



FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF  
**EDUCATION**  
fldoe.org

Pam Stewart, Commissioner

## 2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

---

---

David C Hinson Sr Middle School

1860 N CLYDE MORRIS BLVD

Daytona Beach, FL 32117

386-258-4682

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/hinsonmiddle/pages/default.aspx>

---

## School Demographics

---

**School Type**  
Middle School

**Title I**  
No

**Free and Reduced Lunch Rate**  
51%

**Alternative/ESE Center**  
No

**Charter School**  
No

**Minority Rate**  
33%

---

## School Grades History

---

**2013-14**  
A

**2012-13**  
A

**2011-12**  
A

**2010-11**  
A

**2009-10**  
A

---

## SIP Authority and Template

---

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds, as marked by citations to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or with a grade of F within the prior two years. For all other schools, the district may use a template of its choosing. All districts must submit annual assurances that their plans meet statutory requirements.

This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>. Sections marked "N/A" by the user and any performance data representing fewer than 10 students or educators have been excluded from this document.

---

**Table of Contents**

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Differentiated Accountability</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Part I: Current School Status</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Part II: Expected Improvements</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Goals Summary</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Goals Detail</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Action Plan for Improvement</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Part III: Coordination and Integration</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>41</b>

---

## **Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

---

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. A corollary at the district level is the District Improvement and Assistance Plan (DIAP), designed to help district leadership make the necessary connections between school and district goals in order to align resources. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

### **Part I: Current School Status**

---

Part I summarizes school leadership, staff qualifications and strategies for recruiting, mentoring and retaining strong teachers. The school’s Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is described in detail to show how data is used by stakeholders to understand the needs of all students and allocate appropriate resources in proportion to those needs. The school also summarizes its efforts in a few specific areas, such as its use of increased learning time and strategies to support literacy, preschool transition and college and career readiness.

### **Part II: Expected Improvements**

---

Part II outlines school performance data in the prior year and sets numeric targets for the coming year in ten areas:

1. Reading
2. Writing
3. Mathematics
4. Science
5. Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM)
6. Career and Technical Education (CTE)
7. Social Studies
8. Early Warning Systems (EWS)
9. Parental Involvement
10. Other areas of concern to the school

With this overview of the current state of the school in mind and the outcomes they hope to achieve, the planning team engages in an 8-Step Planning and Problem-Solving Process, through which they define and refine their goals (Step 1), identify and prioritize problems (barriers) keeping them from reaching those goals (Steps 2-3), design a plan to help them implement strategies to resolve those barriers (Steps 4-7), and determine how they will monitor progress toward each goal (Step 8).

### **Part III: Coordination and Integration**

---

Part III is required for Title I schools and describes how federal, state and local funds are coordinated and integrated to ensure student needs are met.

### **Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals**

---

Appendix 1 is the professional development plan, which outlines any training or support needed for stakeholders to meet the goals.

### **Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals**

---

Appendix 2 is the budget needed to implement the strategies identified in the plan.

## Differentiated Accountability

Florida's Differentiated Accountability (DA) system is a statewide network of strategic support, differentiated by need according to performance data, and provided to schools and districts in order to improve leadership capacity, teacher efficacy and student outcomes. DA field teams collaborate with district and school leadership to design, implement and refine school improvement plans, as well as provide instructional coaching, as needed.

### DA Regions

Florida's DA network is divided into five geographical regions, each served by a field team led by a regional executive director (RED).

### DA Categories

Traditional public schools are classified at the start of each school year, based upon the most recently released school grades (A-F), into one of the following categories:

- Not in DA – currently A or B with no F in prior two years; all charter schools; all ungraded schools
- Monitoring Only – currently A or B with at least one F in the prior two years
- Prevent – currently C
- Focus – currently D
  - Year 1 – declined to D, or first-time graded schools receiving a D
  - Year 2 – second consecutive D, or F followed by a D
  - Year 3 or more – third or more consecutive D, or F followed by second consecutive D
- Priority – currently F
  - Year 1 – declined to F, or first-time graded schools receiving an F
  - Year 2 or more – second or more consecutive F

### DA Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses

Additionally, schools in DA are subject to one or more of the following Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses:

- Former F – currently A-D with at least one F in the prior two years. SIP is monitored by FDOE.
- Post-Priority Planning – currently A-D with an F in the prior year. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Planning – Focus Year 2 and Priority Year 1. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Implementing – Focus Year 3 or more and Priority Year 2 or more. District is implementing the Turnaround Option Plan (TOP).

### 2013-14 DA Category and Statuses

DA Category	Region	RED
Not in DA	N/A	N/A

  

Former F	Post-Priority Planning	Planning	Implementing TOP
No	No	No	No

## Current School Status

### School Information

#### School-Level Information

##### School

David C Hinson Sr Middle School

##### Principal

Julian Jones

##### School Advisory Council chair

Susan Higle

#### Names and position titles of the School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT)

Name	Title
Christine Campanella	Assistant Principal
Ron Dickens	Assistant Principal
Jennifer Goodwin	Assistant Principal
Robin Alday	Reading/ELA Coach
Mike Myers	Math Chairperson
Vicki Kessler	Science Chairperson
Richard French	Social Studies Chairperson
Lisa Gallagher	School Counselor Chairperson
Dena Nottingham	Gifted Chairperson
Linda Bishop	Applications Chairperson
Deb Doster	ESE Contact
Julian Jones	Principal
Susan Higle	SAC Chairperson

#### District-Level Information

##### District

Volusia

##### Superintendent

Dr. Margaret A Smith

##### Date of school board approval of SIP

12/10/2013

### School Advisory Council (SAC)

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

#### Membership of the SAC

SAC is comprised of community members/business partners, parents, support staff, instructional staff, an assistant principal, and the principal. There are more community members/business partners, and

parents than there are District employees. The by-laws call for a chairperson, vice-chairperson, secretary, and treasurer.

