

Florida Department of Education
John B Gorrie Elementary



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

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Gorrie Elementary	District Name: Hillsborough County
Principal: Marjorie Sandler	Superintendent: Mary Ellen Elia
SAC Chair: Kristin Rhoads	Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Student Achievement Data:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

[School Grades Trend Data](#) (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)

[Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test \(FCAT\)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data](#) (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)

[High School Feedback Report](#)

[K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan](#)

Highly Qualified Administrators

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Marjorie Sandler	Childhood/Elementary Educational Leadership	5	12	09/10 Grade A-100% AYP 10/11 Grade A-100% AYP 11/12 Grade A-100% AYP

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

Assistant Principal	Jody Adams	ESE K-12 Elementary 1-6 Educational Leadership	2 ½	2 ½	09/10 Grade A-100% AYP 10/11 Grade A-100% AYP 11/12 Grade A-100% AYP
---------------------	------------	--	-----	-----	--

Highly Qualified Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading Coach	Noy Sullivan	BA Elementary Education ESOL Endorsement	1	6	09/10 Grade A-82% AYP (Seminole Elementary) 10/11 Grade C-79% AYP (Seminole Elementary) 11/12 Grade A-100% AYP

Highly Qualified Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1. Teacher Interview Day	Principal/Assistant Principal	June 2013	

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

2. Opportunities for teacher leadership	Principal	ongoing	
3. District Peer Program	District Peers	ongoing	
4. District Mentor Program	District Mentors	ongoing	

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly qualified.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
10	ESOL Classes provided by the District

Staff Demographics

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

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

To	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
tal	of	of	of	of	of	Hi	Re	Na	
Nu	Fir	Te	Te	Te	Te	gh	adi	tion	ES
ber	st-	ach	ach	ach	ach	ly	ng	al	OL
of	Ye	ers	ers	ers	ers	Qu	En	Bo	End
In	ar	with	with	with	with	alif	dor	ard	orse
	Te	1-5	6-	15+	th	ied	sed	Ce	d

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

Structural Staff	Teachers	Years of Experience	14 Years of Experience	Years of Experience	Advanced Degrees	Teachers	Teachers	Certified Teachers	Teachers
51	8%	31%	29%	31%	39%	65%	0%	10%	53%
	(4)	(6)	(5)	(6)	(20)	(41)	(0)	(5)	(27)

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

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

Kristin Stanley	Renee MacKenzie	The district-based mentor is with the EET initiative. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Kristin Stanley	Carrie Franklin	The district-based mentor is with the EET initiative. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.

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

Kristin Stanley	Tabitha Sherrick	The district-based mentor is with the EET initiative. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Kristin Stanley	Alison Alfonso	The district-based mentor is with the EET initiative. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

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

Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.

The leadership team includes:

- Principal
- Assistant Principal
- Guidance Counselor
- School Psychologist
- Social Worker
- Reading Coach
- SAC Chair

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

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

The purpose of the core Leadership Team is to:

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

The Leadership team meets two times a month.

Specific responsibilities include:

- Oversee the multi-layered model of instructional delivery (Tier 1/Core, Tier 2/Supplemental and Tier 3/Intensive)
- Create, manage and update the school resource map
- Ensure the master schedule incorporates allocated time for intervention support at all grade levels.
- Determine scheduling needs, and assist teacher teams in identifying research-based instructional materials and intervention resources at Tiers2/3
- Facilitate the implementation of specific programs (e.g., Extended Learning Programs during and after school; Saturday Academies) that provide intervention support to students identified through data sorts/chats conducted by the PLCs.
- Determine the school-wide professional development needs of faculty and staff and arrange trainings aligned with the SIP goals

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

- Organize and support systematic data collection (e.g., district and state assessments; during-the-grading period school assessments/checks for understanding; in-school surveys)
- Assist and monitor teacher use of SMART goals per unit of instruction. (data will be collected and analyzed by PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT)
- Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction through the:

Implementation and support of PLCs

Review of teacher/PLC core curriculum assessments/chapters tests/checks for understanding (data will be collected and analyzed by PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT)

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

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

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

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

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

MTSS Implementation

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

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.

FAIR

DRA-2

Baseline and Midyear assessments from the Office of Assessment and Accountability for Math and Science

Monthly Gorrie Writes

CELLA

Reading assessments from the District Reading Supervisor

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

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

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

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

Describe plan to support MTSS.

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

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

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The leadership team includes:

- Principal
- Assistant Principal
- Guidance Counselor
- School Psychologist
- Social Worker
- Reading Coach
- SAC Chair

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

<p>1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5).</p>	<p>I.1. -Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13. -Training all content area teachers</p>	<p>I.1. Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas Reading comprehension improves when students are engaged in grappling with complex text. Teachers need to understand how to select/identify complex text, shift the amount of informational text used in the content curricula, and share complex texts with all students. All content area teachers are responsible for implementation. <u>Action Steps</u> Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.</p>	<p>I.1. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses <u>How</u> -Reading PLC Logs -Language Arts PLC Logs -Social Studies PLC Logs -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -Administration and coach rotate through PLCs looking for complex text discussion. -Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis.</p>	<p>I.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. <u>PLC Level</u> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator shares SMART Goal data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>I.1. 3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #1:</u> The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 89% to 92%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>89%</p>	<p>92%</p>					

