# 2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

## Lockhart Elementary Magnet School
3719 N 17TH ST
Tampa, FL 33610
813-276-5727

## School Demographics

| School Type | Title I | Free and Reduced Lunch Rate |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary School | Yes | 95% |

| Alternative/ESE Center | Charter School | Minority Rate |
|---|---|---|
| No | No | 95% |

## School Grades History

| 2013-14 | 2012-13 | 2011-12 | 2010-11 |
|---|---|---|---|
| F | D | D | D |

## 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

## 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Focus Year 3 or more | 4 | Jim Browder |

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

# Current School Status

## School Information

### School-Level Information

**School**

Lockhart Elementary Magnet School

**Principal**

Lynn Roberts

**School Advisory Council chair**

Leighmarie Carrasquillo

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

| Name | Title |
|---|---|
| Lynn Roberts | Principal |
| Kathryn Dickens | Assistant Principal |
| Susan Horan | Social Worker |
| Brooke Lipschultz | Guidance Counselor |
| Kyle Bassett | Psychologist |
| Leighmarie Carrassquillo | AIS |
| Leikeisha Broughton | Reading Coach |
| Julie Lehan | Reading Resource |
| Adrienne Brown | Science Resource |
| Diana Wittorf | ELL Resource |
| Jessica Addington | Lead Teacher |

### District-Level Information

**District**

Hillsborough

**Superintendent**

Mrs. Maryellen Elia

**Date of school board approval of SIP**

2/14/2014

## 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

Lynn Roberts, Principal
Leighmarie Carrasquillo, SAC Chair
Anissa McNeil, Non-instructional
Amber Higginbotham, CTA Chair

Jada Stephens, Parent
Keyona Griffin, Parent
Fridith Seide, Parent
Marlene Gilbert, Parent
Ebony Lynch, Parent
Sheryl Allen, Parent
Monica Shogreen, Parent
Nicole Drayton, Parent

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

SAC members will review goals, barriers and strategies of the SIP plan.

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

September - SIP Development
• If applicable, conduct SAC elections.
• Analyze school data and previous School Improvement Plan.
• Review the Summer Work Group and faculty recommendations for new School Improvement Plan.
• Assist in the development of new School Improvement Plan.
• Brainstorm activities SAC can plan and carry out in all Goal areas (reading, math, writing, science, and parent involvement that will help students reach the Objectives and Actions Steps on the School Improvement Plan.
o Can any of these be included in the SIP as an Action Step?
• Begin development of the SAC Budget (if state funds are available.
October – Finalize and Vote on SIP
• If applicable, conduct the current School Improvement Plan.
• Brainstorm activities SAC can plan and carry out in all Goal areas (reading, math, writing, science and parent involvement) that will help students reach the Objectives and Actions Steps on the School Improvement Plan.
o Can any of these be included in the SIP as an Action Step?
• Conduct the School Improvement Plan SAC vote.
• Finalize SAC Budget (if state funds are available).
November - Review Baseline Testing Data
• Review District-level baseline testing data.
• Do any adjustments need to be made in the plan?
• Discuss the status of activities SAC is planning and carrying out to help students reach the Objectives and Action Steps on the School Improvement Plan.
• Review the SAC budget (if state funds are available).
December – Review Reading Goal
• Review the Objectives for reading.
• Review the Action Steps for reading.
• For each Actions Step, review the person responsible for monitoring the Action Step.
• Review the Process being used to determine the effectiveness of each Action Step.
• Review the Evaluation Tool and data collected to date for each Action Step.
• Review the Professional Development to date for each Objective.
• Based on the review, do any adjustments need to be made in the plan?
• Discuss the status of activities SAC is planning and carrying out to help students read the reading Objectives and Actions Steps on School Improvement Plan
• Review the SAC budget (if state funds are available).
January - Review Writing Goal
• Review the Objectives for writing.
• Review the Actions Steps for writing.
• For each Action Step, review the person responsible for monitoring the Action Step.