Administration: Julian Jones/Principal, Christie Campanella/Administration Liaison

Teachers: Susan Hagle/Chairperson, Rebecca Tozer/Vice-Chairperson, Robin Alday/Secretary, Linda Krenzler/Treasurer

Support Staff: Char Huth/Sue Lurcock

Parents: Elbert Adams, Craig Albright, Lori Beck, Kellis Chehaitli, Susan Coleman, Leigh Ann Giles (Business Partner), Kristin Okarski, Lucy Lorden, Carolyn Pascoe, Leslie Ramshaw, Sherri Zuckerman  
 Community Members: Stephaine Buckholt, Prosperity Bank (Business Partner)

**Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP**

The principal presented the 2013 FCAT and testing data to SAC. As a part of this presentation the areas of focus for the 2014 SIP were presented and discussed. The principal asked SAC for their in-put on the identified areas of focus and any other areas of need. SAC was in agreement with the direction the principal provided for the 2014 SIP. At the September meeting, SAC was presented with and discussed the (two) goals and targets.

**Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year**

SAC is involved in the development, implementation, and monitoring of the school improvement plan. As a part of this process SAC oversees the SAC budget with the understanding that funds are primarily used to fund the school improvement plan. The council also does an annual review of the by-laws and up-dates as needed. As Hinson is an A school, SAC will meet to approve or reject the recommendation of the school recognition committee regarding the use of school recognition funds. During the second semester SAC will conduct the annual climate survey of students, parents, support staff, and teachers. SAC will review and up-date the surveys and once completed will analyze and discuss the results.

**Projected use of school improvement funds, including the amount allocated to each project**

SAC has not received any funds for the 2013-2014 school year.

**Compliance with section 1001.452, F.S., regarding the establishment duties of the SAC**

In Compliance

**If not in compliance, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements**

**Highly Qualified Staff**

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(C) and 1115(c)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

**Administrators**

**# of administrators**

4

**# receiving effective rating or higher**

(not entered because basis is < 10)

**Administrator Information:**

**Julian Jones**

Principal

Years as Administrator: 16

Years at Current School: 0

**Credentials**

BS: Elementary Education/Middle School English  
 MS: Educational Leadership  
 Certifications: Educational Leadership (all levels), Elementary Education 1-6, English 5-9, School Principal (all levels)

**Performance Record**

Galaxy Middle School 2013: School Grade =C: Reading AMO Data:  
 All=50%, Asian=79%, Black=37%, Hispanic=47%, White=58%, ESOL=22%, ESE=9%, Economically Disadvantaged=46%, FCAT Level 3 and above=50%, Learning Gains=55%, Lowest Quartile=52%  
 Math AMO Data: All=43%, Asian=50%, Black=30%, Hispanic=39%, White=52%, ESOL=14%, ESE=15%, Economically Disadvantaged=40%  
 FCAT Level 3 and above=42%, Learning Gains=57%, Lowest Quartile=54%  
 Galaxy Middle Principal 2012 - School grade: C; % High standards in reading: 54%; % High standards in math: 44%; % High standards in writing: 66%; % High standards in science: 47%; % Reading gains: 61%; % math gains: 49%; % low making reading gains: 55%; % low making math gains: 43% 2011 - School grade: B; % High standards in reading: 68%; % High standards in math: 61%; % High standards in writing: 85%; % High standards in science: 57%; % Reading gains: 60%; % math gains: 63%; % low making gains: 64%; % low making math gains: 63% 2010 – School grade: A; % High standards in reading: 67%; % High standards in math: 64%; % High standards in writing: 88%; % High standards in science: 46%; % Reading learning gains: 64%; % learning gains in math: 67%; % lowest 25% making gains in reading: 67%; % lowest 25% making gains in math: 68% 2009 – School grade: B; % High standards in reading: 62%; % High standards in math: 61%; % High standards in writing: 91%; % High standards in science: 47%; % Reading learning gains: 62%; % learning gains in math: 66%; % lowest 25% making gains in reading: 69%; % lowest 25% making gains in math: 66% 2008 – School grade: B; % High standards in reading: 61%; % High standards in math: 61%; % High standards in writing: 87%; % High standards in science: 40%; % Reading learning gains: 59%; % learning gains in math: 68%; % lowest 25% making gains in reading: 58%; % lowest 25% making gains in math: 70% 2007 – School grade: C; % High standards in reading: 59%; % High standards in math: 61%; % High standards in writing: 88%; % High standards in science: 37%; % Reading learning gains: 54%; % learning gains in math: 63%; % lowest 25% making gains in reading: 56%; % lowest 25% making gains in math: 64% 2006 – School grade: A; % High standards in reading: 63%; % High standards in math: 63%; % High standards in writing: 90%; % Reading learning gains: 64%;



% learning gains in math: 66%; % lowest 25% making gains in reading: 70% 2005 – School grade: C; % High standards in reading: 58%; % High standards in math: 60%; % High standards in writing: 80%; % Reading learning gains: 53%; % learning gains in math: 62%; % lowest 25% making gains in reading: 61% 2004 – School grade: B; % High standards in reading: 60%; % High standards in math: 61%; % High standards in writing: 89%; % Reading learning gains: 64%; % learning gains in math: 68%; % lowest 25% making gains in reading: 66% Friendship Elementary Principal 2003 – School grade: A; % High standards in reading: 71%; % High standards in math: 61%; % High standards in writing: 92%; % Reading learning gains: 73%; % learning gains in math: 69%; % lowest 25% making gains in reading: 85%

**Christie Campanella**

Asst Principal

Years as Administrator: 10

Years at Current School: 1

**Credentials**

B.S. - Elementary Education M.Ed. - Educational Leadership  
 Certifications: Elementary Ed. (1-6) Educational Leadership  
 Mathematics (5-9), School Principal (all levels)