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

		<p>1.2.</p> <p>-Teachers' knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13.</p> <p>-Training all content area teachers</p>	<p>1.2.</p> <p>Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas</p> <p>Common Core</p> <p>Questions of all types and levels are necessary to scaffold students' understanding of complex text. Teachers need to understand and use higher-order, text-dependent questions at the word/phrase, sentence, and paragraph/passage levels (Webb's, Bloom, Costas). Student reading comprehension improves when students are required to provide evidence to support their answers to text-dependent questions. Scaffolding of students' grappling with complex text through well-crafted text-dependent question assists students in discovering and achieving deeper understanding of the author's meaning. All content area teachers are responsible for implementation.</p> <p><u>Action Steps</u></p> <p>Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.</p>	<p>1.2.</p> <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>-Principal</p> <p>-AP</p> <p>-Reading Coach</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-Reading PLC Logs</p> <p>-Language Arts PLC Logs</p> <p>-Social Studies PLC Logs</p> <p>-PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete.</p> <p>-PLCs receive feedback on their logs.</p> <p>-Reading Coach observations and walk-throughs</p> <p>-Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency.</p> <p>-Administrator and Reading Coach aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation.</p>	<p>1.2.</p> <p><u>Teacher Level</u></p> <p>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.</p> <p><u>PLC Level</u></p> <p>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.</p> <p>-For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.</p> <p>Leadership Team Level</p> <p>-PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.</p> <p>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>1.2.</p> <p>3x per year</p> <p>- FAIR</p> <p>During the Grading Period</p> <p>- Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)</p>	
--	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

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

		<p>1.3.-Teachers' knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13.</p> <p>-Training all content area teachers</p>	<p>1.3</p> <p>Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas</p> <p>Teachers need to understand how to design and deliver a close reading lesson. Student reading comprehension improves when students are engaged in close reading instruction using complex text. Specific close reading strategies include: 1) multiple readings of a passage 2) asking higher-order, text-dependent questions, 3) writing in response to reading and 4) engaging in text-based class discussion. All content area teachers are responsible for implementation.</p> <p><u>Action Steps</u></p> <p>Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.</p>	<p>1.3.</p> <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>-Principal</p> <p>-AP</p> <p>-Instruction Coaches</p> <p>-PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-Reading Logs</p> <p>-Language Arts Logs</p> <p>-Social Studies Logs</p> <p>-PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete.</p> <p>-PLCs receive feedback on their logs.</p> <p>Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis.</p> <p>-Reading Coach observations and walk-throughs</p> <p>-Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency.</p> <p>-Administrator and Reading Coach aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation.</p>	<p>1.3.</p> <p><u>Teacher Level</u></p> <p>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.</p> <p><u>PLC Level</u></p> <p>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses.</p> <p>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.</p> <p>- For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.</p> <p>Leadership Team Level</p> <p>-PLC facilitator shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.</p> <p>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>1.3.</p> <p>3x per year</p> <p>- FAIR</p> <p>During the Grading Period</p> <p>- Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)</p>	
--	--	---	---	---	--	---	--

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check	Strategy Data Check	Student Evaluation Tool		
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.	2.1.	2.1. See Goals 1, 3, & 4	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
<u>Reading Goal #2:</u> The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 72% to 75%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	72%	75%					
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	Strategy Data Check	Student Evaluation Tool		
			Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?			

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

<p>3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.</p>	<p>B.1. -PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum conversations and data analysis to deepen their learning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act "Instructional Unit" log</p>	<p>B.1. <u>Strategy</u> Student achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: 1.What is it we expect them to learn? 2.How will we if they have learned it? 3.How will we respond if they don't learn? 4.How will we respond if they already know it? <u>Actions/Details</u> -Grade level/like-course PLCs use a Plan-Do-Check-Act "Unit of Instruction" log to guide their discussion and way of work. Discussions are summarized on log.</p>	<p>B.1. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Reading Coach -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses <u>How</u> PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.</p>	<p>B.1. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, and/or leadership team.</p>	<p>B.1. 3x per year FAIR During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p>		
--	---	---	--	---	---	--	--

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

		-Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.					
<u>Reading Goal #3:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 81 points to 86 points.							
	81 Points	86 Points					

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

		<p>B.2.</p> <p>-Teachers tend to only differentiate after the lesson is taught instead of planning how to differentiate the lesson when new content is presented.</p> <p>-Teachers are at varying levels of using Differentiated Instruction strategies.</p> <p>-Teachers tend to give all students the same lesson, handouts, etc.</p>	<p><u>Strategy/Task</u></p> <p>Student achievement improves when teachers use on-going student data to differentiate instruction.</p> <p><u>Actions/Details</u></p> <p>Within PLCs Before Instruction and During Instruction of New Content</p> <p>-Using data from previous assessments and daily classroom performance/work, teachers plan Differentiated Instruction groupings and activities for the delivery of new content in upcoming lessons.</p> <p>In the classroom</p> <p>-During the lessons, students are involved in flexible grouping techniques</p> <p>—</p> <p><u>PLCs After Instruction</u></p> <p>-Teachers reflect and discuss the outcome of their DI lessons.</p> <p>-Teachers use student data to identify successful DI techniques for future implementation.</p>	<p>B.2.</p> <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>-Principal</p> <p>-AP</p> <p>-PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-PLC logs turned into administration.</p> <p>-PLCs receive feedback on their logs.</p> <p>-Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings</p> <p>-Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team.</p> <p>-Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis.</p>	<p>B.2.</p> <p><u>Teacher Level</u></p> <p>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.</p> <p>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u></p> <p>-PLC facilitator shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.</p> <p>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>B.2.</p> <p>3x per year</p> <p>FAIR</p> <p>During the Grading Period</p> <p>Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p>	
--	--	---	---	--	--	--	--