• Review the process being used to determine the effectiveness of each Action Step.
• Review the Evaluation Tool and data collected to date for each Action Step.
• Review Professional Development to date for each Objective.
• Based on the review, do any adjustments need to be made in the plan?
• Discuss the status of activities SAC is planning and carrying out to help students reach the writing Objectives and Actions Steps on the School Improvement Plan
• Review the SAC budget (if state funds are available).
February - Review the Math Goal
• Review the Objectives for math.
• Review the Actions Steps for math.
• For each action Step, review the person responsible for monitoring the Action Step.
• Review the process being used to determine the effectiveness of each Action Step.
• Review the Evaluation Tool and data collected to date for each Action Step.
• Review Professional Development to date for each Objective.
• Based on the review, do any adjustments need to be made in the plan?
• Discuss the status of activities SAC is planning and carrying out to help students reach the math Objectives and Actions Steps on the School Improvement Plan.
• Review the SAC budget (if state funds are available).
March – Review Mid-Year Testing Data
• Review District-level mid-year testing data.
• Do any adjustments need to be made in the plan?
• Discuss the status of activities SAC is planning and carrying out to help students reach the Objective and Actions Steps on the School Improvement Plan.
• Review the SAC budget (if state funds are available).
April – Review Science Goal
• Review the Objectives for science.
• Review the Actions Steps for science.
• For each Action Step, review the person responsible for monitoring the Action Step.
• Review the process being used to determine the effectiveness of each Action Step.
• Review the Evaluation Tool and data collected to date for each Action Step
• Review professional Development to date for each Objective.
• Based on the review, do any adjustments need to be made in the plan?
• Discuss the status of activities SAC is planning and carrying out to help students reach the Science Objectives and Actions Steps on the School Improvement Plan
• Review the SAC budget (if state funds are available).
May – Review all Other Goals
• Review the progress of "Other Goals" (attendance, health and fitness, School Improvement, etc.).
• Begin discussion of potential SAC members and election cycle to be used for the upcoming school year.
• Begin discussion of ideas (objectives, Action Steps, Evaluation Tools and Staff Development) for the upcoming school year.
• Ensure that all SAC Funds have been utilized (if state funds are available).
• Continue discussion of ideas (Objectives, Action Steps, Evaluation Tools and Staff Development) for the upcoming school year.
• If applicable, conduct SAC election.
• Decide who will be a part of the summer work group that looks at the data and begins development of next year's School Improvement Plan.

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

SAC funds will be allocated for each content area (reading, math, writing, science, character education, and attendance) to purchase incentives and food items. ($985.50 amount to spend)

**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**

2

**# receiving effective rating or higher**

(not entered because basis is < 10)

**Administrator Information:**

| Lynn Roberts | | |
|---|---|---|
| Principal | Years as Administrator: 9 | Years at Current School: 1 |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Credentials** | MS- Educational Leadership <br> BS- Elementary Education grades 1-6 |
| **Performance Record** | Lomax: 2006-2007:A 100% AYP <br> Lomax: 2007-2008:A 92% AYP <br> USF Patel: 2008-2009:A 100% AYP <br> USF Patel: 2009-2010: B 97% AYP <br> USF Patel: 2010-2011: B 100% AYP <br> Lockhart: 2011-2012: D No AYP <br> Lockhart 2012-2013: D |

| Kathryn Dickens | | |
|---|---|---|
| Asst Principal | Years as Administrator: 9 | Years at Current School: 0 |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Credentials** | MS- Educational Leadership <br> BS- Elementary Education |
| **Performance Record** | Sheehy: C 2010-2011 <br> Sheehy: D 2011-2012 <br> Sheehy: F 2012-2013 |

### Instructional Coaches

**# of instructional coaches**

5

**# receiving effective rating or higher**

(not entered because basis is < 10)

**Instructional Coach Information:**

## Lekeisha Broughton

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Full-time / District-based | Years as Coach: 2 | Years at Current School: 2 |

**Areas** — Reading/Literacy

**Credentials** — Primary Ed K-3

**Performance Record** — Lockhart 11/12: D no AYP

## Adrienne Brown

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Full-time / District-based | Years as Coach: 6 | Years at Current School: 0 |

**Areas** — Science

**Credentials** — BA: Elementary Education K-6, Gifted, ESOL

**Performance Record**
Riverhills: F 2010-2011
Riverhills: D 2011-2012
Riverhills: D 2012-2013

## Julie Lehan

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Full-time / District-based | Years as Coach: 2 | Years at Current School: 0 |