**Performance Record**

Hinson Middle 2013: School Grade=A: AMO's-All= 65%,  
 Asian=86%,Black =50%, Hispanic=50%, White=69%,  
 ESOL=50%, ESE=29%, ED=52%:Rdg Level 3 and above=65%,  
 Rdg LG=66%, Rdg LQ=58%: Math Level 3 and above=66%, Math  
 LG=66%, Math LQ=52%  
 Mainland High School 2012 School Grade Pending AYP 2011  
 School Grade Pending AYP 72% 2010 Ormond MS - A School;  
 AYP 82% (77%R/79%M; 64%R/79%M; 60%R/73%M 2009  
 Ormond MS - A School AYP 92% (77%R/77%M; 68%R/74%M;  
 70%R/64%M) 2008 Ormond MS - A School AYP90% (77%R/  
 77%M; 66%R/74%M; 60%R/67%M) 2007 Ormond MS - A School  
 AYP 95% (79%R/72%M; 66%R/71%M 2006 Ormond MS A-  
 School AYP 92% (75%R/70%M; 60%R/67%M; 55%R/65%M)  
 2005 - Ormond MS A School AYP 97% ("77%R/73%M; 65%R/  
 68%M; 72%R  
 \*(% Proficient Reading/Math, % Learning Gains Reading/Math, %  
 Lowest 25% Learning Gains Reading/Math)  
 INSTRUCTIONAL

**Ronnie Dickens**

Asst Principal

Years as Administrator: 13

Years at Current School: 9

**Credentials**

BS: Vocational (Agriculture) grades 6-12 MS: Educational Leadership Certification: Agriculture Educational Leadership

**Performance Record**

Hinson Middle 2013: School Grade=A: AMO's-All= 65%, Asian=86%,Black =50%, Hispanic=50%, White=69%, ESOL=50%, ESE=29%, ED=52%:Rdg Level 3 and above=65%, Rdg LG=66%, Rdg LQ=58%: Math Level 3 and above=66%, Math LG=66%, Math LQ=52%  
 2012 A School,(79%R 77%M: 68%R 75%M: 63%R 72%M) 2011 A School, AYP 77% (75%R 78% M: 57% R 74% M: 63% R 69%M) 2010-A School, AYP 87% (79%R 77%M: 68%R 75%M: 63%R 72%M) 2009- A School, AYP 85% (81%R 80%M: 67%R 77%M: 67%R 65%M) 2008 – A School, AYP 92% (80%R 80%M: 70R 78%M 69%R 72%M) 2007 – A School, AYP 92% (77%R 75%M: 60%R 72%M: 56%R 68% M)  
 2006 A School, AYP 92% (77%R 74%M, 68%R 70% M, 72%R) Mainland High School 2005 – C School, AYP 60% (31%R 66% M: 46% R 71% M: 56% R) 2004 C School, AYP 60% (32% R 60% M: 46%R 73% M: 48%R) 2003 C School, AYP NA (35%R 57%M: 53%:R 72%M: 57%R) 2002 C School, AYP NA (34%R 57%M: 54%R 68%M: 55R) \*(% Proficient Reading/Math, % Learning Gains Reading/Math, % Lowest 25% Learning Gains Reading/Math, % Lowest 25% Learning Gains Reading/Math)

**Jennifer Goodwin**

Asst Principal

Years as Administrator: 7

Years at Current School: 1

**Credentials**

BS:Special Education MS: Educational Leadership Certifications: Exceptional Student Education K-12, Educational Leadership K-12

**Performance Record**

Hinson Middle 2013: School Grade=A: AMO's-All= 65%, Asian=86%,Black =50%, Hispanic=50%, White=69%, ESOL=50%, ESE=29%, ED=52%:Rdg Level 3 and above=65%, Rdg LG=66%, Rdg LQ=58%: Math Level 3 and above=66%, Math LG=66%, Math LQ=52%  
 Holly Hill School 2012 (41% R 39%M:52%R 65%M: 63%R 69%M)\* 2011 B School, AYP 74% (55%R 55%M: 57%R 69%M: 75%R 78%M) 2010 B School, AYP 60% (60%R 56%M: 67%R 66%M: 65%R 78%M) 2009 B School, AYP 75% (62%R 54%M: 67%R 66%M: 75%R 67%M) 2008 B School, AYP 85% (54%R 55%M: 61%R 70%M: 72%R 71%M) 2007 C School, AYP 70% (51%R 49%M: 52%R 57%M: 57%R 60%M)  
 \*(% Proficient Reading/Math, % Learning Gains Reading/Math, % Lowest 25% Learning Gains Reading/Math)  
 INSTRUCTIONAL

**Instructional Coaches****# of instructional coaches**

1

**# receiving effective rating or higher**

(not entered because basis is &lt; 10)

**Instructional Coach Information:****Robin Alday**

Full-time / School-based

Years as Coach: 1

Years at Current School: 9

**Areas**

Reading/Literacy

**Credentials**

Degree: BA in Elementary Education

Certifications: Primary (K-3),Elementary Education (1-6),ESOL (K-12), English (5-9)

**Performance Record**

Hinson Middle 2013: School Grade=A: AMO's-All= 65%, Asian=86%,Black =50%, Hispanic=50%, White=69%, ESOL=50%, ESE=29%, ED=52%:Rdg Level 3 and above=65%, Rdg LG=66%, Rdg LQ=58%: Math Level 3 and above=66%, Math LG=66%, Math LQ=52%

2012 A School,(79%R 77%M: 68%R 75%M: 63%R 72%M) 2011 A School, AYP 77% (75%R 78% M: 57% R 74% M: 63% R 69%M)

**Classroom Teachers****# of classroom teachers**

60

**# receiving effective rating or higher**

56, 93%

**# Highly Qualified Teachers**

100%

**# certified in-field**

56, 93%

**# ESOL endorsed**

12, 20%

**# reading endorsed**

13, 22%

**# with advanced degrees**

20, 33%

**# National Board Certified**

5, 8%

**# first-year teachers**

4, 7%

**# with 1-5 years of experience**

5, 8%

**# with 6-14 years of experience**

24, 40%

**# with 15 or more years of experience**

27, 45%

**Education Paraprofessionals****# of paraprofessionals**

10

**# Highly Qualified**

9, 90%

**Other Instructional Personnel****# of instructional personnel not captured in the sections above**

0

**# receiving effective rating or higher**

(not entered because basis is &lt; 10)

**Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies**

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

**Strategies to recruit and retain highly qualified, certified-in-field, effective teachers to the school, including the person responsible**

1. New Teacher Programs (Individualized PD, mentors, peer classroom visits, other site visits) Administration
2. Leadership Opportunities/Administration
3. Professional Development/Administration
4. PLC Activities/Teachers/Department Chairpersons/Administration
5. Participation in District Job Fair and Recruitment Activities/Administration
6. Teacher Recognition/PTA, Chamber of Commerce, Teacher of the Year Committee
7. Business Partner Support

**Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan**

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

**Teacher mentoring program/plan, including the rationale for pairings and the planned mentoring activities**

Each first year teacher is supported with the Empowering Educator Excellence Program (E3). As a part of this program the beginning teacher receives a Peer Assistance Review (PAR) Teacher and PAR Evaluator. The PAR teacher is assigned by the District based on the area of certification(s). The PAR's assigned to the school are Mr. Ed Diniger and Dr. Linda White. The PAR teacher and evaluator work as a team to assist in the development of the beginning teacher. The PAR teacher regularly conducts classroom visits and informal observations and provides feedback based on the best

practices for teaching. The PAR evaluator schedules observations and provides feedback on the Danielson Framework for Teaching. Each grade level administrator serves as the evaluator for the beginning teachers in their grade level. The school administrator/evaluator follows the steps outlined in the Volusia System for Empowering Teachers (VSET) and helps to develop the teacher's effectiveness.

Vicki Fritz :Evaluator-Christie Campanella/8th grade administrator

Angela Hack: Evaluator-Christie Campanella/8th grade administrator

Ashlee Gruenewald: Evaluator-Ron Dickens/6th grade administrator

Karole Hernandez: Evaluator-Ron Dickens/6th grade administrator

Kaylie Rinear: Evaluator-Ron Dickens/6th grade administrator

Bruce Beattie: Evaluator-Jennifer Goodwin/ESE administrator

Second year teachers are also supported with the E3 program. However, they do not receive a the services of a PAR teacher/evaluator.

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

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iv) and 1115(c)(1)(A)-(C), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

#### **Data-based problem-solving processes for the implementation and monitoring of MTSS and SIP structures to address effectiveness of core instruction, resource allocation (funding and staffing), teacher support systems, and small group and individual student needs**

The school improvement plan is data driven and focuses on areas of school- based need for both specific content areas as well as specific student populations. Similarly, MTSS is a data-driven framework that seeks to find solutions/resources matched in intensity to student need in academic and behavioral areas. The MTSS framework follows the district's four-step problem solving process, with Rtl as an integral component of the process. As a result, the school improvement plan is based on a strategic analysis of data, and identified resources (as identified by the MTSS school based leadership team) are matched to the needs of the students/school. Building the SIP within the context of MTSS results in the school determining the areas of most significant need and, as importantly, enables the school to develop a plan that can be addressed based on existing resources.

#### **Function and responsibility of each school-based leadership team member as related to MTSS and the SIP**

The school-based MTSS leadership team identifies school based resources (both materials and personnel) to determine the continuum of academic and behavioral supports available to students at the individual school site. Academic and behavioral data are considered in order to determine priorities and functions of other existing teams (e.g., Problem Solving Team, Behavior Leadership Teams, and Professional Learning Communities). The Problem Solving process (i.e., Problem Identification, Analysis of Problem, Intervention Implementation and Response to Intervention) is used as the way of work of all teams and not just for individual student concerns. Adherence to the Problem Solving process ensures that individual, class-wide, and school-wide issues are addressed systematically with data; that interventions (supports) are tiered to the targeted problems; and that a plan is in place to monitor progress

#### **Systems in place that the leadership team uses to monitor the fidelity of the school's MTSS and SIP**

The school-based MTSS leadership team meets regularly throughout the school year in order to address the academic and behavioral needs that develop throughout the year, as well as to monitor outcomes of supports and interventions.

**Data source(s) and management system(s) used to access and analyze data to monitor the effectiveness of core, supplemental, and intensive supports in reading, mathematics, science, writing, and engagement**

Pinnacle Gradebook provides evidence of performance in core instruction across content areas. In addition, information gleaned from FAIR assessments, DRAs, OPM probes, interim assessments and FCAT provide valuable information regarding reading performance for both individuals and groups of students. Interim assessments and FCAT also provide critical information regarding student performance in the areas of mathematics, science, and writing. Pinnacle Insight reports provide further information regarding performance by both individual and groups of students (disaggregated by specific groups) in order to inform instruction and intervention. Behavioral expectations are communicated by the school to all students and parents. Those students who do not obtain proficiency in behavioral expectations are provided supports and interventions matched to student need. Office discipline data is maintained and monitored by the school site. Tier 2 and tier 3 supports/interventions and the response to these interventions are entered into the electronic PST system. Summary reports within the system are available to MTSS school-based leadership (i.e. the Principal, PST Chair, and school psychologist).

**Plan to support understanding of MTSS and build capacity in data-based problem solving for staff and parents**

School-based support for MTSS will be provided by the District MTSS Leadership Team. In turn, the school-based MTSS Leadership team will disseminate relevant MTSS information to teachers and parents. Data-based meetings throughout the school year will identify those students in need of academic and/or behavioral supports. Furthermore, based on this data-based decision making, supports will be implemented and monitored. School-specific reports, such as those available in Pinnacle Insight, will facilitate the development of a data-based MTSS framework. This data, in conjunction with identified school-based tiered resources, will ensure that a Multi-Tiered System of Supports is an overarching framework that guides the work of the school.

**Increased Learning Time/Extended Learning Opportunities**

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(ii)(II)-(III), 1114(b)(1)(I), and 1115(c)(1)(C)(i) and 1115(c)(2), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

**Research-based strategies the school uses to increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum:**

**Strategy:** Extended Day for All Students**Minutes added to school year:** 0

The teachers voted to use school recognition funds for a day of collaboration. Each department received funds for substitutes so the teachers could meet and analyze data, receive professional development on Common Core Standards (CCSS), and incorporate Common Core and best practices into their curriculum.

