icarii: | ream. | | | |
| | | How will | | | | |
| | | we if they have | | | | |
| | | learned it? | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | How will we | | | | |
| | | respond if they | | | | |
| | | don't learn? | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | How will we | | | | |
| | | respond if they | | | | |
| | | already know it? | - | | | |
| | | l | | | | |
| | | Action St. | | | | |
| | | <u>Steps</u> | | | | |
| | | Action | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | steps | | | | |

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

| | | for this strategy are outlined on grade level/ content area PLC action plans. | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|------|------|------|------|--|
| Mathematics Goal #3: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| In grades 3-5, the points for students who made learning gains on 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 77to 78. | | | | | | | |
| | 77 | 78 | | | | | |
| | | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | |
| | | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. | 33. | 3.3. | |

| Based on the analysis of student | Anticipated | Strategy | Fidelity Check | Strategy Data Check | Student Evaluation Tool | |
|----------------------------------|-------------|----------|----------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| achievement data, and reference | | | | | | |
| 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 | | | , | effectiveness of strategy? | | |
| group: | | | | | | |

| 4.1. 4.1. 4.1. 4.1. 4.1. 4.1. 4.1. 4.1. | students in Lowest 25% | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--|
| making learning gains in mathematics. -Teachers' lack of commitmentTime constraints -PLC's are not implemented with fidelityIEP meetings, parent conferences, and trainings take timeTeacher appointments outside of school. -Teachers' lack of commitmentTime constraints -PLC's to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model and log to seachers focus on tructure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, eachers focus on the following four vertices: -Teacher appointments outside of school. | • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • | | | | | |
| achievement improves through of commitment. -Time constraints -PLC's are not implemented with fidelityIEP meetings, parent conferences, and trainings take time. -Teacher appointments outside of school of the following four constraints -Teacher appointments outside of school of the following four constraints -Time constraints -Time collaboratively in bi-monthly PLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four constraints -Time collaboratively in bi-monthly PLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four counts of instruction. -Teacher appointments outside of school of commitment improves through teachers working teachers working to absent said observe students using the same teacher-created assessments. -During the Grading Period -Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks) -PLCs turn logs into administration on a bi-weekly basis -PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students using the same teacher-created assessments. -PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students using the same teacher-created assessments. -PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students using the same teacher-created assessments. -PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students using the same teacher-created assessments. -PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students using the same teacher-created assessments. -PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students using the same teacher-created assessments. -PLCs will review unit assessments and ch | lmaking learning gains in | Student | Who | Teacher Level | | |
| -Teachers' lack of commitment. -Time collaboratively constraints PLC's are not implemented with fidelity. IEP meetings, parent conferences, and trainings take time. Teacher appointments outside of school Teacher appointments outside of school Teacher appointments outside of school Teacher face hers working collaboratively in bi-monthly PLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan- Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, on their logs. PLCs turn logs into administration on a bi-weekly basis PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of succession and observe students using the same teacher-created assessments. Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks) Common assessments | mathematics | achievement | 11110 | | | |
| teachers working collaboratively in bi-monthly PLCs to focus on -PLC's are not implemented with fidelity. -IEP meetings, parent conferences, and trainings take time. -Teacher appointments outside of school. -Teacher appointments outside of school. -Teacher appointments outside of school. -Time collaboratively in bi-monthly pLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-bo-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on their logs. -Time collaboratively in bi-monthly pLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-bo-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the same teacher-created assessments. -Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks) -PLCs turn logs into administration on a bi-weekly basis -PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least show mastery on units of students reaching at least show mastery on units of students reaching at least show mastery on units of students reaching at least show mastery on units of students reaching at least show mastery on units of students reaching at least show mastery on units of students reaching at least show mastery on units of students reaching at least show mastery on units of students reaching at least show mastery on units of students reaching at least show mastery on units of students reaching at least show mastery on units of students reaching at least show mastery on units of students reaching at least show mastery on units of students reaching at least show mastery on units of students reaching at least show mastery on units of students reaching at least show mastery on units of students reaching at least show mastery on units of students reaching at least show mastery on units of students reacher created and show the students using the students using the students using the same teacher-created and show the students using | l'eachers' la | k improves through | Principal | L | During the Grading | |
| collaboratively in bi-monthly PLCs to focus on student learning. Implemented with fidelity. IEP meetings, parent conferences, and trainings take time. Teacher appointments outside of school. Teacher appointments outside of school. Time constraints PLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model forTeacher appointments outside of school. Teacher appointments outside of school. Administrators attend susing the students using the same teacher-created assessments. | of commitme | | ППСІраї | | Period | |
| constraints PLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan- Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using time. -Teacher appointments outside of school. Teacher appointments outside of school. HOW Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four -Administrators attend same teacher-created assessments. Specifically, they use the Plan- Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four -Administrators attend same teacher-created (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks) PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of | Time | | Assistant Dringing | | | |
| PLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan- Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for appointments outside of school. Teacher appointments outside of school. PLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan- Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on outside of school. The following four appointments outside of school. PLCs turn logs into administration on a bi-weekly basis PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least solve mastery on units of students reaching at leas | | | Assistant Principal | | - Common assessments | |
| implemented with fidelity. IEP meetings, parent conferences, and trainings take time. Teacher appointments outside of school. Implemented with fidelity. IEP meetings, parent conferences, and trainings take time. PLCs turn logs into administration on a bi-weekly basis PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least so% mastery on units of authorises. Administrators attend so% mastery on units of authorises. | | | | | | |
| with fidelity. IEP meetings, parent conferences, and trainings take time. Teacher appointments outside of school. with fidelity. use the Plan- Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on outside of school. Teacher appointments outside of school. weekly basis PLCs turn logs into administration on a bi-weekly basis PLCs receive feedback assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of | | | | assessments. | | |
| Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for appointments outside of school. Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, outside of school. Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, on their logs. PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least stude | implemented | | l . | | checks) | |
| rolled and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for appointments outside of school. model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four the following four to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four the following following four the following following four the following following following following following followin | with fidelity. | | How_ | | | |
| parent conferences, and trainings take time. -Teacher appointments outside of school. bricks tim logs into administration on a biweekly basis -PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of units of units of instructions attends -Administrators attends -PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of | IFP meetin | | | DLC/Dayantus and Lassal | | |
| conferences, and trainings take time. the backwards design model for units of instruction, appointments outside of school. Structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four the following following four the following following four the following following four the following following following following following fo | | illouel allu log to | | PLC/Department Level | | |
| the backwards design model for units of instruction, appointments outside of school. the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four the foll | conferences, | | | | | |
| design model for units of instruction, appointments outside of school. design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four teachers focus on the following focus | | | weekly basis | Γ | | |
| Teacher appointments of instruction, on their logs. teachers focus on the following four outside of school. the following four teachers focus on the following four outside of school. The following four teachers focus on the following four outside of school. | time. | | DI Committee Continue | | | |
| appointments teachers focus on outside of school. the following four t | L-Taschar | units of instruction | on their loss | assessments and chart the | | |
| outside of school. the following four -Administrators attend 80% mastery on units of | | teachers focus on | on their logs. | | | |
| questions: 6.00 to 1 DI Constitute of the control o | | ol. the following four | Administrators attend | | | |
| instruction. | | | | | | |
| | | questions. | targeted i De meetings | instruction. | | |
| • What is it we -Progress of PLCs | | What is it we | -Progress of PLCs | | | |
| expect them to discussed at Leadership | | | | | | |
| learn? Team. | | learn? | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| How will we | | | | | | |
| if they have | | | | | | |
| learned it? | | learned it? | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| • How will we | | | | | | |
| respond if they don't | | | | | | |
| learn? | | | | | | |
| | | icaiii! | | | | |
| How will we | | • How will we | | | | |
| respond if | | | | | | |
| they already | | | | | | |
| know it? | | | | | | |
| | | _ | | | | |
| . Action | | Action | | | | |
| Steps Steps | | | | | | |

| | | Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/ content area PLC action plans. | | | |
|--|---------------|---|--|--|--|
| Mathematics Goal #4: In grades 3-5 students in the lowest 25% making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 75points to 76 points. | Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | |
| | 75 | 76 | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Ciuding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: ### Anticipated Barrier Strategy |
|--|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following |
| achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following Barrier Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? Who and how will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the offertiveness of attentors? |
| achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following Barrier Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? Who and how will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the offertiveness of streeters? |
| achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following Barrier Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? Who and how will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the offertiveness of attentors? |
| achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following Barrier Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? Who and how will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the offertiveness of attentors? |
| achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following Barrier Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? Who and how will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the offertiveness of streeters? |
| achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following Barrier Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? Who and how will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the offertiveness of streeters? |
| achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following Barrier Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? Who and how will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the offertiveness of streeters? |
| achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following Barrier Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? Who and how will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the offertiveness of streeters? |
| achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following Barrier Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? Who and how will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the offertiveness of streeters? |
| and define areas in need of improvement for the following fidelity be monitored? |
| and define areas in need of improvement for the following fidelity be monitored? |
| improvement for the following |
| subgroup: |
| 1 1 1 1 1 1 |
| Based on Ambitious but 2011-2012 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: |
| |
| 1 1 1 1 1 |

| 5A. Student subgroups by | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | |
|---------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| ethnicity (White, Black, | | | | | | |
| Hispanic, Asian, American | | Student | | | | |
| Indian) not making | | achievement | | | | |
| | Teachers' lack | improves through | <u>Who</u> | Teacher Level | During the Grading | |
| satisfactory progress in | of commitment. | teachers working | | | Period | |
| mathematics | | | Principal | _ | | |
| | Time | in bi-monthly | | l | - Common assessments | |
| | constraints | | . . | Assess and observe | (pre, post, mid, section, | |
| | | student learning. | | students using the | end of unit, intervention | |
| | implemented | Specifically, they | | same teacher-created | checks) | |
| | with fidelity. | use the Plan - | | assessments. | ĺ | |
| | , | Do-Check-Act | | | | |
| | IEP meetings, | model and log to | <u>How</u> | | | |
| | parent | structure their way | | | | |
| | | of work. Using | -PLCs turn logs into | PLC/Department Level | | |
| | time. | | administration on a bi- | | | |
| | | | weekly basis | - | | |
| | Teacher | units of instruction, | * | PLCs will review unit | | |
| | appointments | teachers focus on | PLCs receive feedback | assessments and chart the | | |
| | outside of school. | the following four | on their logs. | increase in the number of | | |
| | | questions: | | students reaching at least | | |
| | | ĺ | -Administrators attend | 80% mastery on units of | | |
| | | What is it we | | instruction. | | |
| | | expect them to | l . | | | |
| | | learn? | -Progress of PLCs | | | |
| | | | discussed at Leadership | | | |
| | | How will we | Team. | | | |
| | | if they have | | | | |
| | | learned it? | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | How will we | | | | |
| | | respond if | | | | |
| | | they don't | | | | |
| | | learn? | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | How will we | | | | |
| | | respond if | | | | |
| | | they already | | | | |
| | | know it? | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | . Action | | | | |
| | | <u>Steps</u> | | | | |

| | | | | |
|-------------------|--|------|--|--|
| | Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/ content area PLC action plans. | | | |
| Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | |

| | | White:81% | | | | | |
|---|------------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|-------------------------|-------|--|
| | Black:NA | Black: | | | | | |
| | Hispanic:75% | Hispanic:78% | | | | | |
| | Asian:Y | Asian: | | | | | |
| | Indian:NA | 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 | 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: | | | 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 mathematics. | | | | | | | |
| | | See Strategy 5A1 | See Fidelity Check 5A1 | See Strategy Data Check 5A1 | See Student | | |
| | See Goal 5A1 | | | | Evaluation Tool 5A1 | | |

| Mathematics Goal #5B: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|--|---|---|------------------------|---|-------------------------|-------|--|
| The percentage of economically disadvanged students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA will increase from 53% to 58%. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | 53% | 58% | | | | | |
| | | 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 | 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: | Barrier | | fidelity be monitored? | How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | | | |

| 5C. English Language | 5C.1. | 5C | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Learners (ELL) not | | | | | | |
| making satisfactory | See Goal 5A1 | See Strategy 5A1.1. | | | | |
| progress in mathematics. | | | Car Didalita Charle 5 A 1 | C Ctt D-t- Chl- 5 A 1 | See Student Evaluation Tool | |
| | | | See Fidelity Check 5A1 | See Strategy Data Check 5A1 | 5A1 | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Mathematics Coal #5C: | 2012 Current | 2013 Expected Level | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #5C: | 2012 Current Level of | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | • | | | |
| | Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| The percentage of ELL students | | | | | | |
| scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA will increase from | | | | | | |
| 89% to 90%. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | 000/ | 000/ | | | | |
| | 89% | 90% | | | | |

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

| 5D. Student with | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | |
|---|--------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Disabilities (SWD) not | | | [| | | |
| making satisfactory | | | | | | |
| progress in mathematics. | | | | | | |
| progress in mathematics. | | See Strategy 5A1 | See Fidelity Check 5A1 | See Strategy Data Check 5A1 | See Student Evaluation Tool | |
| | | | | | 5A1 | |
| | | | | | | |
| | See Goal 5A1 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #5D: | 2012 Current | 2013 Expected Level | | | | |
| Widthernaties Godf #3D. | 2012 Current Level of | of Performance:* | | | | |
| | Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| - | | | | | | |
| The percentage of SWD students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 | | | | | | |
| FCAT/FAA will increase from | | | | | | |
| 54% to 59%. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| 54% | 59% | | | | | |
|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | |
| | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | |

End of Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

<u>Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(Middle and High Schools ONLY)</u>