**Areas** — Reading/Literacy

**Credentials**
BS- Early Childhood, Elementary Education, ESOL, Gifted
MS- Educational Leadership

**Performance Record**
Lomax: B 2010-2011
Lomax: C 2011-2012
Gorrie: A 2012-2013

## Jessica Addington

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Full-time / District-based | Years as Coach: 2 | Years at Current School: 2 |

**Areas** — Other

**Credentials**
Masters Degree; Elementary Education/
Certification: ESE K-12; ESOL endorsement

**Performance Record**
MacFarland Park 09/10-A 100% AYP
MacFarland Park 10/11-A 100% AYP
Lockhart: D 2011-2012
Lockhart: D 2012-2013

| Amber Higginbotham | | |
|---|---|---|
| Full-time / District-based | Years as Coach: 0 | Years at Current School: 4 |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Areas** | Mathematics |
| **Credentials** | BS- Elementary K-6 |
| **Performance Record** | Lockhart: 2011-2012: D No AYP<br>Lockhart 2012-2013: D |

## Classroom Teachers

**# of classroom teachers**
52

**# receiving effective rating or higher**
7, 13%

**# Highly Qualified Teachers**
44%

**# certified in-field**
19, 37%

**# ESOL endorsed**
22, 42%

**# reading endorsed**
2, 4%

**# with advanced degrees**
18, 35%

**# National Board Certified**
1, 2%

**# first-year teachers**
8, 15%

**# with 1-5 years of experience**
19, 37%

**# with 6-14 years of experience**
16, 31%

**# with 15 or more years of experience**
9, 17%

## Education Paraprofessionals

**# of paraprofessionals**
9

**# Highly Qualified**
9, 100%

## Other Instructional Personnel

### # of instructional personnel not captured in the sections above

0

### # receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 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

Description of Strategy Person Responsible Projected Completion Date
1. Teacher Interview Day District Staff June
2. District Mentor Program District Mentors ongoing
3. District Peer Program District Peers ongoing
4. Salary Differential (Renaissance Schools) General of Federal Programs ongoing
5. Renaissance Interview Day District Staff June

## 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

Julie Lehan will work with Sarah Gold, Meredith Mullen and Lynn Riley. Julie has over 2 years of mentoring experienc with the EET initiative and 2 months of coaching experience and can assist them in development and implementation of reading guidelines within her classroom. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.
Leikeisha Broughton will work with Dominique Cole and Nicole Drayton. Leikeisha has over 2 years of coaching experience and can assist her in development and implementation of reading guidelines within her classroom.
Jessica Addington will work with Melissa Ivy and Nicole Rosenberger. Jessica has over 2 years of coaching experience and can assist them in development and implementation of science and math guidelines within her classroom.
Adrienne Brown will work with 5th grade teacher Allyson Cooper. Adrienne has over 5 years of coaching experience and can assist her in development and implementation of science guidelines within her classroom.

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

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

•Oversee the multi-layered model of instruction 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 Tier2/3.
•Facilitate the implementation of specific programs(e.g., Extended Learning Programs during and after school) that provide intervention support to students identified through data sorts/chats conducted by the PLCs.
•Determine the school-wide professional development needs of faculty and staff and arrange trainings aligned with the SIP goals
•Organize and support systematic data collection (e.g., district and state assessments; during-the-grading period school assessments/checks for understanding)

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

The responsibility of the MTSS Leadership Team is to:
•Review school-wide assessment data on an ongoing basis in order to identify instructional needs at all grade levels.
•Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core and intervention/enrichment (Tier2/3) levels.
•Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavior , and attendance domains.
•Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams.

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

•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 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.
•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.

**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**

Core Curriculum: Data Sources
Baseline and Midyear District Assessments
Subject-specific assessments generated by District-level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Math, Writing and Science
FAIR
CELLA
Common Assessments* (see below) of chapter/segments tests using adopted curriculum resources
Common Assessments* (see below) of chapter/segments tests using adopted curriculum resources
*A Common Assessment covers a "chunk" of instruction within the District adopted curriculum. It covers all of the skills taught within a certain time period. The purpose of the Common Assessment is to assess