The District provides eight early release professional development sessions (two hours) devoted to incorporating Common Core Standards and strategies into core subjects and the applications department.

The school has developed a program to prepare students for Florida Writes and the Algebra I EOC. These programs are provided prior to the students taking the test. Language Arts teachers identify students that need additional support (at all levels of performance) to provide specific instruction on the skills needed to succeed on Florida Writes. The Math teachers provide two half-day review session to all students enrolled in Algebra I to practice and reinforce the skills and concepts learned throughout the year.

Wednesday Enhancement was implemented to provide time for teachers and students to remediate skills and concepts in all classes and to provide enrichment activities for students that are in advanced classes.

**Strategy Purpose(s)**

- Instruction in core academic subjects
- Enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education
- Teacher collaboration, planning and professional development

**How is data collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this strategy?**

Each department chair collaborates with their teachers and develops an agenda specific to the needs of their department. Following the day of collaboration, the department chairperson submits minutes explaining how the time was used and the benefit to the teachers within the department. The District conducts follow up surveys to determine the effectiveness of the early release professional development sessions.

The Language Arts and Math teachers use the results from Florida Writes and Algebra I EOC. The administration and guidance counselors will be collecting data from mid-term reports and report cards. It will also be tracked to see if there is a decrease in the number of students attending Odyssey Lab for remediation.

**Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?**

The people responsible for implementing and monitoring the days of collaboration include the department chairperson, SAC chairperson, the school recognition committee, principal and administration.

The District and school professional development team are responsible for the implementation and monitoring of the early release professional development activities.

The administration, Language Arts and Math department chairpersons, and Language Arts and Math teachers are responsible for the implementation and monitoring of the Florida Writes and Algebra I EOC preparation sessions.

The administration, guidance department, and all teachers are responsible for the implementation and monitoring of Wednesday Enhancement.



## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

### Names and position titles of the members of the school-based LLT

Name	Title
Julian Jones	Principal
Christie Campanella	Assistant Principal in charge of curriculum
Robin Alday	Reading Coach/Reading and Language Arts Department Chairperson
Jane Peters	Media Specialist
Mike Myers	Math Chairperson
Vicky Kessler	Science Chairperson
Richard French	Social Studies Chairperson
Linda Bishop	Applications Chairperson
Deborah Doster	ESE Contact
Lisa Gallagher	Guidance
Susan Hagle	SAC Chairperson
Dena Nottingham	Teachers of Gifted Department Chairperson

### How the school-based LLT functions

The LLT meets on a regular basis (twice a month). The LLT is the guiding body of the school to assist teachers with development and implementation of best practices within their specialized area, literacy skills, and Common Core State Standards. The LLT team members are the lead teacher within their department and are expected to help their teachers analyze, interpret, and understand the data provided to improve student achievement. The principal has incorporated a philosophy of shared-decision making in leading this group to make decisions for the school.

### Major initiatives of the LLT

The major initiatives of the LLT include assisting the principal and administration in making decisions for the direction of the school. This process includes discussing goals and strategies for student achievement and building consensus. The LLT will also be the primary source to monitor student progress.

## Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction

### How the school ensures every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student

Every secondary school has the support of a Reading Coach to ensure that all teachers receive professional development related to current reading research and instructional pedagogy. All classroom teachers integrate Common Core Literacy Standards into their content-specific curriculum to support their students' critical reading and writing skills.

Administrators conduct walk-throughs on a rotational basis in all subject areas. In addition, administrators conduct announced and unannounced observations, attend Department PLC meetings, and monitor lesson plans as a method of tracking data.

Professional Development is conducted modeling best practices to support ELA CCSS standards.

## College and Career Readiness

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(iii)(I)(aa)-(cc), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).



**How the school incorporates applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future**

The school offers students elective courses in art, business, technology, and career study. Many of these courses focus on job skills and real-world application of skills and content. A focus of the school is for teachers and students to ask each other, "why are we learning this?" to ensure that instruction is always relevant.

**How the school promotes academic and career planning, including advising on course selections, so that each student's course of study is personally meaningful**

The school offers students elective courses in art, business, technology, and career study. Many of these courses focus on job skills. Every year, after FCAT testing, students and parents participate in a course selection that exposes them to next year's curriculum to assist with course selection. In addition, all students will participate in the CHOICES program. Sixth grade will focus on learning styles and interest inventories. Seventh grade will use the interest inventory to identify career clusters. Eighth grade will use the career cluster and develop a four year educational plan. Students will also be invited to high school expo fairs to help with academic planning.

**Strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level**

NA

## Expected Improvements

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(A),(H), and (I), and 1115(c)(1)(A), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

### Area 1: Reading

#### Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	69%	65%	No	72%
American Indian		0%		
Asian	82%	86%	Yes	84%
Black/African American	50%	50%	Yes	55%
Hispanic	65%	50%	No	69%
White	73%	69%	No	76%
English language learners	65%	50%	No	69%
Students with disabilities	47%	29%	No	52%
Economically disadvantaged	57%	52%	No	61%

#### Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	233	29%	31%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	286	36%	38%

#### Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		22%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	13	37%	39%

#### Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	509	66%	68%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)	115	58%	60%

**Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking (students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		91%
Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		58%
Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		35%

**Area 2: Writing**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0) Students scoring at or above 3.5	193	72%	74%
Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4	12	80%	82%

**Area 3: Mathematics****Elementary and Middle School Mathematics****Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0 and EOC assessments, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA**

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	73%	66%	No	75%
American Indian		0%		
Asian	86%	92%	Yes	87%
Black/African American	51%	46%	No	56%
Hispanic	68%	50%	No	72%
White	78%	71%	No	80%
English language learners	73%	69%	No	75%
Students with disabilities	48%	26%	No	54%
Economically disadvantaged	59%	50%	No	63%

**Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	256	32%	34%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	271	34%	36%

**Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	12	34%	36%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		16%

**Learning Gains**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Learning Gains	514	66%	68%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC)	101	52%	54%