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

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

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

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

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

		<p>hierarchy</p> <p>--Facilitate the identification, selection, development of rigorous core curriculum common assessments</p> <p>--Facilitate core curriculum assessment data analysis</p> <p>--Facilitate the planning for interventions and the intentional grouping of the students.</p> <p>-Using walk-through data, the academic coach and administration identify teachers for support in co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing and debriefing.</p> <p>-The academic coach trains each subject area PLC on how to facilitate their own PLC using structured protocols.</p> <p>-Throughout the school year, the academic coach/ administration conducts one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the data gathered from walk-through tools. This data is used for</p>					
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

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

		<p>future professional development, both individually and as a department.</p> <p><u>Leadership Team and Coach</u></p> <p>-The reading coach meets with the principal to map out a high-level summary plan of action for the school year.</p> <p>-Every two weeks, the reading coach meets with the principal to:</p> <p>--Review log and work accomplished and</p> <p>--Develop a detailed plan of action for the next two weeks.</p>					
<p><u>Reading Goal #4:</u></p> <p>Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 83 points to 88 points.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>83 Points</p>	<p>88 Points</p>					

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

		<p>4.2.</p> <p>-The Extended Learning Program (ELP) does not always target the specific skill weaknesses of the students or collect data on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>-Not always a direct correlation between what the students is missing in the regular classroom and the instruction received during ELP.</p> <p>-Minimal communication between regular and ELP teachers.</p>	<p>4.2.</p> <p><u>Strategy</u></p> <p>Students' reading comprehension improves through receiving ELP supplemental instruction on targeted skills that are not at the mastery level.</p> <p><u>Action Steps</u></p> <p>-Classroom teachers communicate with the ELP teachers regarding specific skills that students have not mastered.</p> <p>-ELP teachers identify lessons for students that target specific skills that are not at the mastery level.</p> <p>-Students attend ELP sessions.</p> <p>-Progress monitoring data collected by the ELP teacher on a weekly or biweekly basis and communicated back to the regular classroom teacher.</p> <p>-When the students have mastered the specific skill, they are exited from the ELP program.</p>	<p>4.2.</p> <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>Administrators</p> <p><u>How Monitored</u></p> <p>Administrators will review the communication logs and data collection used between teachers and ELP teachers outlining skills that need remediation.</p>	<p>4.2.</p> <p>Supplemental data shared with leadership and classroom teachers who have students.</p>	<p>4.2.</p> <p>Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM) (From District RtI/ Problem Solving Facilitators.)</p>	
<p>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:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Fidelity Check</p> <p>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p>Strategy Data Check</p> <p>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	<p>Student Evaluation Tool</p>		

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

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.							
<u>Reading Goal #5:</u>							
5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5A.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.		

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

<p><u>Reading Goal #5A:</u></p> <p>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>White: Y</p> <p>Black: Y</p> <p>Hispanic: Y</p> <p>Asian: NA</p> <p>American Indian: NA</p>	<p>White:</p> <p>Black:</p> <p>Hispanic:</p> <p>Asian:</p> <p>American Indian:</p>					
<p>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:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Fidelity Check</p> <p>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p>Strategy Data Check</p> <p>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	<p>Student Evaluation Tool</p>		
<p>5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>		

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

<p><u>Reading Goal #5B:</u></p> <p>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>Y</p>						
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	
<p>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:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Fidelity Check</p> <p>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p>Strategy Data Check</p> <p>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	<p>Student Evaluation Tool</p>		

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

<p>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p>	<p>5C.1.</p>	<p>5C.1.</p>	<p>5C.1.</p>	<p>5C.1.</p>	<p>5C.1.</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #5C:</u> Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					

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

	—	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		

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

Reading Goal #5D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.							
	Y						
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	

Reading Professional Development

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Designing and Delivering a Close Reading Lesson Using in-Depth Questioning Words Their Way book study	K-5	Reading Coach	All Teachers	On-going	Classroom Walkthroughs	Administrators
	K-5	Reading Curriculum PLC chair	Reading Curriculum PLC members	On-going	Classroom Walkthroughs	Administrators

End of Reading Goals

Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

<p>Elementary School Mathematics Goals</p>	<p>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</p>						
<p>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:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p>Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	<p>Student Evaluation Tool</p>		

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

<p>1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in mathematics (Level 3-5).</p>	<p>I.1. -Lack of infrastructure to support technology -Lack of technology hardware -Teachers at varying understanding of the intent of the CCSS</p>	<p>I.1. <u>Strategy</u> Students' math achievements improve through the use of technology and hands-on activities to implement the Common Core State Standards. In addition, student practice taking on-line assessments to prepare students for on-line state testing. <u>Action Steps</u> -PLCs use their core curriculum information to learn more about hands-on and technology activities. -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.</p>	<p>I.1. <u>Who</u> -Principal <u>How Monitored</u> -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs.</p>	<p>I.1. PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 75% mastery on units of instruction. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends.</p>	<p>I.1. 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During the Grading Period -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, etc.)</p>		
--	---	--	--	---	---	--	--

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

<u>Mathematics Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 81% to 85 %.	81%	85%					