students' knowledge of the core curriculum. The results of the Common Assessment are used to:
•Determine if the lesson plans and teaching strategies used to teach the core curriculum were effective or need to be modified.
•Determine which skills need to be taught with alternative strategies.
•Determine which skills need to be re-taught within the core curriculum and which skills need to be moved to the Reinforcement Instructional Calendar.
•Determine which students need Differentiated Instruction within the classroom and which students might need Supplemental Services.
Core Curriculum: Management System
Scantron Achievement Series
Data Wall
Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network
Sagebrush (IPT) and Dashboard
Subject Area Generated Database
Supplemental and Intensive Instruction: Data Source
Extended Learning Program (ELP)* (see below) Ongoing Progress Monitoring (mini-assessments and other assessments from adopted curriculum resource materials)
I-Station Computer Program
Intervention/Enrichment Groups (daily)
*Students receiving pull-out tutoring or push in tutoring during the school day or Extended Learning Program (ELP) after school will receive instruction on the specific skills they have not mastered in the core curriculum. As students work on these specific skills, they will be assessed during tutoring and ELP to ensure mastery of skills. In order to make this process effective, a communication system between classroom teacher and the tutor/ELP teacher will be developed by the PSLT and monitored for effectiveness throughout the school year. As students progress through Supplementary Support and Intensive Instruction, the number/type of supplemental services, time spent in the supplemental services and frequency of assessment will increase in duration.
Supplemental and Intensive Instruction: Management System
School Generated Database in Excel
District Generated Database
Online Database
Teacher/Tutor Lesson Plans

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

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.
Provide designated school personnel to train parents in the problem solving process using the MTSS as our guide.

## 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:** Before or After School Program

**Minutes added to school year:** 1,680

We are currently using ELP funds for daytime tutoring for reading in grades 3-5

### Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects

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

We will implement afterschool ELP funds for Writing during the months of January and February 2014 for 4th grade. Teachers will meet with students twice a week. Teachers will continue to use the star conference format during the afterschool ELP to help guide instruction and feedback to students.

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

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

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

| Name | Title |
|------|-------|
| Lynn Roberts | Principal |
| Leikeisha Broughton | Reading Coach |
| Julie Lehan | Reading Resource |
| Teresa Potter | Media Specialist |
| Leighmarie Carrasquillo | AIS |

### How the school-based LLT functions

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

### Major initiatives of the LLT

Will use new grant, Annenberg, to use money sources to create literacy areas around the school (cafeteria and grade level hallways). Increasing the amount of books read on Myon.

## Preschool Transition

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

**Strategies for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs**

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

## 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 | 52% | 46% | No | 57% |
| American Indian | | | | |
| Asian | | | | |
| Black/African American | 39% | 39% | Yes | 45% |
| Hispanic | 57% | 51% | No | 61% |
| White | 83% | 70% | No | 84% |
| English language learners | 43% | 30% | No | 49% |
| Students with disabilities | 28% | 14% | No | 36% |
| Economically disadvantaged | 48% | 44% | No | 54% |

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

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 | 74 | 46% | 57% |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 | 32 | 20% | 25% |

**Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)**

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 | *[data excluded for privacy reasons]* | | 100% |
| Students scoring at or above Level 7 | | | |

**Learning Gains**

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA) | 63 | 60% | 65% |
| Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0) | | 62% | 65% |

### 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) | 22 | 49% | 54% |
| Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students) | 12 | 27% | 32% |
| Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students) | 14 | 31% | 36% |

## 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 | 35 | 66% | 71% |
| Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4 | *[data excluded for privacy reasons]* |  | 0% |

## 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 | 53% | 39% | No | 58% |
| American Indian |  |  |  |  |
| Asian |  |  |  |  |
| Black/African American | 43% | 28% | No | 49% |
| Hispanic | 61% | 51% | No | 65% |
| White | 61% | 60% | No | 65% |
| English language learners | 48% | 41% | No | 53% |
| Students with disabilities | 36% | 14% | No | 42% |
| Economically disadvantaged | 51% | 37% | No | 56% |

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

|  | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 | 62 | 39% | 58% |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 | 19 | 12% | 17% |

**Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)**

|  | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 | *[data excluded for privacy reasons]* | | 100% |
| Students scoring at or above Level 7 | | | |

**Learning Gains**

|  | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Learning Gains | 57 | 54% | 59% |
| Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC) | | 48% | 54% |

## Area 4: Science

### Elementary School Science

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

|  | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 | 20 | 35% | 54% |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 | *[data excluded for privacy reasons]* | | 17% |

**Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)**

|  | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 | *[data excluded for privacy reasons]* | | 100% |
| Students scoring at or above Level 7 | | | |