**Middle School Acceleration**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Middle school participation in high school EOC and industry certifications	113	59%	61%
Middle school performance on high school EOC and industry certifications	113	100%	100%

**Algebra I End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	18	16%	18%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	95	84%	86%

**Area 4: Science****Middle School Science****Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	64	24%	26%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	119	45%	47%

**Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		49%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		22%

**Area 5: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM)**

**All Levels**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target
# of STEM-related experiences provided for students (e.g. robotics competitions; field trips; science fairs)	6		7
Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students	450	50%	52%

**Area 8: Early Warning Systems****Middle School Indicators**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time	334	37%	35%
Students who fail a mathematics course	7	1%	1%
Students who fail an English Language Arts course	13	1%	1%
Students who fail two or more courses in any subject	6	1%	1%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals	231	22%	20%
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that leads to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.	250	24%	22%

**Area 9: Parent Involvement**

Title I Schools may use the Parent Involvement Plan to meet the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(F) and 1115(c)(1)(G), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

**Parental involvement targets for the school**

Family Math night will be offered to students and their parents to build math skills related to FCAT and Algebra I EOC. Teachers will provide math activities to help build understanding of math concepts and skills as they relate to NGSS and CCSS.

**Specific Parental Involvement Targets**

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Families of students in the lowest quartile.	0	0%	10%

**Area 10: Additional Targets****Additional targets for the school**

Family Math night will be offered to students and their parents to build math skills related to FCAT and Algebra I EOC. Teachers will provide math activities to help build understanding of math concepts and skills as they relate to NGSS and CCSS. Community members and business partners will be invited to participate and/or support family math night.

**Specific Additional Targets**

<b>Target</b>	<b>2013 Actual #</b>	<b>2013 Actual %</b>	<b>2014 Target %</b>
Families of students in the lowest quartile.	0	0%	10%

## Goals Summary

- G1.** By June 2014, 74% of eighth grade students will score at achievement level 3.5 or higher on the Florida Writes 2.0.
- G2.** By June 2014, 54% of the lowest quartile performers on the 2013 Math FCAT will show at least a years growth as measured by the 2014 Math FCAT.

## Goals Detail

**G1.** By June 2014, 74% of eighth grade students will score at achievement level 3.5 or higher on the Florida Writes 2.0.

### Targets Supported

- Writing

### Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Teachers that have previously taught the curriculum, mentor teachers, PLC's, Day of Collaboration, professional development, Empowering Excellence in Education (E3) program.
- The language arts department has teachers that are experienced with the Florida Writes 2.0 expectations that can help new teachers within their department.
- PLC Meetings provide opportunities for teachers to plan and develop strategies to increase student achievement in writing.
- Day of Collaboration provides an opportunity for teachers to plan and develop strategies to increase student achievement in writing.
- Empowering Excellence in Education (E3) program will receive additional support to develop effective teaching and writing strategies.
- Language arts teachers will have the opportunity to participate in professional development.

### Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Teachers that are new to the grade level curriculum.
- Writing across the content areas imbedded in the curriculum.
- Student barriers include low level readers with limited vocabulary, student overuse of technology (formal vs. informal writing), student lack of exposure with expository, argumentative, and technical writing, and lack of student motivation to write.

## Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Increasing achievement level 3.5 and higher

### Person or Persons Responsible

Administration, Reading/Academic Coach, Department Chairperson, Teachers, Literacy Leadership Team

### Target Dates or Schedule:

Quarterly

### Evidence of Completion:

Volusia Writes, content area writing samples with rubrics, reflective discussion, 2014 Florida Writes 2.0 scores

**G2.** By June 2014, 54% of the lowest quartile performers on the 2013 Math FCAT will show at least a years growth as measured by the 2014 Math FCAT.

### Targets Supported

- Math (Elementary and Middle School, Elementary and Middle AMO's, Elementary and Middle FCAT 2.0, Elementary and Middle Learning Gains)

### Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Resources include teachers that have previously taught the grade level curriculum, mentor teachers, PLC's, Day of Collaboration, professional development, and Empowering Education Excellence (E3) program.
- The math department has teachers that are experienced with FCAT 2.0 and the Algebra I EOC expectations that can help new teachers within their department.
- PLC Meetings provide opportunities for teachers to plan and develop strategies to increase student achievement in math.
- Day of Collaboration provides an opportunity for teachers to plan and develop strategies to increase student achievement in math.
- The Empowering Excellence in Education (E3) program will receive additional support to develop effective teaching strategies.
- Math teachers will have the opportunity to participate in professional development opportunities.

### Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Teachers new to the curriculum
- Time for teachers to plan
- Low socio-economic status



## Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Increasing the lowest quartile by 2% on the 2014 FCAT 2.0

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Administration, Department Chairperson, Teachers, Literacy Leadership Team, Reading/Academic Coach

**Target Dates or Schedule:**

Quarterly

**Evidence of Completion:**

DIA Assessments, 2014 FCAT, 2014 EOC, Formative and Summative Assessments, teacher and administration observation, reflective discussion, analysis of assessment results

## Action Plan for Improvement

### Problem Solving Key

**G** = Goal

**B** = Barrier

**S** = Strategy

**G1.** By June 2014, 74% of eighth grade students will score at achievement level 3.5 or higher on the Florida Writes 2.0.

**G1.B1** Teachers that are new to the grade level curriculum.

**G1.B1.S1** Provide learning opportunities for teachers new to the curriculum and grade level to develop effective lesson and unit plans through collaboration with PLC and Day of Collaboration.

#### **Action Step 1**

Provide learning opportunities for teachers new to the curriculum and grade level to develop effective lesson and unit plans through collaboration with PLC and Day of Collaboration.

#### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Administration, Reading/Academic Coach, Language Arts Teachers, PAR teachers, Literacy Leadership Team

#### **Target Dates or Schedule**

Bi-weekly PLC meetings, Day of Collaboration (October-December), implementation of effective writing strategies prior to Florida Writes (February), writing camp prior to Florida Writes (February)

#### **Evidence of Completion**

Teachers will implement effective writing strategies that are recorded into their unit plans or lesson plans.