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

		<p>I.2.</p> <p>-Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques.</p> <p>-PLC meetings need to focus on identifying and writing higher order questions to deliver during the lessons.</p> <p>-Finding time to conduct Webb's Depth of Knowledge walk-throughs is sometimes challenging.</p>	<p>I.2.</p> <p><u>Strategy/Task</u></p> <p>Students' math achievement improves through frequent participation in higher order questions/discussion activities to deepen and extend student knowledge. These quality questions/prompts and discussion techniques promotes thinking by students, assisting them to arrive at new understandings of complex material.</p> <p><u>Actions/Details</u></p> <p>Within PLCs</p> <p>-Teachers work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively use higher order questions/activities.</p> <p>-Teachers plan higher order questions/activities for upcoming lessons to increase the lessons' rigor and promote student achievement.</p> <p>-Teachers plan for scaffolding questions and activities to meet the differentiated needs of students.</p> <p>-After the lessons, teachers examine student work samples and classroom questions</p>	<p>I.2.</p> <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>-Principal</p> <p><u>How Monitored</u></p> <p>-PLCS turn their logs into administration</p> <p>-PLCs receive feedback on their Logs.</p> <p>-Classroom walk-throughs using Webb's Depth of Knowledge wheel as a higher order walk-through form.</p>	<p>I.2.</p> <p>PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 75% mastery on units of instruction.</p>	<p>I.2.</p> <p>2x per year</p> <p>District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing</p> <p>During the Grading Period</p> <p>-Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, interventions etc.)</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

			<p>using Webb’s Depth of Knowledge to evaluate the sophistication/complexity of students’ thinking.</p> <p>-Use student data to identify successful higher order questioning techniques for future implementation.</p> <p><u>In the classroom</u></p> <p>During the lessons, teachers:</p> <p>-Ask questions and/or provides activities that require students to engage in frequent higher order thinking as defined by Webb’s Depth of Knowledge.</p> <p>-Wait for full attention from the class before asking questions.</p> <p>-Provide students with wait time.</p> <p>-Use probing questions to encourage students to elaborate and support assertions and claims drawn from the text/content.</p> <p>-Allow students to “unpack their thinking” by describing how they arrive at an answer.</p> <p>-Encourage discussion by using open-ended questions.</p> <p>-Ask questions with</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

			<p>multiple correct answers or multiple approaches.</p> <p>-Scaffold questions to help students with incorrect answers.</p> <p>-Engage all students in the discussion and ensure that all voices are heard.</p> <p><u>During the lessons, students:</u></p> <p>-Have opportunities to formulate many of the high-level questions based on the text/content.</p> <p>-Have time to reflect on classroom discussion to increase their understanding (and without teacher mediation).</p> <p><u>School Leadership</u></p> <p>-The coach/resource teacher/PLC member/administrator collects higher order questioning walk-through data using Webb’s Depth of Knowledge wheel.</p>				
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	<p>Fidelity Check</p> <p>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p>Strategy Data Check</p> <p>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	Student Evaluation Tool		

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

<p>2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics.</p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1. See Goals 1, 3 & 4</p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1.</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #2:</u> The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 53% to 55%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>53%</p>	<p>55%</p>					

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

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

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

<p>3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making learning gains in mathematics.</p>	<p>B.1. -PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum and data analysis discussion to deepen their learning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act "Instructional Unit" log</p>	<p>B.1. <u>Strategy</u> Students' math achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: 1.What is it we expect them to learn? 2.How will we know if they have learned it? 3.How will we respond if they don't learn? 4.How will we respond if they already know it? <u>Actions/Details</u> -This year, the like-course PLCs will administer common end-of-chapter assessments. The assessments will be identified/generated</p>	<p>B.1. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses <u>How</u> PLCS turn their logs into administration -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.</p>	<p>B.1. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, and/or leadership team.</p>	<p>B.1. 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p>		
--	--	---	--	---	--	--	--

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

		<p>prior to the teaching of the unit.</p> <p>-Grade level/like-course PLCs use a Plan-Do-Check-Act "Unit of Instruction" log to guide their discussion and way of work. Discussions are summarized on log.</p> <p>-Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.</p>					
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #3:</u></p> <p>Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 78 points to 86 points.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>78 Points</p>	<p>86 Points</p>					

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

		<p>B.2.</p> <p>-Teachers tend to only differentiate after the lesson is taught instead of planning how to differentiate the lesson when new content is presented.</p> <p>-Teachers are at varying levels of using Differentiated Instruction strategies.</p> <p>-Teachers tend to give all students the same lesson, handouts, etc.</p>	<p>B.2.</p> <p><u>Strategy/Task</u></p> <p>Students' math achievement improves when teachers use on-going student data to differentiate instruction.</p> <p><u>Actions/Details</u></p> <p>Within PLCs Before Instruction and During Instruction of New Content</p> <p>-Using data from previous assessments and daily classroom performance/work, teachers plan Differentiated Instruction groupings and activities for the delivery of new content in upcoming lessons.</p> <p>In the classroom</p> <p>-During the lessons, students are involved in flexible grouping techniques.</p> <p><u>PLCs After Instruction</u></p> <p>-Use student data to identify successful DI techniques for future implementation.</p> <p>-Using a problem-solving question protocol, identify students who need re-teaching/interventions and</p>	<p>B.2.</p> <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>-Principal</p> <p>-AP</p> <p>-Instruction Coaches</p> <p>grades and/or like courses</p>	<p>B.2.</p> <p><u>Teacher Level</u></p> <p>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.</p> <p>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.</p> <p>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>B.2.</p> <p>2x per year</p> <p>District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing</p> <p>During the Grading Period</p> <p>Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p>	
--	--	---	---	--	--	--	--