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

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

| | l _{1 1} | l _{1 1} | 1 1 | 1 1 | 1 1 | |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|--|
| | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | |
| proficient in Algebra | | | | | | |
| (Levels 3-5). | | | | | | |
| (| | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | 2012 G | 2012 7 1 1 1 | | | | |
| Algebra Goal #1: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
| | Level of | of Performance:* | | | | |
| | Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | | | | | | |
| hox | | | | | | |
| oon. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | ĺ | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 1 | ĺ | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 1 | ĺ | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | ĺ | | | | | |
| | ĺ | | | | | |
| | | 1 | | | l | |

| | | • | | • | | • | |
|--|-------------|----------|------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|------|--|
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| D | A4: -:41 | C44 | F: 1-1:4 Cl1- | Storetown Data Charle | Student Evaluation Tool | | |
| Based on the analysis of student | Anticipated | Strategy | Fidelity Check | Strategy Data Check | Student Evaluation 1001 | | |
| achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify | Barrier | | | | | | |
| and define areas in need of | | | Who and how will the | How will the evaluation tool | | | |
| improvement for the following | | | fidelity be monitored? | data be used to determine the | | | |
| group: | | | | effectiveness of strategy? | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Alg2. Students scoring | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | | |
| Achievement Levels 4 or 5 | | | | | | | |
| in Algebra. | | | | | | | |
| ili Algebia. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| Algebra Goal #2: | 2012 Current | 2013 Expected Level | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|------|------|------|------|--|
| 1 | Level of Performance:* | of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | Performance:* | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Enter narrative for the goal in this | | | | | | | |
| box. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a

Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised July, 2012

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)

End of Mathematics Goals

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 | |

| 1. FCAT 2.0: Students | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| scoring proficient (Level | 1.1. | | | 1 | 1.1. | |
| 3-5) in science. | | Student | Mho | Teacher Level | | |
| 5-5) in science. | | achievement | <u>Who</u> | reacher Lever | | |
| | | | L | L | During the Grading | |
| | | through | Principal | Γ | Period | |
| | Teachers' lack | taaahawa | | Assess and observe students | i criod | |
| | | working | Assistant Principal | using the same teacher- | - Common | |
| | Time | collaboratively | | | assessments (pre, | |
| | constraints | in bi-monthly | | | post, mid, section, end | |
| | | PLCs to focus | | | of unit, intervention | |
| | PLC's are not | | <u>How</u> | | checks) | |
| | implemented | learning. | | PLC/Department Level | , | |
| | with fidelity. | Specifically, | -PLCs turn logs into | | | |
| | IEP meetings, | | administration on a bi- | - | | |
| | parent | Plan-Do- | | PLCs will review unit | | |
| | conferences and | Check-Act | 1 | assassments and abort the | | |
| | trainings take | model and log | PLCs receive feedback on | increase in the number of | | |
| | time. | to structure | their logs. | students reaching at least | | |
| | T 1 | their way of | | 80% mastery on units of | | |
| | Teacher appointments | work. Using | -Administrators attend | instruction. | | |
| | | the backwards | targeted PLC meetings | | | |
| | | design model | | | | |
| | | for units of | -Progress of PLCs | | | |
| | | instruction, | discussed at Leadership | | | |
| | | teachers focus on the | Геат. | | | |
| | | following four | | | | |
| | | questions: | | | | |
| | | questions. | | | | |
| | | What is it | | | | |
| | | we expect | | | | |
| | | them to | | | | |
| | | learn? | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | How will | | | | |
| | | we if | | | | |
| | | they have | | | | |
| | | learned it? | | ĺ | | |
| | | | | ĺ | | |
| | | • How | | ĺ | | |
| | | will we | | ĺ | | |
| | | respond if | | ĺ | | |
| | | they don't | | | | |

| learn? | | |
|--|--|--|
| iouiii. | | |
| • How | | |
| will we | | |
| respond if they | | |
| if they | | |
| already | | |
| know it? | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| <u>Act</u> | | |
| <u>Act</u> <u>ion</u> <u>Steps</u> | | |
| <u>Steps</u> | | |
| | | |
| Act | | |
| ion stans | | |
| steps for | | |
| this | | |
| strat | | |
| egy | | |
| are | | |
| outlin | | |
| ed on | | |
| grade level/ | | |
| con | | |
| tent | | |
| area | | |
| PLC | | |
| act | | |
| act ion | | |
| plans. | | |
| | | |
| | | |

| In grade 5, the percentage of students who score at a level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT | <u>Level of</u> Performance∴* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|--|---|---------------------|----------------------------|------|--|
| Science will increase from 80% to 81%. | | 81% | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| 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 | Strategy Data Check | Student Evaluation Tool | | |

| 2. FCAT 2.0: Students | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| scoring Achievement | - | | | | 2.1. | |
| Levels 4 or 5 in science. | | Student | Mho | Teacher Level | | |
| Levels 4 or 5 in science. | | achievement | <u>Who</u> | reacher Level | | |
| | | | L | L | During the Grading | |
| | | through | Principal | Γ | Period | |
| | Teachers' lack | taaahawa | | Assess and observe students | CHOU | |
| | of commitment. | working | Assistant Principal | using the same teacher- | - Common | |
| | Time | collaboratively | | | assessments (pre, | |
| | constraints | in bi-monthly | | | post, mid, section, end | |
| | | PLCs to focus | | | of unit, intervention | |
| | PLC's are not | | <u>How</u> | | checks) | |
| | implemented | learning. | | PLC/Department Level | () | |
| | with fidelity. | | -PLCs turn logs into | | | |
| | IEP meetings, | | administration on a bi- | F | | |
| | parent | Plan-Do- | | PLCs will review unit | | |
| | conferences, and | Check-Act | l - | accecements and chart the | | |
| | trainings take | model and log | PLCs receive feedback on | increase in the number of | | |
| | time. | to structure | their logs. | students reaching at least | | |
| | | their way of | | 80% mastery on units of | | |
| | Teacher appointments | work. Using | -Administrators attend | instruction. | | |
| | | the backwards | targeted PLC meetings | | | |
| | Cuisiae of Senioon | design model | | | | |
| | | for units of | -Progress of PLCs | | | |
| | | instruction, | discussed at Leadership | | | |
| | | teachers | Team. | | | |
| | | focus on the | | | | |
| | | following four questions: | | | | |
| | | questions. | | | | |
| | | • What is it | | | | |
| | | we expect | | | | |
| | | them to | | | | |
| | | learn? | | | | |
| | | iourii: | | | | |
| | | How will | | | | |
| | | we if | | | | |
| | | they have | | | | |
| | | learned it? | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | How | | | | |
| | | will we | | | | |
| | | respond if | | | | |
| | | they don't | | | | |

| | | | i . | · |
|-------------|---------------------|---|-----|---|
| | learn? | | | |
| | | l | | |
| | • How | l | | |
| | will we | | | |
| | will we | | | |
| | respond | | | |
| | if they already | | | |
| | already | | | |
| | know it? | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | Act | | | |
| | ion | | | |
| | Act ion Steps | | | |
| | <u>Steps</u> | | | |
| | | | | |
| | Act | | | |
| | ion | | | |
| | atona | | | |
| | steps | | | |
| | for | | | |
| | this | | | |
| | strat | | | |
| | egy | | | |
| | are | | | |
| | arc | | | |
| | outlin | | | |
| | ed on | | | |
| | grade | l | | |
| | grade level/ | | | |
| | con | | | |
| | tent | l | | |
| | | | | |
| | area | | | |
| | PLC | | | |
| | act | | | |
| | ion | l | | |
| | plans. | l | | |
| | F | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | 1 | | I |

| In grade 5, the percentage of students who score at a level 4 or 5 on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 38% to 39%. | Level of Performance:* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|------|--|------|--|
| | 38% | 39% | | | | |
| | | | 2.2. | | 2.2. | |

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.

Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised July, 2012

| 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 | school-wide) | meetings) | | |

End of Science Goals

Writing/Language Arts Goals

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

| | 1 | i | I | l | 1, , | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 1. Students scoring | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | |
| at Achievement | | | | | | |
| Level 3.0 or higher | | Student | <u>Who</u> | Teacher Level | | |
| in writing. | | achievement | | | | |
| | | improves | Principal | F | During the Grading | |
| | Teachers' lack of | through teachers | | Assess and observe | Period | |
| | commitment. | working | Assistant Principal | | | |
| | | collaboratively | Assistant i micipai | students using the | - Common | |
| | Time constraints | in bi-monthly | | same teacher-created | assessments (pre, | |
| | | PLCs to focus on | | assessments. | post, mid, section, | |
| | PLC's are not | student learning. | | | intervention checks) | |
| | implemented with | Specifically, they | <u>How</u> | | | |
| | fidelity. | use the Plan- | | | | |
| | IEP meetings, | Do-Check- | -PLCs turn logs into | PLC/Department Level | | |
| | parent conferences | Act model and | administration on a bi- | | | |
| | and trainings take | log to structure | weekly basis | F | | |
| | time. | their way of | | PLCs will review unit | | |
| | | work. Using the | -PLCs receive feedback on | assessments and chart the | | |
| | Teacher | backwards design | their logs. | increase in the number of | | |
| | appointments outside of school. | model for units | | students reaching at least | | |
| | of school. | of instruction, | -Administrators attend | 80% mastery on units of | | |
| | | teachers focus on | targeted PLC meetings | instruction. | | |
| | | the following four | | | | |
| | | questions: | -Progress of PLCs | | | |
| | | | discussed at Leadership | | | |
| | | What is it | Team. | | | |
| | | we expect | | | | |
| | | them to | | | | |
| | | learn? | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | How will we | | | | |
| | | if they have | | | | |
| | | learned it? | | | | |
| | | 77 '11 | | | | |
| | | • How will we | | | | |
| | | respond if | | | | |
| | | they don't | | | | |
| | | learn? | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | How will we respond if | | | | |
| | | respond if they already | | | | |
| | | know it? | | | | |
| | | KIIOW It! | | | | |
| | 1 | | | 1 | | |

| | | <u>Action</u> | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | <u>Steps</u> | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | Action | | | |
| | | steps | | | |
| | | steps for this | | | |
| | | strategy | | | |
| | | are | | | |
| | | outlined | | | |
| | | on | | | |
| | | grade | | | |
| | | level/ | | | |
| | | content | | | |
| | | area | | | |
| | | PLC | | | |
| | | action | | | |
| | | plans. | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Writing/LA Goal #1: | 2012 Current Level | 2013 Expected | | | |
| Writing/LA Goal #1: | of Performance:* | Level of Performance:* | | | |
| | | Performance:* | | | |
| | | | | | |
| In grade 4 the | | | | | |
| in grade 4 the | | | | | |
| percentage of | | | | | |
| students proficient | | | | | |
| in writing on the | | | | | |
| 2012 FCAT Whiting | | | | | |
| 2013 FCAT Writing | | | | | |
| will increase from | | | | | |
| 96% to 97%. | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | 96% | 97% | | | |
| | 7070 | 7/70 | | | |
| | | | | | |

| | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Writing/Language Arts Professional Development

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. PD Content /Topic

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)

End of Writing Goals

Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised July, 2012

| 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 | |
| | There is not a system to reinforce parents for facilitating improvement in attendance. | Beginning at the 5th unexcused absence, guidance | Social Worker Guidance Counselor MTSS | PSLT will disaggregate attendance data for the "Tier 2" group along with the guidance counselor and maintain communication about these children | 1.1 Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/ Tardy data | |

| Attendance Goal #1: | 2012 Current Attendance Rate:* | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Students will attend | | | | | |
| 97% of school days | | | | | |
| during the 2013 school year. | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| The number of | | | | | |
| students with | | | | | |
| excessive tardies will decrease from | | | | | |
| 25 to 24 students. | | | | | |
| | 96.33% | | | | |
| | Number of Students | 2013 Expected Number of Students | | | |
| | with Excessive Absences | with Excessive Absences | | | |
| | (10 or more) | (10 or more) | | | |
| | (10 of more) | (10 of more) | | | |
| | 27 | 26 | | | |
| | 2012 Current | 2013 Expected | | | |
| | Students with | Number of | | | |
| | Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | Students with Excessive Tardies | | | |
| | | (10 or more) | | | |
| | 25 | 24 | | | |
| | | <u> </u> | | | |

| | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. PD Content /Topic

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)

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

| Suspension | Problem- | | | |
|------------|------------|--|--|--|
| Goal(s) | solving | | | |
| | Process to | | | |
| | Decrease | | | |

Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised July, 2012

| | 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 | |
| 1. Suspension | implementing the common school-wide expectations and rules and not providing explicit instruction to students on the expectations | the school-wide expectations and rules, and provide training to new staff in methods | Motivating" subgroup | PSLT "Managing and Motivating" subgroup with review data on Office Discipline Referrals (ODRs) and out of school suspensions monthly. | 1.1 "UNTIE" ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data | |

| [a | b010 F + 137 1 | h 012 F | · | | |
|---|---------------------------|---------------------------|-------|--|---|
| Suspension Goal #1: | 2012 Total Number | 2013 Expected | | | |
| | <u>of</u> | Number of | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | In School | In School | | | |
| L | In –School Suspensions | In- School Suspensions | | | |
| The total number of in- | Suspensions | Suspensions | | | |
| school suspensions will | | | | | |
| school suspensions will decrease from 1 to 0 | | | | | |
| during the 2013 school year. | | | | | |
| year. | | | | | |
| ſ | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | 1 |
| 1 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | |
| 1 | I | I | | | |

| Suspension Goal #2 The total number of out of school suspensions will decrease from 1 to 0. | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| | 2012 Total Number of Students | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended | | | |
| | 2012 Number of | In -School 2013 Expected | | | |
| | Suspensions Suspensions | Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | | | |
| | 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School | | | |
| | | | | | |

| | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | |
|---|---|----------|------|---|------|--|
| I | Tier 1: Positive Behavior Support (PBS) will be implemented to address school- wide expectations and rules. | subgroup | 1 | and suspension data cross-referenced with | | |
| | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

Suspension Professional Development

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

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

PD Content /Topic Grade Level/ Subject

PD Fac

and/or

PLC Leader

PD Facilitator PD Participants

Target Dates and Schedules

Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring

Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

and/or PLC Focus

J

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

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

meetings)

End of Suspension Goals

Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised July, 2012

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

| Dropout Prevention Goal(s) | Problem- solving Process to Dropout Prevention | | , U | represents next to the per | | |
|---|--|----------|---|--|----------------------------|--|
| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | |
| 1. Dropout Prevention | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | |
| Dropout Prevention Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out | | | | | | |
| during the 2011-2012 school year. | | | | | | |

| | 2012 Current Dropout Rate:* | 2013 Expected Dropout Rate:* | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | | | | | | | |
| Enter narrative for the goal | | | | | | | |
| in this box. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | 2012 Current Graduation Rate:* | 2013 Expected Graduation Rate:* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. PD Content /Topic

Grade Level/ Subject

PD Facilitator

PD Participants

Target Dates and Schedules

Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring

Person or Position Responsible for

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 July, 2012

81

Monitoring

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Title I Schools - Please see the Parent Information Notebook (PIN) to view a copy of the Title I PIP.

| Parent Involvement Goal(s) | Problem- solving Process to Parent Involveme nt | | | | | |
|---|--|------|------|--|----------------------------|--|
| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | | | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | |
| 1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | |

| Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | 2012 Current level of Parent Involvement.* | 2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:* | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|----------------------------|------|--|
| | | 1.2. | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| Parent Involvement Goal(s) | Problem- solving Process to Parent Involveme nt | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | | |

| 2. Parent Involvement | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | | |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | | | | | | | |
| Donant Involvement Coal | | | | | | | |
| Parent Involvement Goal #2: | | | | | | | |
| | 2012 Current | 2013 Expected | | | | | |
| | level of Parent Involvement:* | level of Parent Involvement:* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 2.1. | |
| | | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | |

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

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

Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised July, 2012

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Health and Fitness Goal(s)

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

| | <u> </u> | | <u> </u> | _ ^ | | |
|---|------------------------|----------|----------------|---|----------------------------|--|
| | Problem- 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? | | |

| Goal | -Heat and humidity will not allow students to perform their best on the test. | | • | 1. Classroom walkthroughs Class schedules | 1. Information from classroom walkthroughs | |
|---|--|------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| Health and Fitness Goal #1: During the 2012-2013 school year, 83.9% of fifth grade students fell in the Healthy Fitness Zone for cardiovascular fitness using the PACER test. By May, 2013, 93.9% of our fifth grade students will be in the Healthy Fitness Zone. | 2012 Current Level :* | 2013 Expected Level :* | | | | |
| | 83.9% | 93.9% | | | | |

| | 1.2. Health and physical activity initiatives developed and implemented by the school's H.E.A.R.T. team. | 1.2. H.E.A.R.T. team. | team notes/agendas | 1.2. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health. | |
|--|--|---------------------------------------|--------------------|---|--|
| | playground or fitness course equipment; | 1.3. Physical Education Teacher | Physical Education | 1.3. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health. | |

Health and Fitness Goals Professional Development

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. PD Content /Topic

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)

Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised July, 2012

Continuous Improvement Goal(s)

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

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

| 4 0 1 | 1 1 | lı 1 | 1 1 | 1 1 | 4 0 1 1 01 | 1 | |
|--|--------------------------|---------------|---------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|---|--|
| 20 00000000 | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1. School Climate | | |
| Improvement Goal | | | | | Servey | | |
| | | Sch | Who | <u> Teacher Level</u> | | | |
| | | | | | PLC Logs | | |
| | | ool | Principal | _ | | | |
| | | web | | | | | |
| | Teachers | | | Teachers will communicate | | | |
| | not updating | Site | Assistant Principal | with parents on a regular | | | |
| 1 | websites. | will | | basis. | | | |
| | | be | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | upd | | | | | |
| | | ated | | | | | |
| | | on a | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | reg | | | | | |
| | | ular | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | basi | | | | | |
| | | S. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Continuous Improvement | 2012 Current Level :* | 2013 Expected | | | | | |
| Goal #1: | Level :* | Level :* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Based on the 2011- | | | | | | | |
| 2012 School Climate and | | | | | | | |
| Perception Survey for | | | | | | | |
| Parents,47.8% of the | | | | | | | |
| people strongly agree with | | | | | | | |
| the following statement: | | | | | | | |
| the following statement: The school keeps me informed of activities. In 2013 the | | | | | | | |
| of activities. In 2013 the | | | | | | | |
| number of parents who strongly | | | | | | | |
| number of parents who strongly agree with this statement will increase to 50%. | | | | | | | |
| | | 700 | | | | | |
| | 47.8% | 50% | | | | | |
| | - / • • / • | | | | | | |

Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised July, 2012

| | | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2. | |
|---|--|------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |
| Į | | | | | | | |

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

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)

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

NEW Reading Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

| A. Florida | A.1. | A.1. | A.1. | A.1. | A.1. | |
|-------------|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| Alternate | | | | | | |
| Assessment: | | Student | Who | Teacher Level | | |
| | | | VVIIO | Todonor Editor | | |
| | | l. | Dringing | L | During the Grading Period | |
| <u> -</u> | | | | | Burnig the Grading Ferror | |
| | Teachers' lack of commitmentTime constraintsPLC's are not implemented with fidelityIEP meetings, parent conferences, and trainings take timeTeacher appointments outside of school. | through teachers working collaborat ively in bi- monthly PLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do- Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, | How -PLCs turn logs into administration on a bi-weekly basis -PLCs receive feedback on their logsAdministrators attend targeted PLC | Assess and observe students using the same teacher-created assessments. PLC/Department Level PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. | During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks) | |
| | | focus on the following four questions: What is it we expect them to learn? How will | Leadership Team. | | | |

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

| 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | learned it? How will we respond if they don't learn? How will we respond if they don't learn? | - | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | |
| 15% | 16% | | | | | |
| | A.2. | A.2. | A.2. | A.2. | A.2. | |
| | | they have learned it? How will we respond if they don't learn? How will we respond if they already know it? 2012 Current Level of Performance:* 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | they have learned it? How will we respond if they don't learn? How will we respond if they already know it? 2012 Current Level of Performance:* 2015 Performance:* 15% 16% | they have learned it? How will we respond if they don't learn? How will we respond if they already know it? 2012 Current Level of Performance:* Performance:* 15% 16% | they have learned it? How will we respond if they don't learn? How will we respond if they already know it? 2012 Current Level of Performance.* 2013 Expected Level of Performance.* | they have learned it? How will we respond if they don't learn? How will we respond if they already know it? 2012 Current Level of Performance.* 2018 Expected Level of Performance.* 2018 Expected Level of Performance.* |

| | A.3. | A.3. | A.3. | A.3. | A.3. | |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| B. Florida | B.1. | B.1. | B.1. | B.1. | B.1. | |
|-------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|---|-----------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Alternate | D.11. | B.1. | D.11. | 5.1. | D.1. | |
| Assessment: | | Student | <u>Who</u> | Teacher Level | | |
| | | achievement | <u>vviio</u> | reaction bevon | | |
| Percentage of | | _ | D. C. C. C. | | During the Grading Period | |
| students making | | through | Principal | | During the Grading Ferrod | |
| Learning Gains in | | tooobows | | Assess and observe | - Common assessments | |
| reading. | | working | Assistant Principal | students using the | (pre, post, mid, section, end | |
| | communent. | collaborat | | same teacher-created | of unit, intervention checks) | |
| | Time | ively in bi- | | assessments. | | |
| | | monthly | | | | |
| | | PLCs to focus | <u>How</u> | | | |
| | PLC's are not | on student | | L | | |
| | implemented | learning. | ri Les turn logs into | PLC/Department Level | | |
| | with fidelity. | | administration on a | | | |
| | | they use the | bi-weekly basis | <u> </u> | | |
| | | Plan-Do- | Dr. C. | PLCs will review unit | | |
| | meetings, parent | Check-Act | -PLCs receive feedback on their | assessments and chart | | |
| | | to structure | | the increase in the | | |
| | and trainings | their way of | logs. | number of students | | |
| | 4 4 4 | | -Administrators | reaching at least 80% | | |
| | | the backwards | attend targeted PLC | mastery on units of | | |
| | Teacher appointments | design model | meetings | instruction. | | |
| | outside of | for units of | J. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. | | | |
| | school. | instruction, | -Progress of | | | |
| | | teachers | PLCs discussed at | | | |
| | | focus on the | Leadership Team. | | | |
| | | following four | 1 | | | |
| | | questions: | | | | |
| | | What | | | | |
| | | is it we | | | | |
| | | expect | | | | |
| | | them to | | | | |
| | | learn? | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | How will | | | | |
| | | we if | | | | |
| | | they have | | | | |
| | | learned | | | | |
| | | it? | | | | |
| | | • How | | | | |
| | | • HOW | | | | |

| | will we respond if they don't learn? How will we respond if they already know it? | <u>-</u> | | | | |
|-------------------|--|----------|------|------|------|--|
| Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| 3% | 4% | | | | | |
| | B.2. | B.2. | B.2. | B.2. | B.2. | |

| B.3. | B.3. | B.3. | B.3. | B.3. | |
|------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

NEW Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

| proficient in Listening/ Speaking. | Teachers' lack of commitmentTime constraintsPLC's are not implemented with fidelityIEP meetings, parent conferences, and trainings take timeTeacher appointments outside of school. | improves through teachers working collaboratively in bi- monthly PLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: What is it we expect them to learn? How will we if they have learned it? | Principal Assistant Principal How -PLCs turn logs into administration on a bi-weekly basis -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team. | Assess and observe students using the same teacher-created assessments. PLC/Department Level PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. | During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks) | |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| | | | | | | |

| CELLA Goal #C: The number of students that score proficient in listening/speaking will increase from 59% to 60% on the 2013 CELLA assessment. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: | | | | | |
|--|--|----------|------|--|-------------------------|------|
| | 59% | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | |

| proficient in Reading. | Teachers' lack of commitmentTime constraintsPLC's are not implemented with fidelityIEP meetings, parent conferences, and trainings take timeTeacher appointments outside of school. | Student achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively in bimonthly PLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: What is it we expect them to learn? How will we if they have learned it? | Who Principal Assistant Principal How -PLCs turn logs into administration on a bi-weekly basis -PLCs receive feedback on their logsAdministrators attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed | Teacher Level Assess and observe students using the same teacher-created assessments. PLC/Department Level | During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks) | |
|------------------------|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| | | How will we if they have learned it?How will we respond | targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team. | mastery on units of | | |

| CELLA Goal #D: The number of students that score proficient in Reading will increase from 53% to 54% on the 2013 CELLA assessment. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------|---|-------------------------|-----------------------------|------|
| | 53% | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 2.2. |
| Students write in English at grade | Anticipated Barrier | 2.3 Strategy | 2.3 Fidelity Check | 2.3 Strategy Data Check | 2.3 Student Evaluation Tool | 2.3 |
| level in a manner similar to non- ELL students. | Tanaspassa Barras | | Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | | | |

| E. Students scoring | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| zi staatiits storing | F | ∠. 1. | - | F. 1. | T | |
| proficient in Writing. | | G. 1 . 1: | l.,, | T 1 7 1 | | |
| | | | <u>Who</u> | <u> Teacher Level</u> | | |
| | | improves through | | | | |
| | | teachers working | Principal | F | During the Grading Period | |
| | | collaboratively in bi- | | Assess and observe | | |
| | | monthly PLCs to focus | l | | - Common assessments (pre, | |
| | | on student learning. | • | students using the | post, mid, section, end of unit, | |
| | | Specifically, they use | | same teacher-created | intervention checks) | |
| | PLC's are not implemented with | the Plan-Do-Check-Act | | assessments. | | |
| | fidelity. | model and log to structure | | | | |
| | | their way of work. | <u>How</u> | | | |
| | IEP meetings, parent conferences, | Using the backwards | | | | |
| | and trainings take time. | design model for units of | -PLCs turn logs into | PLC/Department Level | | |
| | | | administration on a bi-weekly | | | |
| | | | basis | F | | |
| | | questions: | | DI Co. 111 ou in ouit | | |
| | | ~ | | PLCs will review unit | | |
| | | | thain ta an | assessments and chart | | |
| | | them to learn? | - | the increase in the | | |
| | | | A 1 | number of students | | |
| | | How will we if they | (1 DT C (| reaching at least 80% | | |
| | | have learned it? | | mastery on units of | | |
| | | | -Progress of PLCs discussed | instruction. | | |
| | | How will we respond | at Landarshin Team | | | |
| | | if they don't learn? | at Leadership Team. | | | |
| | | if they don't learn: | | | | |
| | | How will we respond | | | | |
| | | if they already know | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | it? | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| CELLA Goal #E: The number of students who score proficient will increase from 53% to 54% on the 2013 CELLA assessment. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing: | | | | |
|---|---|------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | 53% | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. 2.3 | 2.2. 2.3 | 2.2. 2.3 |

NEW Math Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

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

| F. Florida | F.1. | F.1. | F.1. | F.1. | F.1. | | |
|-------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|---|---|---|--|
| · · | 1.1. | r.1. | 1.1. | u·.i. | u·.i. | | |
| Alternate | | Ct. 1t | NA /II. | Teacher Level | | | |
| Assessment: | | Student | <u>Who</u> | Teacher Level | | | |
| Students scoring | | achievement | | | | | |
| at in mathematics | | improves | Principal | Γ | During the Grading Period | • | |
| (Levels 4-9). | Teachers Tack | through | | Assess and observe students | G | | |
| | of commitment. | teachers | Assistant Principal | using the same teacher-created | - Common assessments | | |
| | | working collaboratively | · · | • | (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks) | | |
| | Time | | | assessments. | of unit, intervention checks) | | |
| | | in bi-monthly PLCs to focus | | | | | |
| | | | How | | | | |
| | implemented | learning. | 110W | PLC/Department Level | | | |
| | with fidelity. | | -PLCs turn logs into | * | | | |
| | | | administration on a | L | | | |
| | IEP meetings, | | bi-weekly basis | DI G 311 : : | | | |
| | parent conferences, | Check-Act | oi-weekiy basis | PLCs will review unit | | | |
| | and trainings | | -PLCs receive | assessments and chart the increase in the number of | | | |
| | | | feedback on their | | | | |
| | | their way of | logs. | students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. | | | |
| | Teacher | work. Using | Bo. | mastery on units of histraction. | | | |
| | appointments | | -Administrators | | | | |
| | outside of school. | design model | attend targeted PLC | | | | |
| | SCHOOL. | for units of | meetings | | | | |
| | | instruction, | Č | | | | |
| | | teachers | -Progress of | | | | |
| | | focus on the | PLCs discussed at | | | | |
| | | following four | Leadership Team. | | | | |
| | | questions: | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | • What is it | | | | | |
| | | we expect | | | | | |
| | | them to | | | | | |
| | | learn? | | | | | |
| | | How will | | | | | |
| | | we if | | | | | |
| | | they have | | | | | |
| | | learned it? | | | | | |
| | | l icarricu it! | | | | | |
| | | • How | | | | | |
| | | will we | | | | | |
| | | respond if | | | | | |
| | | they don't | | | | | |

| | | learn? How will we respond if they already know it? | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|--|------|------|------|------|--|
| The number of students who scored levels 4-9 on the FAA math assessment will maintain or increase from 25% to 26% in 2013. | Level of Performance:* | | | | | | |
| | 25% | 26% | | | | | |
| | | F.2. | F.2. | F.2. | F.2. | F.2. | |

| | F.3. | F.3. | F.3. | F.3. | F.3. | |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| C TI 11 | C 1 | C 1 | h: 1 | G.1. | G.1. | |
|-------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| G. Florida | G.1. | G.1. | G.1. | G.1. | G.1. | |
| Alternate | | | | L | | |
| Assessment: | | Student | <u>Who</u> | Teacher Level | | |
| Percentage of | | achievement | | | | |
| students making | | improves | Principal | - | During the Grading Period | |
| Learning Gains in | Teachers' lack | through | ' | Assess and observe students | | |
| mathematics. | of commitment | teachers | Assistant Principal | | - Common assessments | |
| mathematics. | | WOLKING | · · | using the same teacher-created | (pre, post, mid, section, end | |
| | Time | collaboratively | 7 | assessments. | of unit, intervention checks) | |
| | | in bi-monthly | | | | |
| | | PLCs to focus | | | | |
| | PLC's are not implemented | | <u>How</u> | PLC/Department Level | | |
| | with fidelity. | learning. | | PLC/Department Level_ | | |
| | with fidelity. | Specifically, | -PLCs turn logs into | | | |
| | IEP meetings, | they use the | administration on a | Γ | | |
| | parent | Plan-Do- | bi-weekly basis | PLCs will review unit | | |
| | conferences, | Check-Act | L | assessments and chart the | | |
| | | | -PLCs receive | increase in the number of | | |
| | | | feedback on their | students reaching at least 80% | | |
| | | their way of | logs. | mastery on units of instruction. | | |
| | appointments | work. Using | | | | |
| | outside of | the backwards | -Administrators | | | |
| | school. | design model | attend targeted PLC | | | |
| | | for units of | meetings | | | |
| | | instruction, teachers | D C | | | |
| | | | -Progress of | | | |
| | | | PLCs discussed at Leadership Team. | | | |
| | | questions: | Leadership Team. | | | |
| | | questions. | | | | |
| | | • What is it | | | | |
| | | we expect | | | | |
| | | them to | | | | |
| | | learn? | | | | |
| | | l curr. | | | | |
| | | How will | | | | |
| | | we if | | | | |
| | | they have | | | | |
| | | learned it? | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | How | | | | |
| | | will we | | | | |
| | | respond if | | | | |
| | | they don't | | | | |

| | 1 | learn? | | | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | | • How | | | | | |
| | | will we respond | | | | | |
| | | if they already | | | | | |
| | | know it? | | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal | 2012 Current | 2013 Expected Level of | | | | | |
| <u>G:</u> | Level of Performance:* | Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| The number of students who make learning gains | | | | | | | |
| who make learning gains will maintain or increase from 9 to 10 in 2013. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | 9 | 10 | | | | | |
| | ļ | | | | | | |
| | | G.2. | G.2. | G.2. | G.2. | G.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | G.3. | G.3. | G.3. | G.3. | G.3. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

NEW Geometry End-of-Course Goals *(High School ONLY)

| Geometry EOC 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 | |

| | L . | L . | L . | L. | | |
|--|------------------------|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|--|
| H. Students scoring in the middle or upper third (proficient) in Geometry. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | |
| the middle or upper third | | | | | | |
| (nyoficiant) in Coometwy | | | | | | |
| (proficient) in Geometry. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Geometry Goal H: | 2012 Current | 2013 Expected Level | | | | |
| Geometry Goar H. | Level of | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
| | Level of Performance:* | of f criofinance. | | | | |
| | i criormance. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Enter narrative for the goal in this | | | | | | |
| box. | | | | | | |
| ook. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
|----------------------------------|-------------|----------|------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|------|--|
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |
| | | 1.5. | 1.5. | 1.5. | 1.5. | 1.5. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| D | A42 -241 | 644 | Fidelia, Charle | Storte Dete Charle | C4d4 Ed Tl | | |
| Based on the analysis of student | Anticipated | Strategy | Fidelity Check | Strategy Data Check | Student Evaluation Tool | | |
| achievement data, and reference | Barrier | | | | | | |
| to "Guiding Questions", identify | | | Who and have will the | How will the evaluation tool | | | |
| and define areas in need of | | | Who and how will the | now will the evaluation tool | | | |
| improvement for the following | | | fidelity be monitored? | data be used to determine the | | | |
| | | | | effectiveness of strategy? | | | |
| group: | | | | | | | |
| I. Students scoring in the | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | | |
| i. Stauchts scoring in the | [· · · | Γ | F | F | | | |
| upper third on Geometry. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | l | | | |
| | | | | l | | | |
| | | | | l | | | |
| | | | | l | | | |
| | | | | l | | | |
| | | | | l | | | |
| | | | | l | | | |
| | | | | l | | | |
| | | | | l | | | |
| | | | | l | | | |
| | | | | l | | | |
| | | | | l | | | |
| | | | | l | | | |
| | | | | l | | | |
| | | | I | I | | I | |

| Enter narrative for the goal in this | <u>Level of</u> Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|------|------|------|------|--|
| box. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | |
| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | |
| | | | | | | | |

End of Geometry EOC Goals

NEW Science Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

| Elementary, Middle | Problem- | | | |
|-------------------------------|------------|--|--|--|
| <mark>and High</mark> 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 Elevision Alternation | J.1. | J.1. | J.1. | J.1. | T 1 | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---|--|
| J. Florida Alternate | 0.1. | D.1. | J.1. | J.1. | J.1. | |
| Assessment: Students | | G. 1 | l.,, | | | |
| scoring at proficient in | | Student | <u>Who</u> | Teacher Level | | |
| science (Levels 4-9). | | achievement | | | D : 4 C !: | |
| | | improves | Principal | Γ | During the Grading | |
| | Teachers' lack | through | | Assess and observe students | <u>Period</u> | |
| | of commitment. | teachers | Assistant Principal | using the same teacher- | | |
| | | working collaborativel | · · | l • . | - Common | |
| | Time | | | created assessments. | assessments (pre, | |
| | constraints | y in bi-monthly PLCs to focus | | | post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention | |
| | PLC's are not | | How | | checks) | |
| | implemented | learning. | <u>How</u> | PLC/Department Level | cnecks) | |
| | with fidelity. | | | <u> </u> | | |
| | | | -PLCs turn logs into | L | | |
| | IEP meetings, | Plan-Do- | administration on a bi- weekly basis | L | | |
| | parent | Check-Act | - | PLCs will review unit | | |
| | conferences, and trainings take | model and log | DI Ca receive feedback on | assessments and chart the | | |
| | time. | to structure | -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. | increase in the number of | | |
| | time. | their way of | ŭ | students reaching at least | | |
| | Teacher | work. Using | -Administrators attend | 80% mastery on units of | | |
| | appointments | | targeted PLC meetings | instruction. | | |
| | outside of school. | design model | aurgeted i De meetings | | | |
| | | for units of | -Progress of PLCs | | | |
| | | instruction, | discussed at Leadership | | | |
| | | teachers | Team. | | | |
| | | focus on the | | | | |
| | | following four | | | | |
| | | questions: | | | | |
| | | <u> </u> | | | | |
| | | What is it | | | | |
| | | we expect | | | | |
| | | them to | | | | |
| | | learn? | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | How will | | | | |
| | | we if | | | | |
| | | they have | | | | |
| | | learned it? | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | • How | | | | |
| | | will we | | | | |
| | | respond if | | | | |
| | ĺ | they don't | | | l | |

| | | learn? | | | | | |
|--|---|--|------|------|------|------|--|
| | | How will we respond if they already know it? | | | | | |
| | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| The number of students scoring levels 4-9 on FAA Science will maintain or increase by 1 student in 2013. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | J.2. | J.2. | J.2. | J.2. | J.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | J.3. | J.3. | J.3. | J.3. | J.3. | |
| | | | | | | | |

NEW Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

| | | number of ste | idents the percentage i | epresents next to the per | ciitage (c.g. 7070 (| 33)). | |
|---|---|---------------|--|--|----------------------------|-------|--|
| Biology EOC 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 | | |
| K. Students scoring in the middle or upper third (proficient) in Biology. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | | |

| Biology Goal K: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------------------|--|--|----------------------------|------|--|
| Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | | 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 | | |

| T Students seeming in | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | |
|--|---|--|------|------|------|--|
| L. Students scoring in upper third in Biology. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | |
| upper third in biology. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Biology Goal L: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
| | Level of | Level of | | | | |
| | Performance:* | Performance:* | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | | | | | | |
| box. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | |
|---|--|------|------|------|------|------|--|
| Γ | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | |
| | | | | | | | |

NEW Writing Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

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

| NAT TOLL 1.7 | M.1. | M 1 | N. / 1 | M.1. | M.1. | |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------------------|-------------------------|---|-------------------------|-------------|
| | M.1. | M.1. | M.1. | IVI. I . | M1.1. | |
| Alternate | | | l.,, | L | | |
| Assessment: | | Student | <u>Who</u> | Teacher Level | | |
| Students scoring | | achievement | | | L | |
| at 4 or higher in | | improves | Principal | - | During the Grading | |
| writing (Levels 4-9). | Teachers' lack of | through teachers | | Assess and observe | Period | |
| | commitment. | working collaboratively | . . | students using the | - Common | |
| | | in bi-monthly | · · | same teacher-created | assessments (pre, | |
| | Time constraints | PLCs to focus on | | assessments. | post, mid, section, end | |
| | PLC's are not | student learning. | | assessments. | of unit, intervention | |
| | implemented with | Specifically, they | How | | checks) | |
| | fidelity. | use the Plan - | <u>i i i ovv</u> | | checks) | |
| | 1 | | -PLCs turn logs into | PLC/Department Level | | |
| | IEP meetings, | | administration on a bi- | | | |
| | parent conferences, and trainings take | | weekly basis | L | | |
| | time. | their way of | - | DI Co. III oo iyo aata | | |
| | | | | PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the | | |
| | Teacher | backwards design | 1 1 | increase in the number of | | |
| | appointments outside | model for units | - | students reaching at least | | |
| | of school. | | | 80% mastery on units of | | |
| | | teachers focus on | targeted PLC meetings | instruction. | | |
| | | the following four | | instruction. | | |
| | | questions: | -Progress of PLCs | | | |
| | | | discussed at Leadership | | | |
| | | | Team. | | | |
| | | we expect | | | | |
| | | them to | | | | |
| | | learn? | | | | |
| | | How will we | | | | |
| | | if they have | | | | |
| | | learned it? | | | | |
| | | learned it? | | | | |
| | | How will we | | | | |
| | | respond if | | | | |
| | | they don't | | | | |
| | | learn? | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | How will we | | | | |
| | | respond if | | | | |
| | | they already | | | | |
| | | know it? | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| Writing Goal M: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|--|--|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|--|
| The number of students scoring levels 4-9 on FAA Writing will maintain or increase by 1 student in 2013. | | | | | | | |
| | 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)

| STEM Goal(s) | Problem-Solving | | |
|--------------|------------------|--|--|
| | Process to | | |
| | Increase Student | | |
| | Achievement | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| 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: | | | fidelity be monitored? | How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | |
| STEM Goal #1: | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| We will increase participation in Math Bowl, Science Olympics and Science Fair. | events often comes too late | | | PLC logs PLC walk-throughs | Administration will require a list of students participating in these events. |
| | | | PLC logs | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | | | |
| | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| | | | | | |

STEM Professional Development

Professional

Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised July, 2012

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

and/or

PLC Leader

PD Participants

Target Dates and Schedules

Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring

Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

and/or PLC Focus

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

| CTE Goal(s) | Problem-Solving Problem-Solving | |
|-------------|---------------------------------|--|
| | Process to | |
| | Increase Student | |
| | Achievement | |
| | | |
| | | |

| 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: | | | Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | |
| CTE Goal #1: | 1.1. | 1.1 | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| | | | Guidance counselor | Guest sign in sheet | Guest sign in sheet |
| Increase student interest in career opportunities and program selection prior to middle school. The school will increase the frequency of career exposure activities during the 2012/2013 school year. | The availability of quality speakers. | Utilize GATI to provide career options to students. | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | 1.2.Not enough time in the school year | 1.2.Provide field trip opportunities. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | school year | opportunities. | Assistant Principal | | Log of CTE field trips |
| | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| | | | | | |

CTE Professional Development

Professional Development

Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised July, 2012

(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

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)

End of CTE Goal(s)

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

| School Differentiated Accountability Status | | | |
|---|-----|----|---------|
| Priority | Foc | us | 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 - In grades 3-5, the percentage of students who will score a level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 82% to 83% | The purchase of Making Meaning and Comprehension Tootkits to aid teachers with student reading comprehension. | \$1,857.60 | |
|---|---|------------|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Final Amount Spent | | | |