#### **Facilitator:**

Administration, Reading/Academic Coach, Department Chairperson

#### **Participants:**

Language Arts teachers

### Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B1.S1

PLC's and Day of Collaboration

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Administration, Reading/Academic Coach, Language Arts Teachers, Literacy Leadership Team

**Target Dates or Schedule**

PLC's are bi-weekly, Day of Collaboration by December 1

**Evidence of Completion**

Agenda and minutes

### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S1

PLC and Day of Collaboration

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Administration, Reading/Academic Coach, Language Arts Teachers, Literacy Leadership Team

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Monthly

**Evidence of Completion**

Agenda and minutes, implementation of strategies, Volusia Writes scores

**G1.B1.S2** Teachers will use frequent formative assessments to monitor student learning/check for understanding. This may include but is not limited to the following choices: structured lesson planning, close reading, using rubrics with students to guide writing, interactive notebooks, student self-assessment, CCSS and NGSS standards, academic vocabulary, higher-order questioning, and the gradual release model.

**Action Step 1**

Frequent formative assessments

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Administration, Department Chairperson, Reading/Academic Coach, Teachers, Literacy Leadership Team

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Quarterly

**Evidence of Completion**

Formative assessments as identified by each department

**Facilitator:**

Administration, Reading/Academic Coach

**Participants:**

Teachers

**Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B1.S2**

Frequent Formative Assessments

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Administration, Reading/Academic Coach, Department Chairperson, Teachers, Literacy Leadership Team

**Target Dates or Schedule**

on-going

**Evidence of Completion**

Formative assessments as defined by each department.

## Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S2

Frequent formative assessments

### Person or Persons Responsible

Administration, Reading/Academic Coach, Department Chairperson, Teachers, Literacy Leadership Team

### Target Dates or Schedule

on-going

### Evidence of Completion

Formative assessments as defined by each department

## G1.B2 Writing across the content areas imbedded in the curriculum.

**G1.B2.S1** Teachers would receive professional development on using rubrics with students to guide writing in all content areas.

### Action Step 1

Content area teachers will receive professional development on the use of rubrics.

### Person or Persons Responsible

Reading/Academic Coach, Department Chairperson, Teachers

### Target Dates or Schedule

Day of Collaboration

### Evidence of Completion

Agenda and minutes, evidence of the use of rubric with writing assignments

### Facilitator:

Administration, Reading/Academic Coach

### Participants:

Content Area Teachers

### Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B2.S1

Use of writing rubrics in content areas

#### Person or Persons Responsible

Administration, Reading/Academic Coach, Department Chairperson, Teachers

#### Target Dates or Schedule

Quarterly

#### Evidence of Completion

Writing samples with rubrics

### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B2.S1

Use of rubrics in content areas

#### Person or Persons Responsible

Administration, Reading/Academic Coach, Department Chairperson, Teachers

#### Target Dates or Schedule

Quarterly

#### Evidence of Completion

Writing samples with use of rubrics, reflective discussion

**G1.B5** Student barriers include low level readers with limited vocabulary, student overuse of technology (formal vs. informal writing), student lack of exposure with expository, argumentative, and technical writing, and lack of student motivation to write.

### G1.B5.S1 Provide select students with a writing camp to prepare for Florida Writes 2.0

#### Action Step 1

Provide select students with a writing camp to prepare for Florida Writes 2.0.

#### Person or Persons Responsible

Administration, Reading/Academic Coach, Language Arts Teachers, Guidance Counselor

#### Target Dates or Schedule

January 2014

#### Evidence of Completion

Activities and writing samples completed during the camp.

### Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B5.S1

Writing Camp

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Administration, Reading/Academic Coach, Language Arts Teachers, Guidance Counselor

**Target Dates or Schedule**

January 2014

**Evidence of Completion**

Students selected for writing camp, dates selected

### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B5.S1

Writing Camp

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Administration, Reading/Academic Coach, Language Arts Teachers, Guidance Counselor

**Target Dates or Schedule**

May 2014

**Evidence of Completion**

2014 Florida Writes 2.0 scores

**G2.** By June 2014, 54% of the lowest quartile performers on the 2013 Math FCAT will show at least a years growth as measured by the 2014 Math FCAT.

**G2.B1** Teachers new to the curriculum

**G2.B1.S1** PLC meetings will provide learning opportunities for teachers new to the grade level curriculum to develop effective lesson and unit plans.

**Action Step 1**

PLC meetings and Day of Collaboration

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Administration, Department Chairperson, Math Teachers, Reading/Academic Coach, Literacy Leadership Team

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Bi-weekly

**Evidence of Completion**

Agendas and minutes, unit plans, lesson plans

**Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G2.B1.S1**

PLC meetings and Day of Collaboration

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Administration, Department Chairperson, Teachers, Literacy Leadership Team, Reading/Academic Coach

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Bi-Weekly

**Evidence of Completion**

Agendas and minutes, unit plans, lesson plans, DIA Assessments, Formative and Summative assessments, teacher and administration observation, reflective discussion, analysis of assessment results



## Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B1.S1

PLC meetings and Day of Collaboration

### Person or Persons Responsible

Administration, Department Chairperson, Teachers, Literacy Leadership Team, Reading/Academic Coach

### Target Dates or Schedule

Bi-weekly

### Evidence of Completion

Review and evaluate lesson and unit plans, DIA Assessments, Formative and Summative assessments, teacher and administration observation, reflective discussion, analysis of assessment results

**G2.B1.S2** Teachers will use frequent formative assessments to monitor student learning/check for understanding. This may include but is not limited to the following choices: structured lesson planning, close reading, using rubrics with students to guide writing, interactive notebooks, student self-assessment, CCSS and NGSS standards, academic vocabulary, higher-order questioning, and the gradual release model.