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

			<p>how that instruction will be provided.</p> <p>-Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/ content area PLCs.</p>				
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	Strategy Data Check	Student Evaluation Tool		
4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	<p>4.1.</p> <p>-Scheduling time for the principal/ AP to meet with the reading coach on a regular basis.</p> <p>-Teachers willingness to accept support from the coach.</p>	<p>4.1.</p> <p>Strategy Across all Content Areas</p> <p><u>Strategy/Task</u></p> <p>Students’ math achievement improves through teachers’ collaboration with the math curriculum PLC.</p> <p><u>Actions/Details</u></p> <p>Leadership Team</p> <p>-The principal reviews the curriculum meeting notes along with data and provides feedback.</p>	<p>4.1.</p> <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>Administration</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-Review of curriculum PLC notes</p> <p>-Administrative walk-throughs</p>	<p>4.1.</p> <p>-Tracking of data and PLC notes</p>	<p>4.1.</p> <p>2x per year</p> <p>District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing</p> <p>During the Grading Period</p> <p>- Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p>		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal #4:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 71 points to 81 points.							
	71 Points	81 Points					

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

		<p>4.2.</p> <p>-The Extended Learning Program (ELP) does not always target the specific skill weaknesses of the students or collect data on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>-Not always a direct correlation between what the students is missing in the regular classroom and the instruction received during ELP.</p> <p>-Minimal communication between regular and ELP teachers.</p>	<p>4.2.</p> <p><u>Strategy</u></p> <p>Students' math achievement improves through receiving ELP supplemental instruction on targeted skills that are not at the mastery level.</p> <p><u>Action Steps</u></p> <p>-Classroom teachers communicate with the ELP teachers regarding specific skills that students have not mastered.</p> <p>-ELP teachers identify lessons for students that target specific skills that are not at the mastery level.</p> <p>- Students attend ELP sessions.</p> <p>- Progress monitoring data collected by the ELP teacher on a weekly or biweekly basis and communicated back to the regular classroom teacher.</p> <p>-When the students have mastered the specific skill, they are exited from the ELP program.</p>	<p>4.2</p> <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>Administrators</p> <p><u>How Monitored</u></p> <p>Administrators will review the communication logs and data collection used between teachers and ELP teachers outlining skills that need remediation.</p>	<p>4.2.</p> <p>Supplemental data shared with leadership and classroom teachers who have students.</p>	<p>4.2.</p> <p>Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM) (From District RtI/ Problem Solving Facilitators.)</p>	
<p>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:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Fidelity Check</p> <p>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p>Strategy Data Check</p> <p>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	<p>Student Evaluation Tool</p>		

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

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.							
<u>Math Goal #5:</u>							
5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics	5A.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5A.1. See Goals 1, 3 & 4	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<p>The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 24% to 32%.</p>							
<p>The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 72% to 75%.</p>							

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

	White: Y 89% Black: N 24% Hispanic: N 72% Asian: NA American Indian: NA	White: 89% Black: 32% Hispanic: 75% Asian: NA American 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	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		

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

<p>5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1. See Goals 1, 3 & 4</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u> The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 50% to 55%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>50%</p>	<p>55%</p>					

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

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

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

<p><u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u></p> <p>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>Y</p>						
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
<p>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:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Fidelity Check</p> <p>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p>Strategy Data Check</p> <p>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	<p>Student Evaluation Tool</p>		

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

<p>5D. Student with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p>	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u> Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>Y</p>						
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	

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

		5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	
--	--	------	------	------	------	------	--

End of Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader PD Facilitator	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Problem Solving in Mathematics	K-5		School-wide	January 2013/ongoing	Walk throughs	Administration

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

<p>1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science.</p>	<p>1.1. -Teachers are at varying skill levels in the use of inquiry and the 5E lesson plan model. -Lack of common planning time to facilitate and hold PLCs for like courses.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Strategy</u> Students' science skills will improve through participation in the 5E instructional model. <u>Action Steps</u> -Teachers will attend District Science training and share 5 E Instructional Model information with their PLCs. -PLCs write SMART goals based for units of instruction. -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time collaboratively building 5E Instructional Model for upcoming lessons. -PLC teachers instruct students using the 5E Instructional Model.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Who</u> Principal AP <u>How Monitored</u> -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. <u>PLC Level</u> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>1.1. 2x per year District-level baseline and mid-year tests During the Grading Period -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, intervention checks, etc.)</p>		
--	--	---	--	---	--	--	--

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

		<p>-At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material.</p> <p>-Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs.</p> <p>-Based on the data, teachers discuss effectiveness of the 5E Lesson Plans to drive future instruction.</p>					
<p><u>Science Goal #1:</u></p> <p>The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 84% to 85%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>84%</p>	<p>85%</p>					

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

		<p>1.2. PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum conversations and data analysis to deepen their learning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act "Instructional Unit" log.</p>	<p>1.2. <u>Strategy</u> Student achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning using the 5E Instructional Model. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for unit of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: 1.What is it we expect them to learn? 2.How will we know if they have learned it? 3.How will we respond if they don't learn? 4.How will we respond if they already know it? <u>Actions/Details</u> Within PLCs: -PLCs will use a PLC log to monitor the following: --Guide their Plan-Do-Check-Act conversations and way of work. --Monitor the frequency of meetings. -Working with the core curriculum, within grade level PLCs teachers will:</p>	<p>1.2. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses <u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration/coaches provides feedback -Administrators attended targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.</p>	<p>1.2. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period outcomes to administration and leadership team.</p>	<p>1.2. 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p>	
--	--	---	---	---	---	---	--

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

			<p>--Unpack the benchmark and identify what students need to understand, know, and do.</p> <p>--Plan for checks for understanding during the unit.</p> <p>--Plan for the End-of-Unit Assessment</p> <p>--Plan upcoming lessons/units using the 5E Instructional Model.</p> <p>--Reflect on the outcome of lessons taught</p> <p>--Analyze checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments.</p> <p>--Act on the core curriculum data by planning interventions for the whole class or small group.</p> <p>-PLCs will generate SMART goals for upcoming units of instruction.</p> <p>-PLCs will report SMART goal data through their logs.</p> <p>As a Science Department</p> <p>-PLC, share action plan successes and challenges of the grade levels courses.</p> <p>-PLCs will adjust action plans based on teacher/coach walk-through data, PLC collaboration, and student data.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

		<p>1.3.</p> <p>-Teachers are at varying skill levels in using appropriate instructional, scientific and laboratory technology (animations, probeware, digital microscopy)</p> <p>-Administrators are at varying skill levels in using appropriate instructional, scientific and laboratory technology (animations, probeware, digital microscopy)</p>	<p>1.3.</p> <p><u>Strategy</u></p> <p>Student understanding of the nature of science and scientific inquiry improves when students are intellectually active in learning important and challenging science content through the use of appropriate instructional methods, scientific processes, laboratory experiences, and uses of technology (animations, probeware, digital microscopy).</p> <p><u>Action Steps</u></p> <p>-As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling technology and hands-on strategies.</p> <p>-Within PLCs, teachers plan for engaging exploration of science content using hands-on learning experiences, inquiry, labs, technology (such as probeware, simulations and animations) within the 5E Instructional Model.</p> <p>-Teachers implement the 5E Instructional Model to promote learning experiences that cause students to think, make connections, formulate and test hypotheses and draw conclusions.</p> <p>-Teachers facilitate student-</p>	<p>1.3.</p> <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>Principal</p> <p>AP</p> <p><u>How Monitored</u></p> <p>-Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.</p>	<p>1.3.</p> <p><u>Teacher Level</u></p> <p>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.</p> <p><u>PLC Level</u></p> <p>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses.</p> <p>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.</p> <p>- For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress</p>	<p>1.3.</p> <p>2x per year</p> <p>District-level baseline and mid-year tests</p> <p>During the Grading Period</p> <p>Unit assessments</p>	
--	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

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

			<p>centered learning through the use of the 5E Instructional Model.</p> <p>-Common Core Literacy Standards for both Reading and Writing are appropriately embedded throughout the 5E Instruction Model.</p> <p>-Each teacher maintains a record of the number of occurrences of engagement tasks (hands-on-learning experiences, labs, and technology) per week. This data is then reported on the Science PLC log.</p>				
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	<p>Fidelity Check</p> <p>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p>Strategy Data Check</p> <p>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	<p>Student Evaluation Tool</p>		

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

<p>2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science.</p>	<p>2.1. -Not all teachers have received the CCLS for Science overview. -Not all teachers understand how to integrate close reading with the 5E instructional model. -Not all PLCs routinely look at curriculum materials beyond those posted on the curriculum guide</p>	<p>2.1. <u>Strategy</u> Students' comprehension of science text improves when students are engaged in close reading techniques using on-grade-level content-based text (textbooks and other supplemental texts). <u>Action Steps</u> Professional Development -The Reading Coach conducts trainings to develop teachers' ability to use the close reading model. -The Reading Coach attends science departmental PLCs to co-plan with teachers, developing lessons using the close reading model. -Teachers within departments attend professional</p>	<p>2.1. <u>Who</u> Principal AP Reading Coach Reading Leadership Team <u>How Monitored</u> Administration, Coach -PLC logs turned into administration. -Administration provides feedback.</p>	<p>2.1. Science PLC Resource meetings Reading Leadership Team PLCs will track achievement on the benchmark attached to the Close Reading passage comparing baseline achievement level to 80% mastery using the proximal evaluation tool.</p>	<p>2.1. 3x-per year District level assessments During the Grading Period -mini-assessments -unit assessments</p>		
---	--	---	---	--	---	--	--

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

	<p>development provided by the district/school on text complexity and close reading models that are most applicable to science classrooms and support the 5E instructional model.</p> <p><u>In PLCs</u></p> <p>-Teachers work in their PLCs to locate, discuss, and disseminate appropriate texts to supplement their textbooks.</p> <p>-PLCs review Close Reading Selections to determine word count and high-Lexile.</p> <p>-PLCs assign appropriate NGSSS benchmark to Close Reading passage</p> <p>-To increase stamina, teachers select high-Lexile, complex and rigorous texts that are shorter and progress throughout the year to longer texts that are high-Lexile,</p>					
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

		<p>complex and rigorous</p> <p>- Teachers debrief lesson implementation to determine effectiveness and level of student comprehension and retention of the text. Teachers use this information to build future close reading lessons.</p> <p>During the lessons, teachers:</p> <p>-Guide students through text without reading or explaining the meaning of the text using the following:</p> <p>--Introducing critical vocabulary to ensure comprehension of text.</p> <p>--Stating an essential question prior to reading</p> <p>--Using questions to check for understanding.</p> <p>--Using question to engage students in discussion.</p>					
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

		<p>--Requiring oral and written responses to text.</p> <p>-Ask text-based questions that require close reading of the text and multiple reads of the text.</p> <p>During the lessons, students:</p> <p>-Grapple with complex text.</p> <p>-Re-read for a second purpose and to increase comprehension.</p> <p>-Engage in discussion to answer essential question using textual evidence.</p> <p>-Write in response to essential question using textual evidence.</p>					
<p><u>Science Goal #2:</u></p> <p>The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 45% to 51%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					

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

	45%	51%					
--	------------	------------	--	--	--	--	--

Science Professional Development

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Integrating reading strategies, K-5 specifically Close Reading, into math lessons			Science PLC Facilitator	Ongoing	PLC Logs Walk throughs	Administration

End of Science Goals

Writing/Language Arts Goals

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

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

<p>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing.</p>	<p>1.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Not all teachers know how to plan and execute writing lessons with a focus on model-based writing. -Not all teachers know how to review student writing to determine trends and needs in order to drive instruction. -All teachers need training to score student writing accurately during the 2012-2013 school year using information provided by the state. 	<p>1.1.</p> <p>Strategy</p> <p>Students' use of mode-specific writing will improve through use of Writers' Workshop/daily instruction with a focus on mode-specific writing.</p> <p>Action Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Based on baseline data, PLCs write SMART goals for each Grading Period. (For example, during the first Grading Period, 50% of the students will score 4.0 or above on the end-of-the Grading Period writing prompt.) <p>Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Professional Development for updated rubric courses -Professional Development for instructional delivery of mode-specific writing -Training to facilitate data- 	<p>1.1.</p> <p>Who</p> <p>Principal</p> <p>APEI</p> <p>How Monitored</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -PLC logs -Classroom walk-throughs Observation Form -Conferencing while writing walk-through tool (for coaches) 	<p>1.1.</p> <p>See "Check" & "Act" action steps in the strategies column</p>	<p>1.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Student monthly demand writes/formative assessments -Student daily drafts -Student revisions -Student portfolios 		
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

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

	<p>driven PLCs</p> <p>-Using data to identify trends and drive instruction</p> <p>-Lesson planning based on the needs of students</p> <p>Do:</p> <p>-Daily/ongoing models and application of appropriate mode-specific writing based on teaching points</p> <p>-Daily/ongoing conferencing</p> <p>Check:</p> <p>Review of daily drafts and scoring monthly demand writes</p> <p>-PLC discussions and analysis of student writing to determine trends and needs</p> <p>Act:</p> <p>-Receive additional professional development in areas of need</p>					
--	---	--	--	--	--	--

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

		<p>-Seek additional professional knowledge through book studies/research</p> <p>-Spread the use of effective practices across the school based on evidence shown in the best practice of others</p> <p>-Use what is learned to begin the cycle again, revise as needed, increase scale if possible, etc.</p> <p>-Plan ongoing monitoring of the solution(s)</p>					
<u>Writing/LA Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writing will increase from 91% to 93%.							
	91%	93%					

Writing/Language Arts Professional Development

Professional Development

Hillsborough 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised July, 2012

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Rubric Training	2-5	District Level Writing Trainer	All Language Arts teacher, grades 2-5	By January 2013	Notification of rubric training mastery from Writing Department Head	Principal

End of Writing Goals

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

Attendance Goal #1:	<u>2012 Current</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u>					
	Attendance Rate:*	Attendance Rate:*					
1. The attendance rate will increase from 96.55% in 2011-2012 to 97% in 2012-2013.							
2. The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused absences throughout the school year will decrease by 10%							
3. The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused tardies to school throughout the school year will decrease by 10%.							
	96.55%	97%					
	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Number of Students</u> <u>with Excessive</u> <u>Unexcused</u> <u>Absences</u> <u>(10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Number of Students</u> <u>with Excessive</u> <u>Unexcused Absences</u> <u>(10 or more)</u>					
	22	20					

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

	<u>2012 Current</u> Number of Students with Unexcused Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	<u>2013 Expected</u> Number of Students with Unexcused Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	87	79					
		1.2. There is no system to reinforce parents for facilitating improvement in attendance.	1.2. <u>Tier 2</u> Beginning at the 5th unexcused absence, the Attendance Committee (which is a subgroup of the Leadership Team) collaborate to ensure that a letter is sent home to parents outlining the state statute that requires parents send students to school. If a student's attendance improves (no absences in a 20 day period) a positive letter is sent home to the parent regarding the increase in their child's attendance.	1.2. Social Worker Guidance Counselor PSLT	1.2. The attendance committee (which is a subset of the leadership Team) will disaggregate attendance data for the "Tier 2" group along with the guidance counselor and maintain communication about these children.	1.2. <u>Tool</u> Attendance/Tardy data	

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

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

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

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension						
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check	Strategy Data Check	Student Evaluation Tool		
			Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?			
1. Suspension	1.1. There needs to be common school-wide expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior.	1.1. -Provide teachers with resources for continued teaching and reinforcement of school expectations and rules.	1.1. <u>Who</u> -PSLT Behavior Committee -Leadership Team -Administration	1.1. - PSLT /Behavior Committee will review data on Office Discipline Referrals ODRs and out of school suspensions, ATOSS data monthly.	1.1. EASI and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data		

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

Suspension Goal #1:	<u>2012 Total Number of</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of</u>					
	<u>In-School Suspensions</u>	<u>In-School Suspensions</u>					
1. The total number of In-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%.							
2. The total number of students receiving In-School Suspension throughout the school year will decrease by 10%.							
3. The total number of Out-of-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%.							
4. The total number of students receiving Out-of-School Suspensions throughout the school year will decrease by 10%.							
	5	4					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended</u>					
	<u>In-School</u>	<u>In-School</u>					

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

	3	2					
	<u>2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>					
	5	4					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended</u> <u>Out-of-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended</u> <u>Out-of-School</u>					
	4	3					

Suspension Professional Development

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

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

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

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

End of Suspension Goals

Health and Fitness Goal(s)

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

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

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

<p>1. Health and Fitness Goal</p>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2		
	<p>Teachers lack ideas for providing structured activities during teacher directed PE.</p>	<p>Health and physical activity initiatives developed and implemented by the Principal's designee.</p> <p>During Grade Level PLC meetings, teachers will discuss ideas for implementing structured activities during Teacher Directed PE.</p>	<p>Principal's designee.</p> <p>Principal</p>	<p>Data on the number of students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ)</p> <p>Data on the number of students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ)</p>	<p>PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.</p> <p>PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.</p>		

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

Health and Fitness Goal #1:	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
<p>During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students scoring in the “Healthy Fitness Zone” (HFZ) on the Pacer for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular health will increase from <u>94%</u> on the Pretest to <u>97%</u> on the Posttest.</p> <p>Schools will enter the data after the Pretest and Posttest. Make sure there is at least a 10% between the Pretest and Posttest.</p>							
	<p>94% (92)</p>	<p>97% (96)</p>					

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.

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

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

Continuous Improvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

<p>1. Continuous Improvement Goal</p>	<p>I.1. -There is still confusion on how to conduct PLCs that are focused on deepening the knowledge base of teachers and improving student performance by the implementation of the Plan-Do-Check-Act model. -Still confusion on how the Plan-Do-Check-Act model works. -Still some resistance to staff members attending PLCs and/or arriving on time to meetings.</p>	<p>I.1. The leadership team will become trained on the use of the PLC "Unit of Instruction" log that follows the Plan-Do-Check-Act model. PLC facilitators will guide their PLCs through the Plan-Do-Check-Act model for units of instruction. The work will be recorded on PLC logs that are reviewed by the Leadership Team.</p>	<p>I.1. <u>Who</u> Principal Leadership Team PLC facilitators</p>	<p>I.1. "Quick" PLC informal surveys will be administered during the school year every two months. The Leadership Team will aggregate the data and share outcomes of the school-wide results with their PLCs. The data will provide direction for future PLC training.</p>	<p>I.1. PLC Survey materials from Teams to Teach (Anne Jolly)</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	---	--	--

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

<u>Continuous Improvement Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>					
The percentage of teachers who strongly agree with the indicator that “teachers meet on a regular basis to discuss their students’ learning, share best practices, problem solve and develop lessons/assessments that improve student performance (under Teaching and Learning)” will increase from 65% in 2012 to 80% in 2013.							
	65%	80%					

Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development

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

Please note that each Strategy

**Hillsborough 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised July, 2012**

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

does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator	PD Participants	Target Dates and Schedules	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
and/or PLC Focus		and/or	(e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	(e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)		
Plan-Do-Check-Act Modell	Leadership Team	PLC Leader Leadership Team	School-wide	PLCs meet every three weeks for Plan-Do-Check-Act PLCs.	Administrator and leadership team walk-throughs	Leadership Team
	All teachers	Subject Area Leaders			Administrator and leadership attendance at PLC meetings	
		PLC Facilitators			PLC Survey data	

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

NEW Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

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

<p>C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/ Speaking.</p>	<p>1.1. -Lack of understanding teachers can provide ELL accommodations beyond FCAT testing. -Bilingual Education Paraprofessionals at varying levels of expertise in providing support. -Allocation of Bilingual Education Paraprofessional dependent on number of ELLs. -Administrators at varying levels of expertise in being familiar with the ELL guidelines and job responsibilities of ERT and Bilingual paraprofessional.</p>	<p>1.1. ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/standards improves through participation in the following day-to-day accommodations on core content and district assessments across Reading, LA, Math, Science, and Social Studies: 1.Extended time (lesson and assessments) 2.Small group testing 3.Para support (lesson and assessments) 4.Use of heritage language dictionary (lesson and assessments)</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Who</u> -School based Administrators -ESOL Resource Teachers <u>How</u> -Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the walk-throughs look for Committee Meeting Recommendations. In addition, tools from the RtI Handbook and ELL RtI Checklist, and ESOL Strategies Checklist can be used as walk-through forms</p>	<p>1.1. Analyze core curriculum and district level assessments for ELL students. Correlate to accommodations to determine the most effective approach for individual students.</p>	<p>1.1. During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests</p>	
--	---	---	--	--	---	--

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

<p><u>CELLA Goal #C:</u></p> <p>The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from 54% to 62%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</u></p>					
	<p>54%</p>					
<p>Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Fidelity Check</p> <p>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p>Strategy Data Check</p> <p>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	<p>Student Evaluation Tool</p>	

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

<p>D. Students scoring proficient in Reading.</p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1. See goal 1</p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1.</p>	
<p><u>CELLA Goal #D:</u> The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase from 58% to 65%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :</u></p>					
	<p>58%</p>					

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool	
E. Students scoring proficient in Writing.	2.1.	2.1. See goal 1	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	

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

<p><u>CELLA Goal #E:</u></p> <p>The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA will increase from 46% to 50%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u></p>					
	<p>46%</p>					

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

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

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

<p><u>STEM Goal #1:</u></p> <p>Implement/expand project/problem-based learning in math, science and CTE/STEM electives.</p>	<p>I.1.</p> <p>Need common planning time for math, science, ELA and other STEM teachers</p>	<p>I.1.</p> <p>-Explicit direction for STEM professional learning communities to be established.</p> <p>-Documentation of planning of units and outcomes of units in logs.</p> <p>-Increase effectiveness of lessons through lesson study and district metrics, etc.</p>	<p>I.1.</p> <p>PLC or grade level leads</p>	<p>I.1.</p> <p>Administrative walk-throughs</p>	<p>I.1.</p> <p>Logging number of project-based learning in math, science and CTE/STEM elective per nine week. Share data with teachers.</p>
---	---	--	---	---	---

STEM Professional Development

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

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

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
Priority	Focus	Prevent

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

Yes No

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

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

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

Final Amount Spent			