## 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) | 35 | | |
| Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students | | | |

## Area 8: Early Warning Systems

**Elementary School Indicators**

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time | | | |
| Students retained, pursuant to s. 1008.25, F.S. | | | |
| Students who are not proficient in reading by third grade | | | |
| Students who receive two or more behavior referrals | | | |
| Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that lead to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S. | 12 | | 11% |

## 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**

See Title One Parent Involvement Plan (PIP)

**Specific Parental Involvement Targets**

| Target | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|---|---|---|---|

## Goals Summary

**G1.**    We will increase instructional rigor in all content areas with the implementation of cognitive complexity as measured by FAIR and district assessments.

## Goals Detail

**G1.** We will increase instructional rigor in all content areas with the implementation of cognitive complexity as measured by FAIR and district assessments.

### Targets Supported

- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, FAA, Learning Gains, CELLA, Postsecondary Readiness)

- Writing

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

- Science

- Science - Elementary School

### Resources Available to Support the Goal

- 1. math coach 2.science resource 3.reading resource 4. reading coach 5. social worker 6. guidance 7. psychologist 8. kagan strategies / professional development 9. gifted 10. magnet lead 11. power 3 12. creative science labs 13. district support 14. TIP program 15. technology (nooks, smartboards, leap pads)

### Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Lack of rigor within all content areas (within grade level standards-CCSS) • lack of implementation of higher cognitive complexity levels • lack of understanding of what rigor means • no feedback provided to students (need for conferencing, use of rubrics) • need for student evidence of learning (exit ticket, informal checks, etc) • lack of high quality student work displayed/shared • lack of understanding of what student engagement means • lack of purposeful planning (expectation for planning) • lack of content knowledge in all curricular areas (teachers and students) • gaps in learning • no fidelity checks • lack of understanding of how to incorporate the gradual release responsibility model

### Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Student samples of work in each content area (reading, science and math)

### Person or Persons Responsible
Administration and resource teachers

### Target Dates or Schedule:
Quarterly

### Evidence of Completion:
Student journals and rubrics completed by teachers

# Action Plan for Improvement

**Problem Solving Key**

**G** = Goal          **B** = Barrier          **S** = Strategy

**G1.** We will increase instructional rigor in all content areas with the implementation of cognitive complexity as measured by FAIR and district assessments.

**G1.B1** Lack of rigor within all content areas (within grade level standards-CCSS) • lack of implementation of higher cognitive complexity levels • lack of understanding of what rigor means • no feedback provided to students (need for conferencing, use of rubrics) • need for student evidence of learning (exit ticket, informal checks, etc) • lack of high quality student work displayed/shared • lack of understanding of what student engagement means • lack of purposeful planning (expectation for planning) • lack of content knowledge in all curricular areas (teachers and students) • gaps in learning • no fidelity checks • lack of understanding of how to incorporate the gradual release responsibility model

**G1.B1.S1** Strategy 1- Implementation of Webb's Depth of Knowledge across all content areas • lack of implementation of higher cognitive complexity levels • lack of understanding of what rigor means • lack of understanding of what student engagement means

### Action Step 1

WHAT: Incorporated into each planning sessions; Implemented within lessons; shared during faculty meetings/PLC meetings

#### Person or Persons Responsible

WHO: Coaches; Lead Teacher; Teachers and Administration

#### Target Dates or Schedule

WHEN: Weekly with planning sessions; daily within the lessons; monthly at faculty/PLC meetings

#### Evidence of Completion

EVIDENCE OF COMPLETION: Walk through checklists; student samples/work

#### Facilitator:

All Resource teachers (Reading coach, math, science, reading and Lead Teacher)

#### Participants:

All K-5 teachers

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

WHAT: Perform classroom walk throughs using EET informal and district content walk through checklists.

**Person or Persons Responsible**

WHO: Administration & PSLT

**Target Dates or Schedule**

WHEN: monthly by content area

**Evidence of Completion**

EVIDENCE OF COMPLETION: Walk through checklist; evidence of student work

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

WHAT: Student work/samples will be collected to verify the use of Webb's DOK

**Person or Persons Responsible**

WHO: Administration & PSLT

**Target Dates or Schedule**

WHEN: quarterly

**Evidence of Completion**

EVIDENCE OF COMPLETION: Student work/products which includes level 2-3 on the Webb's DOK

**G1.B1.S2** Strategy 2- Implement specific feedback to student through the use of rubrics • no feedback provided to students (need for conferencing, use of rubrics) • need for student evidence of learning (exit ticket, informal checks, etc) • lack of high quality student work displayed/shared

### Action Step 1

WHAT: Grade level understanding of rubrics per content area; model and practice feedback to students; feedback to teacher on rubric use; sharing student work with rubrics vertically with teams

#### Person or Persons Responsible

WHO: Coaches, Lead Teacher; Teachers and Administration

#### Target Dates or Schedule

WHEN: PLC's/faculty meetings; During core instruction

#### Evidence of Completion

EVIDENCE OF COMPLETION: student samples of work and content rubrics

#### Facilitator:

All Resource teachers (Reading, math, science and Lead Teacher)

#### Participants:

All K-5 teachers

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

WHAT: Review specific feedback according to the content rubric given to students. (ie: written feedback on rubrics, in journals, posted in the room).

#### Person or Persons Responsible

WHO: Content coaches, Lead Teacher & PSLT

#### Target Dates or Schedule

WHEN: monthly

#### Evidence of Completion

EVIDENCE OF COMPLETION: Lead teacher's data collection of rubric feedback

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

WHAT: Overtime, student work/products will demonstrate an increase towards mastery as indicated by the content rubric.

### Person or Persons Responsible

WHO: Lead Teacher, Coaches, Classroom teachers & PSLT

### Target Dates or Schedule

WHEN: quarterly

### Evidence of Completion

EVIDENCE OF COMPLETION: Student samples collected overtime (portfolio, journals)

**G1.B1.S3** Strategy 3- Goal oriented planning with coaches • lack of purposeful planning (expectation for planning) • lack of content knowledge in all curricular areas (teachers and students) • gaps in learning • no fidelity checks • lack of understanding of how to incorporate the gradual release responsibility model

### Action Step 1

WHAT: The following will be incorporated into planning sessions with coaches: precise language; Essential Questions; Standard/Benchmark; cognitively complex questions; student engagement activity; evidence of student learning; data analysis

### Person or Persons Responsible

WHO: Coaches

### Target Dates or Schedule

WHEN: ongoing during planning and PLC's

### Evidence of Completion

EVIDENCE OF COMPLETION: coaches checklist for planning

**Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B1.S3**

WHAT: Review coaches planning checklist

### Person or Persons Responsible

WHO: Administration & PLST

### Target Dates or Schedule

WHEN: monthly

### Evidence of Completion

EVIDENCE OF COMPLETION: walk through checklist

**Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S3**

WHAT: Student engagement in lesson, teacher/students' use of precise language; deepening of understanding for teachers/students

### Person or Persons Responsible

WHO: Coaches & PSLT

### Target Dates or Schedule

WHEN: quarterly

### Evidence of Completion

EVIDENCE OF COMPLETION: Walk throughs & an increase in an understanding of gradual release of responsibility (teachers facilitating more with minimal talk and more student accountable talk/ discussions).

## Coordination and Integration

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

### How federal, state, and local funds, services, and programs are coordinated and integrated at the school

Title I, Part A
Services are provided to ensure students who need additional remediation are provided support through: after school programs, quality teachers through professional development, content resource teachers, and mentors.
Title I, Part C- Migrant
NA
Title I, Part D
NA
Title II
The district receives funds for staff development to increase student achievement through teacher training. In addition, the funds are utilized in the Salary Differential Program at Renaissance schools.
Title III
Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners.
Title X- Homeless
The district receives funds to provide resources (social workers and tutoring) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school, reading coaches, and extended learning opportunity programs.
Violence Prevention Programs
NA
Nutrition Programs
FFVP Grant
Housing Programs
NA
Head Start
We utilize information from student Head Start to transition to Kindergarten.
Adult Education
NA
Career and Technical Education
NA
Job Training
NA

## 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.** We will increase instructional rigor in all content areas with the implementation of cognitive complexity as measured by FAIR and district assessments.

**G1.B1** Lack of rigor within all content areas (within grade level standards-CCSS) • lack of implementation of higher cognitive complexity levels • lack of understanding of what rigor means • no feedback provided to students (need for conferencing, use of rubrics) • need for student evidence of learning (exit ticket, informal checks, etc) • lack of high quality student work displayed/shared • lack of understanding of what student engagement means • lack of purposeful planning (expectation for planning) • lack of content knowledge in all curricular areas (teachers and students) • gaps in learning • no fidelity checks • lack of understanding of how to incorporate the gradual release responsibility model

**G1.B1.S1** Strategy 1- Implementation of Webb's Depth of Knowledge across all content areas • lack of implementation of higher cognitive complexity levels • lack of understanding of what rigor means • lack of understanding of what student engagement means

### PD Opportunity 1

WHAT: Incorporated into each planning sessions; Implemented within lessons; shared during faculty meetings/PLC meetings

#### Facilitator

All Resource teachers (Reading coach, math, science, reading and Lead Teacher)

#### Participants

All K-5 teachers

#### Target Dates or Schedule

WHEN: Weekly with planning sessions; daily within the lessons; monthly at faculty/PLC meetings

#### Evidence of Completion

EVIDENCE OF COMPLETION: Walk through checklists; student samples/work

**G1.B1.S2** Strategy 2- Implement specific feedback to student through the use of rubrics • no feedback provided to students (need for conferencing, use of rubrics) • need for student evidence of learning (exit ticket, informal checks, etc) • lack of high quality student work displayed/shared

### PD Opportunity 1

WHAT: Grade level understanding of rubrics per content area; model and practice feedback to students; feedback to teacher on rubric use; sharing student work with rubrics vertically with teams

### Facilitator

All Resource teachers (Reading, math, science and Lead Teacher)

### Participants

All K-5 teachers

### Target Dates or Schedule

WHEN: PLC's/faculty meetings; During core instruction

### Evidence of Completion

EVIDENCE OF COMPLETION: student samples of work and content rubrics

## Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals

### Budget Summary by Goal

| Goal | Description | Total |
|------|-------------|-------|
| G1. | We will increase instructional rigor in all content areas with the implementation of cognitive complexity as measured by FAIR and district assessments. | $900 |
| | Total | $900 |

### Budget Summary by Funding Source and Resource Type

| Funding Source | Other | Total |
|----------------|-------|-------|
| SAC Funds | $900 | $900 |
| SAC funds | $0 | $0 |
| Total | $900 | $900 |

### Budget Details

*Budget items identified in the SIP as necessary to achieve the school's goals.*

**G1.** We will increase instructional rigor in all content areas with the implementation of cognitive complexity as measured by FAIR and district assessments.

**G1.B1** Lack of rigor within all content areas (within grade level standards-CCSS) • lack of implementation of higher cognitive complexity levels • lack of understanding of what rigor means • no feedback provided to students (need for conferencing, use of rubrics) • need for student evidence of learning (exit ticket, informal checks, etc) • lack of high quality student work displayed/shared • lack of understanding of what student engagement means • lack of purposeful planning (expectation for planning) • lack of content knowledge in all curricular areas (teachers and students) • gaps in learning • no fidelity checks • lack of understanding of how to incorporate the gradual release responsibility model

**G1.B1.S1** Strategy 1- Implementation of Webb's Depth of Knowledge across all content areas • lack of implementation of higher cognitive complexity levels • lack of understanding of what rigor means • lack of understanding of what student engagement means

### Action Step 1

WHAT: Incorporated into each planning sessions; Implemented within lessons; shared during faculty meetings/PLC meetings

#### Resource Type

Other

#### Resource

Food/snack incentives for students. (All food items: drinks, snacks, breakfast items, candy, ice cream, ice pops, etc. will be purchased at Publix)

#### Funding Source

SAC Funds

#### Amount Needed

$400

**G1.B1.S2** Strategy 2- Implement specific feedback to student through the use of rubrics • no feedback provided to students (need for conferencing, use of rubrics) • need for student evidence of learning (exit ticket, informal checks, etc) • lack of high quality student work displayed/shared

### Action Step 1

WHAT: Grade level understanding of rubrics per content area; model and practice feedback to students; feedback to teacher on rubric use; sharing student work with rubrics vertically with teams

**Resource Type**

Other

**Resource**

Food/snack incentives for students. (All food items: drinks, snacks, breakfast items, candy, ice cream, ice pops, etc. will be purchased at Publix)

**Funding Source**

SAC funds

**Amount Needed**

$500