### Action Step 1

Frequent formative assessments

#### Person or Persons Responsible

Administration, Reading/Academic Coach, Department Chairperson, Literacy Leadership Team, Teachers

#### Target Dates or Schedule

on-going

#### Evidence of Completion

Formative assessments as defined by each department

#### Facilitator:

Administration, Reading/Academic Coach

#### Participants:

Teachers

## Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G2.B1.S2

Frequent formative assessments

### Person or Persons Responsible

Administration, Reading/Academic Coach, Department Chairperson, Literacy Leadership Team, Teachers

### Target Dates or Schedule

on-going

### Evidence of Completion

Formative assessments as defined by each department

## Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B1.S2

Frequent formative assessments

### Person or Persons Responsible

Administration, Reading/Academic Coach, Department Chairperson, Literacy Leadership Team, Teachers

### Target Dates or Schedule

on-going

### Evidence of Completion

Formative assessments as defined by each department

## G2.B2 Time for teachers to plan

**G2.B2.S1** PLC meetings and Day of Collaboration will provide learning opportunities for teachers new to the grade level curriculum to develop effective lesson and unit plans.

### Action Step 1

PLC meetings and Day of Collaboration

### Person or Persons Responsible

Administration, Department Chairperson, Math Teachers, Reading/Academic Coach, Literacy Leadership Team

### Target Dates or Schedule

Bi-monthly

### Evidence of Completion

Agenda and minutes

### Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G2.B2.S1

PLC meetings and Day of Collaboration

#### Person or Persons Responsible

Administration, Department Chairperson, Math teachers, Reading/Academic Coach, Literacy Leadership Team

#### Target Dates or Schedule

Bi-monthly

#### Evidence of Completion

Agendas and minutes, unit plans, lesson plans, DIA Assessments, Formative and Summative assessments, teacher and administration observation, reflective discussion, analysis of assessment results

### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B2.S1

PLC meetings and Day of Collaboration

#### Person or Persons Responsible

Administration, Department Chairperson, Math teachers, Reading/Academic Coach, Literacy Leadership Team

#### Target Dates or Schedule

Bi-monthly

#### Evidence of Completion

Agendas and minutes, unit plans, lesson plans, DIA Assessments, Formative and Summative assessments, teacher and administration observation, reflective discussion, analysis of assessment results

## G2.B4 Low socio-economic status

**G2.B4.S1** High-performing math students will be selected by math teachers, guidance counselor, and administration to serve a peer tutors in math classes.

### Action Step 1

Peer Tutors

#### Person or Persons Responsible

Math teachers, guidance counselor, administration, Reading/Academic Coach, Literacy Leadership Team

#### Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly

#### Evidence of Completion

Students scheduled with math teachers

## Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G2.B4.S1

Peer Tutors

#### Person or Persons Responsible

Administration, Department Chairperson, Math Teachers, Guidance Counselor, Reading/Academic Coach, Literacy Leadership Team

#### Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly

#### Evidence of Completion

Review and evaluate lesson and unit plans, DIA Assessments, Formative and Summative assessments, teacher and administration observation, reflective discussion, analysis of assessment results

## Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B4.S1

Peer Tutors

### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Administration, Department Chairperson, Math teachers, Guidance Counselor, Reading/Academic Coach, Literacy Leadership Team

### **Target Dates or Schedule**

Monthly

### **Evidence of Completion**

Review and evaluate lesson and unit plans, DIA Assessments, Formative and Summative assessments, teacher and administration observation, reflective discussion, analysis of assessment results

## Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support School Improvement Goals

This section will satisfy the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b), by demonstrating high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, for pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff is being offered to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

*Professional development opportunities identified in the SIP as action steps to achieve the school's goals.*

**G1.** By June 2014, 74% of eighth grade students will score at achievement level 3.5 or higher on the Florida Writes 2.0.

**G1.B1** Teachers that are new to the grade level curriculum.

**G1.B1.S1** Provide learning opportunities for teachers new to the curriculum and grade level to develop effective lesson and unit plans through collaboration with PLC and Day of Collaboration.

### PD Opportunity 1

Provide learning opportunities for teachers new to the curriculum and grade level to develop effective lesson and unit plans through collaboration with PLC and Day of Collaboration.

#### Facilitator

Administration, Reading/Acadmic Coach, Department Chairperson

#### Participants

Language Arts teachers

#### Target Dates or Schedule

Bi-weekly PLC meetings, Day of Collaboration (October-December), implementation of effective writing strategies prior to Florida Writes (February), writing camp prior to Florida Writes (February)

#### Evidence of Completion

Teachers will implement effective writing strategies that are recorded into their unit plans or lesson plans.

**G1.B1.S2** Teachers will use frequent formative assessments to monitor student learning/check for understanding. This may include but is not limited to the following choices: structured lesson planning, close reading, using rubrics with students to guide writing, interactive notebooks, student self-assessment, CCSS and NGSS standards, academic vocabulary, higher-order questioning, and the gradual release model.

**PD Opportunity 1**

Frequent formative assessments

**Facilitator**

Administration, Reading/Academic Coach

**Participants**

Teachers

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Quarterly

**Evidence of Completion**

Formative assessments as identified by each department

**G1.B2** Writing across the content areas imbedded in the curriculum.

**G1.B2.S1** Teachers would receive professional development on using rubrics with students to guide writing in all content areas.

**PD Opportunity 1**

Content area teachers will receive professional development on the use of rubrics.

**Facilitator**

Administration, Reading/Academic Coach

**Participants**

Content Area Teachers

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Day of Collaboration

**Evidence of Completion**

Agenda and minutes, evidence of the use of rubric with writing assignments

**G2.** By June 2014, 54% of the lowest quartile performers on the 2013 Math FCAT will show at least a years growth as measured by the 2014 Math FCAT.

**G2.B1** Teachers new to the curriculum

**G2.B1.S2** Teachers will use frequent formative assessments to monitor student learning/check for understanding. This may include but is not limited to the following choices: structured lesson planning, close reading, using rubrics with students to guide writing, interactive notebooks, student self-assessment, CCSS and NGSS standards, academic vocabulary, higher-order questioning, and the gradual release model.

**PD Opportunity 1**

Frequent formative assessments

**Facilitator**

Administration, Reading/Academic Coach

**Participants**

Teachers

**Target Dates or Schedule**

on-going

**Evidence of Completion**

Formative assessments as defined by each department



## Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals