

Florida Department of Education



School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: New River Elementary	District Name: Pasco
Principal: Lynn Pabst	Superintendent: Heather Fiorentino
SAC Chair: Colleen Wilkinson	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

[High School Feedback Report](#)

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

Administrators

List your school’s administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress.

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
----------	------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

Principal	Lynn Pabst	M.A. Educational Leadership B.A. Elementary Education	5	11	2012-B Rdg Lrng Gains- 61% Mth Lrng Gains-75% Rdg Lowest 25%- 55% Mth Lowest 24%- 67% AMO- Reading White: 65% Black: 61% Hispanic: 51% ELL: 33% SWD: 18% FRL: 51% AMO-Math White: 58% Black: 46% Hispanic: 48% ELL: 31% SWD: 26% FRL: 42% 2011 - C AYP - No Rdg Lrng Gains - 61% Mth Lrng Gains - 60% Rdg Lowest 25% - 46% Mth Lowest 25% - 56% 2010 - B AYP - No Rdg Lrng Gains - 62% Mth Lrng Gains - 60% Rdg Lowest 25% - 51% Mth Lowest 25% - 69% 2009 - B AYP - No Rdg Lrng Gains - 67% Mth Lrng Gains - 55% Rdg Lowest 25% - 50% Mth Lowest 25% - 60% 2008 - B AYP - No Rdg Lrng Gains - 70% Mth Lrng Gains - 59% Rdg Lowest 25% - 63% Mth Lowest 25% - 60%
Assist Principal	Clara Craig	M.A. Educational Leadership B.S. Elementary Education National Board Certified- Middle Childhood Generalist	2	2	2012-B Rdg Lrng Gains- 61% Mth Lrng Gains-75% Rdg Lowest 25%- 55% Mth Lowest 24%- 67% AMO- Reading White: 65% Black: 61% Hispanic: 51% ELL: 33% SWD: 18% FRL: 51% AMO-Math White: 58% Black: 46% Hispanic: 48% ELL: 31% SWD: 26% FRL: 42% 2011 - C AYP - No Rdg Lrng Gains - 61% Mth Lrng Gains - 60% Rdg Lowest 25% - 46% Mth Lowest 25% - 56%

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

--	--	--	--	--	--

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

Instructional Coaches

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Ellen Martin	M.A. Reading, B.A. Elementary Ed., National Board Certified-Early Childhood	4	2	2012-B Rdg Lrng Gains- 61% Mth Lrng Gains-75% Rdg Lowest 25%- 55% Mth Lowest 24%- 67% AMO- Reading White: 65% Black: 61% Hispanic: 51% ELL: 33% SWD: 18% FRL: 51% AMO-Math White: 58% Black: 46% Hispanic: 48% ELL: 31% SWD: 26% FRL: 42% 2011 - C AYP - No Rdg Lrng Gains - 61% Mth Lrng Gains - 60% Rdg Lowest 25% - 46% Mth Lowest 25% - 56% 2010 - B AYP - No Rdg Lrng Gains - 62% Mth Lrng Gains - 60% Rdg Lowest 25% - 51% Mth Lowest 25% - 69% 2009 - B AYP - No Rdg Lrng Gains - 67% Mth Lrng Gains - 55% Rdg Lowest 25% - 50% Mth Lowest 25% - 60% 2008 - B AYP- No Rdg Lrng Gains - 70% Mth Lrng Gains - 59% Rdg Lowest 25% - 63% Mth Lowest 25% - 60%

Highly Effective Teachers

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. District guidelines will be followed to recruit and retain highly qualified teachers.	Principal/ Asst. Principal	On-going
2.		
3.		
4.		

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

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who are NOT highly effective.

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
N/A	N/A

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
43	6.9% (3)	55.8% (24)	32.6 % (14)	4.7% (2)	13.9% (6)	100% (43)	9.3% (4)	4.7% (2)	58.1% (25)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Katie Kruza	Melissa Moline	Beginning Teacher	Monthly meetings to review specific needs.
Colleen Wilkinson	Ayleen Gallahue	New to Pasco Teacher	Monthly meetings to review specific needs.

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

Sarah Bordner	Amber Shepard	New to Pasco Teacher	Monthly meetings to review specific needs.
Peggy Jasper	Caleb Gates	Beginning Teacher	Monthly meetings to review specific needs.
Jessi Leidy	Megan Smith	Beginning Teacher	Monthly meetings to review specific needs.

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

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

Title I, Part A
Title I, Part C- Migrant
Title I, Part D
Title II
Title III
Title X- Homeless
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Violence Prevention Programs
Nutrition Programs
Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training

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

Other

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

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
<p>Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach, School Psychologist, Social Worker, School Nurse, 5 Basic Ed – Teachers, 1 – Special Area Teacher, 2 – ESE Teachers</p>
<p>Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts? The New River RtI Leadership team meets monthly to review school data in regards to instruction/interventions that are effective for students. Tier 1 Problem Solving occurs with the Leadership Team at least once monthly, Tier 2 & 3 – Problem Solving occurs on a weekly to bi-weekly basis to develop, implement, and monitor intervention plans for students.</p>
<p>Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? The RtI Leadership team met at the end of the previous school year and throughout the summer to review the survey data and make recommendations for the school improvement plan through analysis of current barriers. The SIP is reviewed quarterly by the RtI Leadership team and monitored through other formative academic data.</p>
MTSS Implementation
<p>Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior. Reports generated from Pasco STAR, Tier 2 BEP data, PMRN, and CORE K-12 will be used. In addition pre and post-test data will be utilized throughout the year.</p>
<p>Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. New staff will receive training from the RtI coach assigned to our school. The RtI Leadership team received RtI facilitator training to build problem-solving capacity in school teams.</p>
<p>Describe the plan to support MTSS. Support will be provided through monthly Swamp Support meetings, scheduled TBIT/SBIT/RtI meetings each week, and quarterly student data reviews.</p>

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
<p>Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Literacy Coach, Principal, Assistant Principal, 7 basic education teachers, 1 ESE teacher</p>
<p>Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The Lead Literacy Team will meet monthly to review best practices and implementation data. The Reading Supervisor will be collaborating with the team by utilizing literacy scan data, obtained by a district team.</p>
<p>What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? After looking at effective research, NRES LLT will begin the roll out of Common Core Standards in English Language Arts with all instructional staff. Explicit teaching of text complexity reading strategies will be the major focus used for professional development activities, as well as walkthrough data observations.</p>

Public School Choice

- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**

Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the “Upload” page.

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

****Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition***

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

****Grades 6-12 Only*** Sec. 1003.413 (2)(b) F.S

For schools with grades 6-12, how does the school ensure that every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student?

****High Schools Only***

Note: Required for High School-Sec. 1003.413(2)(g), (2)(j) F.S.

How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future?

How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful?

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#).

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.	1A.1. Instructional staff needs to understand levels of text demands and utilize text dependent questions.	1A.1. Weekly common grade-level meetings to collaborate and develop text-dependent questions and evaluate text complexities.	1A.1. Administration, Literacy Coach, and grade-level teams	1A.1. 1) Review FAIR and weekly curriculum assessments 2) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly.	1A.1. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments Dialogue from grade-level meetings FCAT		
Reading Goal #1A: By June 2013, the number of students achieving FCAT proficiency will increase from 62% to 70%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

	62% (151)	70%					
		1A.2. Teacher's ability to set learning goals with individual students.	1A.2. Implementation of learning goals set and monitored by students and teachers for short term and long term learning goals in reading.	1A.2. Instructional staff, Literacy Coach, Administration, Students	1A.2. 1) Review student goal folders with students 2) Reflect and debrief on implementation of student learning goals with grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	1A.2. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT Learning goal folders/student graphs	
		1A.3. Teacher's awareness and ability to challenge diverse learners with text-dependent questions and evaluate text complexities.	1A.3. Implementation of text-dependent questioning.	1A.3. Administration, Literacy Coach, and grade-level teams	1A.3. 1) Review FAIR and weekly curriculum assessments 2) Reflect on implementation of text-dependent questioning 3) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	1A.3. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Reading Goal #1B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.	2A.1. Instructional staff needs to understand levels of text demands and utilize text dependent questions.	2A.1. Continue professional development in differentiated instruction to instructional staff.	2A.1. Administration, Literacy Coach, and grade-level teams	2A.1. 1) Review FAIR and weekly curriculum assessments 2) Reflect on implementation of text-dependent questioning 3) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	2A.1. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT		
Reading Goal #2A: By June 2013, the number of students achieving above proficiency will increase from 32.8% to 40%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	32.8% (87)	40%					
		2A.2. Teacher's awareness and ability to challenge diverse learners with text-dependent questions and evaluate text complexities.	2A.2. Implementation of text-dependent questioning.	2A.2. Administration, Literacy Coach, and grade-level teams	2A.2. 1) Review FAIR and weekly curriculum assessments 2) Reflect on implementation of text-dependent questioning 3) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	2A.2. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT	

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

		2A.3. Teacher's ability to set learning goals with individual students.	2A.3. Implementation of learning goals set and monitored by students and teachers for short term and long term learning goals in reading.	2A.3. Instructional staff, Literacy Coach, Administration, Students	2A.3. 1) Review student goal folders with students 2) Reflect and debrief on implementation of student learning goals with grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	2A.3. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT Learning goal folders/student graphs	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Reading Goal #2B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance.*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance.*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	3A.1. Instructional staff needs to understand levels of text demands and utilize text dependent questions.	3A.1. Continue professional development in differentiated instruction to instructional staff.	3A.1. Instructional staff, Literacy Coach, Classroom teachers	3A.1. 1) Review FAIR and weekly curriculum assessments 2) Reflect on implementation of text-dependent questioning 3) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	3A.1. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT		
<u>Reading Goal #3A:</u> By June 2013, the percentage of students making learning gains in Reading will increase from 61% to 66%, as evidenced on the FCAT.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>						
	61% (82)	66%					
		3A.2. Teacher's awareness and ability to challenge all learners with text-dependent questions and evaluate text complexities.	3A.2. Implementation of text-dependent questioning.	3A.2. Instructional staff, Literacy Coach, Classroom teachers	3A.2. 1) Review FAIR and weekly curriculum assessments 2) Reflect on implementation of text-dependent questioning 3) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	3A.2. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT	

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

		3A.3. Teacher's ability to set learning goals with individual students.	3A.3. Implementation of learning goals set and monitored by students and teachers for short term and long term learning goals in reading.	3A.3. Instructional staff, Literacy Coach, Administration, Students	3A.3. 1) Review student goal folders with students 2) Reflect and debrief on implementation of student learning goals with grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	3A.3. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT CELLA Learning goal folders/student graphs	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
<u>Reading Goal #3B:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4A.1. Instructional staff needs to understand levels of text demands and utilize text dependent questions.	4A.1. Continue professional development in differentiated instruction to instructional staff.	4A.1. Instructional staff, Literacy Coach, Classroom teachers	4A.1. 1) Review FAIR and weekly curriculum assessments 2) Reflect on implementation of text-dependent questioning 3) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	4A.1. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT		
<u>Reading Goal #4A:</u> By June 2013, the percentage of students making learning gains in the lowest quartile will increase from 55% to 60%, as evidenced on the FCAT.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	55% (41)	60%					
		4A.2. Teacher's awareness and ability to challenge all learners with text-dependent questions and evaluate text complexities.	4A.2. Implementation of text-dependent questioning.	4A.2. Instructional staff, Literacy Coach, Classroom teachers	4A.2. 1) Review FAIR and weekly curriculum assessments 2) Reflect on implementation of text-dependent questioning 3) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	4A.2. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT	

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

		4A.3. Teacher's ability to set learning goals with individual students.	4A.3. Implementation of learning goals set and monitored by students and teachers for short term and long term learning goals in reading.	4A.3. Instructional staff, Literacy Coach, Administration, Students	4A.3. 1) Review student goal folders with students 2) Reflect and debrief on implementation of student learning goals with grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	4A.3. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT Learning goal folders/student graphs	
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.		
<u>Reading Goal #4B:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	
		4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011	White: 65% Black: 61% Hispanic: 51% ELL: 33% SWD: 18% FRL: 51%	White: 68% Black: 64% Hispanic: 56% ELL: 39% SWD: 26% FRL: 56%	White: 72% Black: 68% Hispanic: 60% ELL: 45% SWD: 33% FRL: 60%	White: 75% Black: 71% Hispanic: 65% ELL: 51% SWD: 41% FRL: 65%	White: 78% Black: 75% Hispanic: 69% ELL: 57% SWD: 48% FRL: 69%	White: 81% Black: 79% Hispanic: 74% ELL: 64% SWD: 56% FRL: 74%
<u>Reading Goal #5A:</u> By June 2013, the proficiency of the targeted subgroup(s) will reduce their achievement gap by 50% as evidenced on the FCAT.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5B.1. Instructional staff needs to understand levels of text demands and utilize text dependent questions	5B.1. Continue professional development in differentiated instruction to instructional staff	5B.1. Instructional staff, Literacy Coach, Classroom Teachers	5B.1. 1) Review FAIR and weekly curriculum assessments 2) Reflect on implementation of text-dependent questioning 3) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	5B.1. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT		

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

Reading Goal #5B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<p>All student subgroups will decrease the achievement gap by 10% from 2012 to 2013.</p>							
	<p>White: 65% Black: 61% Hispanic: 51% ELL: 33% SWD: 18% FRL: 51%</p>	<p>White: 68% Black: 64% Hispanic: 56% ELL: 39% SWD: 26% FRL: 56%</p>					
		<p>5B.2. Teacher's awareness and ability to challenge targeted subgroups with text-dependent questions and evaluate text complexities.</p>	<p>5B.2. Implementation of text-dependent questioning</p>	<p>5B.2. Instructional staff, Literacy Coach, Classroom Teachers</p>	<p>5B.2. 1) Review FAIR and weekly curriculum assessments 2) Reflect on implementation of text-dependent questioning 3) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly</p>	<p>5B.2. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT</p>	
		<p>5B.3. Teacher's ability to set learning goals with individual students.</p>	<p>5B.3. Implementation of learning goals set and monitored by students and teachers for short term and long term learning goals in reading.</p>	<p>5B.3. Instructional staff, Literacy Coach, Administration, Students</p>	<p>5B.3. 1) Review student goal folders with students 2) Reflect and debrief on implementation of student learning goals with grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly</p>	<p>5B.3. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT Learning goal folders/student graphs</p>	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5C.1. Instructional staff needs to understand levels of text demands and utilize text dependent questions	5C.1. Continue professional development in differentiated instruction to instructional staff	5C.1. Instructional staff, Literacy Coach, Classroom Teachers	5C.1. 1) Review FAIR and weekly curriculum assessments 2) Reflect on implementation of text-dependent questioning 3) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	5C.1. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT CELLA		
Reading Goal #5C: By June 2013, the percentage of English Language Learner (ELL) students making satisfactory progress in reading will increase from 80% to 90%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>80% (8)</i>	<i>90%</i>					
		5C.2. Teacher's awareness and ability to challenge targeted subgroups with text-dependent questions and evaluate text complexities.	5C.2. Implementation of text-dependent questioning	5C.2. Instructional staff, Literacy Coach, Classroom Teachers	5C.2. 1) Review FAIR and weekly curriculum assessments 2) Reflect on implementation of text-dependent questioning 3) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	5C.2. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT CELLA	

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

		5C.3. Teacher's ability to set learning goals with individual students.	5C.3. Implementation of learning goals set and monitored by students and teachers for short term and long term learning goals in reading.	5C.3. Instructional staff, Literacy Coach, Administration, Students	5C.3. 1) Review student goal folders with students 2) Reflect and debrief on implementation of student learning goals with grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	5C.3. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT CELLA Learning goal folders/student graphs	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5D.1. Instructional staff needs to understand levels of text demands and utilize text dependent questions	5D.1. Continue professional development in differentiated instruction to instructional staff	5D.1. Instructional staff, Literacy Coach, Classroom Teachers	5D.1. 1) Review FAIR and weekly curriculum assessments 2) Reflect on implementation of text-dependent questioning 3) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	5D.1. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT		
Reading Goal #5D: By June 2013, the percentage of Students with Disabilities (SWD) making satisfactory progress in reading will increase from 30% to 35%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	30% (13)	35%					

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

		5D.2. Teacher's awareness and ability to challenge targeted subgroups with text-dependent questions and evaluate text complexities.	5D.2. Implementation of text-dependent questioning	5D.2. Instructional staff, Literacy Coach, Classroom Teachers	5D.2. 1) Review FAIR and weekly curriculum assessments 2) Reflect on implementation of text-dependent questioning 3) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	5D.2. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT	
		5D.3. Teacher's ability to set learning goals with individual students.	5D.3. Implementation of learning goals set and monitored by students and teachers for short term and long term learning goals in reading.	5D.3. Instructional staff, Literacy Coach, Administration, Students	5D.3. 1) Review student goal folders with students 2) Reflect and debrief on implementation of student learning goals with grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	5D.3. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT Learning goal folders/student graphs	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5E.1. Instructional staff needs to understand levels of text demands and utilize text dependent questions	5E.1. Continue professional development in differentiated instruction to instructional staff	5E.1. Instructional staff, Literacy Coach, Classroom Teachers	5E.1. 1) Review FAIR and weekly curriculum assessments 2) Reflect on implementation of text-dependent questioning 3) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	5E.1. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT		
Reading Goal #5E: By June 2013, the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students making satisfactory progress in reading will increase from 53% to 60%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	53% (79)	60%					
		5E.2. Teacher's awareness and ability to challenge targeted subgroups with text-dependent questions and evaluate text complexities.	5E.2. Implementation of text-dependent questioning	5E.2. Instructional staff, Literacy Coach, Classroom Teachers	5E.2. 1) Review FAIR and weekly curriculum assessments 2) Reflect on implementation of text-dependent questioning 3) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	5E.2. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT	

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

		5E.3. Teacher's ability to set learning goals with individual students.	5E.3. Implementation of learning goals set and monitored by students and teachers for short term and long term learning goals in reading.	5E.3. Instructional staff, Literacy Coach, Administration, Students	5E.3. 1) Review Student goal folders with students 2) Reflect and debrief on implementation of student learning goals with grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	5E.3. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT Learning goal folders/student graphs	
--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core Standards, DI	K-5	Admin/Lit Coach	All Instructional Staff	Taught explicitly throughout PD activities	Common weekly grade-level meetings	Administration
PLC-Common Grade Mtgs	K-5	Admin/Lit. Coach	All instructional staff	Weekly	Common weekly grade-level meetings	Administration

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

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/ materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Total: \$0.00			

End of Reading Goals

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

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition					
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.	1.1. Instructional staff needs to understand CCSS for Listening and Speaking.	1.1. Through professional development in CCSS instructional staff will implement best practices for instruction for listening/ speaking.	1.1. Instructional staff, Literacy Coach, Classroom Teachers	1.1. 1) Review FAIR and weekly curriculum assessments 2) Reflect on implementation of listening/ speaking strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	1.1. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT CELLA Observation	
CELLA Goal #1: By June 2013, the percentage of English Language Learner students proficient in listening/speaking will increase from 87% to 95%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					
	87% (26)					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.	2.1. Instructional staff needs to understand levels of text demands and utilize text dependent questions	2.1. Continue professional development in differentiated instruction to instructional staff	2.1. Instructional staff, Literacy Coach, Classroom Teachers	2.1. 1) Review FAIR and weekly curriculum assessments 2) Reflect on implementation of text-dependent questioning 3) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	2.1. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT CELLA	
CELLA Goal #2: By June 2013, the percentage of English Language Learner students proficient in reading will increase from 63% to 70%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:					
	63% (19)					
		2.2. Teacher's awareness and ability to challenge targeted subgroups with text-dependent questions and evaluate text complexities.	2.2. Implementation of text-dependent questioning	2.2. Instructional staff, Literacy Coach, Classroom Teachers	2.2. 1) Review FAIR and weekly curriculum assessments 2) Reflect on implementation of text-dependent questioning 3) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	2.2. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT CELLA
		2.3. Teacher's ability to set learning goals with individual students.	2.3. Implementation of learning goals set and monitored by students and teachers for short term and long term learning goals in reading.	2.3. Instructional staff, Literacy Coach, Administration, Students	2.3. 1) Review Student goal folders with students 2) Reflect and debrief on implementation of student learning goals with grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	2.3. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT CELLA Learning goal folders/student graphs

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.	2.1. Following the MMH writing curriculum does not provide adequate practice/instruction and modeling for CCSS.	2.1. Students will use journals across the curriculum to support/defend their thinking. Writer's camp offered in winter for all 4 th grade students. Provide all instructional staff with writer's workshop approach to allow for implementation of strategies.	2.1. Literacy Coach, Assistant Principal	2.1. Collaboration at grade level team meetings to discuss effectiveness of journals.	2.1. FCAT Writes BOY/MOY/EOY Writing Samples Journals CELLA	
CELLA Goal #3: By June 2013, the percentage of English Language Learner students proficient in writing will increase from 50% to 60%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
	<i>50% (15)</i>					
		2.2. Lack of knowledge of CCSS	2.2. Weekly PD with CCSS	2.2. Literacy coach	2.2. Team Meetings	2.2.FCAT Writes CELLA BOY/MOY/EOY Writing Samples Journals
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

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

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Total: \$0.00			

End of CELLA Goals

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.	1A.1. Instructional staff has limited experience with integrating higher order questions to promote higher level thinking and problem solving	1A.1. Instructional staff will implement higher order questioning strategies and mathematical practices of the common core standards.	1A.1. Team Leaders, Grade-level teams, Administration	1A.1. 1) Review Core K12 and pre/post math assessments 2) Reflect on implementation of higher order questioning 3) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	1A.1. Core K12 Pre and Post Math Assessments FCAT		
<u>Mathematics Goal #1A:</u> By June 2013, students will increase math proficiency from 55% to 60% as evidenced on FCAT.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	55% (138)	60 %					

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

		1A.2. Instructional staff's awareness and ability to challenge all learners with complex problem solving.	1A.2. Instructional staff will meet as a grade-level team to develop problems that require higher order problem solving. Each student will use higher order problem solving skills to solve the weekly problem in their math journal.	1A.2. Team Leaders, Grade-level teams	1A.2. 1) Review weekly student work and rubrics 2) Reflect on implementation of complex problem-solving 3) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	1A.2. Rubric for problem solving expectations, Math Journal table of contents page, Core K12 Pre and Post Math Assessments FCAT	
		1A.3. Teacher's ability to set learning goals with individual students.	1A.3. Implementation of learning goals set and monitored by students and teachers for short term and long term learning goals in math.	1A.3. Instructional staff, Literacy Coach, Administration, Students	1A.3. 1) Review student goal folders with students 2) Reflect and debrief on implementation of student learning goals with grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	1A.3. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT Learning goal folders/student graphs	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #1B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.	2A.1. Instructional staff has limited experience with integrating higher order questions to promote higher level thinking and complex problem solving	2A.1. Instructional staff will implement higher order questioning strategies and mathematical practices of the common core standards.	2A.1. Team Leaders, Grade-level teams, Administration	2A.1. 1) Review Core K12 and pre/post math assessments 2) Reflect on implementation of higher order questioning 3) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	2A.1. Core K12 Pre and Post Math Assessments FCAT		
<u>Mathematics Goal #2A:</u> By June 2013, those students achieving above proficiency in mathematics will increase from 23% to 28% as evidenced by the FCAT.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	23% (62)	28%					
		2A.2. Instructional staff's awareness and ability to challenge all learners with complex problem solving.	2A.2. Instructional staff will meet as a grade-level team to develop problems that require higher order problem solving. Each student will use higher order problem solving skills to solve the weekly problem in their math journal.	2A.2. Team Leaders, Grade-level teams	2A.2. 1) Review weekly student work and rubrics 2) Reflect on implementation of complex problem-solving 3) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	2A.2. Rubric for problem solving expectations, Math Journal table of contents page, Core K12 Pre and Post Math Assessments FCAT	

June 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

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

		2A.3. Teacher's ability to set learning goals with individual students.	2A.3. Implementation of learning goals set and monitored by students and teachers for short term and long term learning goals in math.	2A.3. Instructional staff, Literacy Coach, Administration, Students	2A.3. 1) Review student goal folders with students 2) Reflect and debrief on implementation of student learning goals with grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	2A.3. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT Learning goal folders/student graphs	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #2B:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance.*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance.*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3A.1. Instructional staff has limited experience with integrating higher order questions to promote higher-level thinking and complex problem solving.	3A.1. Instructional staff will implement higher order questioning strategies and mathematical practices of the common core standards.	3A.1. Team Leaders, Grade-level teams, Administration	3A.1. 1) Review Core K12 and pre/post math assessments 2) Reflect on implementation of higher order questioning 3) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	3A.1. Core K12 Pre and Post Math Assessments FCAT		
<u>Mathematics Goal #3A:</u> By June 2013, the NRES students making learning gains will increase from 75% to 80% as evidenced by the FCAT.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	75% (200)	80%					
		3A.2. Instructional staff's awareness and ability to challenge all learners with complex problem solving.	3A.2. Instructional staff will meet as a grade-level team to develop problems that require higher order problem solving. Each student will use higher order problem solving skills to solve the weekly problem in their math journal.	3A.2. Team Leaders, Grade-level teams	3A.2. 1) Review weekly student work and rubrics 2) Reflect on implementation of complex problem-solving 3) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	3A.2. Rubric for problem solving expectations, Math Journal table of contents page, Core K12 Pre and Post Math Assessments FCAT	

June 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

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

		3A.3. Teacher's ability to set learning goals with individual students.	3A.3. Implementation of learning goals set and monitored by students and teachers for short term and long term learning goals in math.	3A.3. Instructional staff, Literacy Coach, Administration, Students	3A.3. 1) Review student goal folders with students 2) Reflect and debrief on implementation of student learning goals with grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	3A.3. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT Learning goal folders/student graphs	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #3B:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance.*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance.*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4A.1. Instructional staff has limited experience with integrating higher order questions to promote higher-level thinking and complex problem solving.	4A.1. Instructional staff will implement higher order questioning strategies and mathematical practices of the common core standards.	4A.1. Team Leaders, Grade-level teams, Administration	4A.1. 1) Review Core K12 and pre/post math assessments 2) Reflect on implementation of higher order questioning 3) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	4A.1. Core K12 Pre and Post Math Assessments FCAT		
<u>Mathematics Goal #4A:</u> By June 2013, our lowest 25% students making satisfactory progress in math will increase from 67% to 72% as evidenced by FCAT.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	67% (47)	72%					
		4A.2. Instructional staff's awareness and ability to challenge all learners with complex problem solving.	4A.2. Instructional staff will meet as a grade-level team to develop problems that require higher order problem solving. Each student will use higher order problem solving skills to solve the weekly problem in their math journal.	4A.2. Team Leaders, Grade-level teams	4A.2. 1) Review weekly student work and rubrics 2) Reflect on implementation of complex problem-solving 3) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	4A.2. Rubric for problem solving expectations, Math Journal table of contents page, Core K12 Pre and Post Math Assessments FCAT	

June 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

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

		4A.3. Teacher's ability to set learning goals with individual students.	4A.3. Implementation of learning goals set and monitored by students and teachers for short term and long term learning goals in math.	4A.3. Instructional staff, Literacy Coach, Administration, Students	4A.3. 1) Review Student goal folders with students 2) Reflect and debrief on implementation of student learning goals with grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	5A.3. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT Learning goal folders/student graphs	
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #4B:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	
		4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011	Black: 46% Hispanic: 48% White: 58% ELL: 31% SWD: 26% FRL: 42%	Black: 51% Hispanic: 53% White: 62% ELL: 38% SWD: 33% FRL: 48%	Black: 56% Hispanic: 57% White: 66% ELL: 44% SWD: 39% FRL: 53%	Black: 61% Hispanic: 62% White: 69% ELL: 50% SWD: 46% FRL: 58%	Black: 66% Hispanic: 67% White: 73% ELL: 56% SWD: 53% FRL: 63%	Black: 71% Hispanic: 72% White: 77% ELL: 63% SWD: 60% FRL: 69%
<u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u> By June 2013, the proficiency of the targeted subgroup will reduce their achievement gap by 50% as evidenced on the FCAT.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p>	<p>5A.1. Instructional staff has limited experience with integrating higher order questions to promote higher-level thinking and complex problem solving.</p>	<p>5A.1. Instructional staff will implement higher order questioning strategies and mathematical practices of the common core standards.</p>	<p>5A.1. Team Leaders, Grade-level teams, Administration</p>	<p>5A.1. 1) Review Core K12 and pre/post math assessments 2) Reflect on implementation of higher order questioning 3) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly</p>	<p>5A.1. Core K12 Pre and Post Math Assessments FCAT</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u> All student subgroups will decrease their achievement gap by 10% from 2012 to 2013.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>White: 43.8% (62) Black: 53.7% (25) Hispanic: 52.5% (34)</p>	<p>White: 39% Black: 49% Hispanic: 48%</p>					
		<p>5B.2. Instructional staff's awareness and ability to challenge all learners with complex problem solving.</p>	<p>5B.2. Instructional staff will meet as a grade-level team to develop problems that require higher order problem solving. Each student will use higher order problem solving skills to solve the weekly problem in their math journal.</p>	<p>5B.2. Team Leaders, Grade-level teams</p>	<p>5B.2. 1) Review weekly student work and rubrics 2) Reflect on implementation of complex problem-solving 3) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly</p>	<p>5B.2. Rubric for problem solving expectations, Math Journal table of contents page, Core K12 Pre and Post Math Assessments FCAT</p>	
		<p>5B.3. Teacher's ability to set learning goals with individual students.</p>	<p>5B.3. Implementation of learning goals set and monitored by students and teachers for short term and long term learning goals in math.</p>	<p>5B.3. Instructional staff, Literacy Coach, Administration, Students</p>	<p>5B.3. 1) Review Student goal folders with students 2) Reflect and debrief on implementation of student learning goals with grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly</p>	<p>5B.3. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT Learning goal folders/student graphs</p>	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5C.1. Instructional staff has limited experience with integrating higher order questions to promote higher-level thinking and complex problem solving.	5C.1. Instructional staff will implement higher order questioning strategies and mathematical practices of the common core standards.	5C.1. Team Leaders, Grade-level teams, Administration	5C.1. 1) Review Core K12 and pre/post math assessments 2) Reflect on implementation of higher order questioning 3) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	5C.1. Core K12 Pre and Post Math Assessments FCAT		
<u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u> By June 2013, our English Language Learners students making satisfactory progress in math will increase from 45% to 55% as evidenced by FCAT.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	45% (5)	55%					

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

		5C.2. Instructional staff's awareness and ability to challenge all learners with complex problem solving.	5C.2. Instructional staff will meet as a grade-level team to develop problems that require higher order problem solving. Each student will use higher order problem solving skills to solve the weekly problem in their math journal.	5C.2. Team Leaders, Grade-level teams	5C.2. 1) Review weekly student work and rubrics 2) Reflect on implementation of complex problem-solving 3) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	5C.2. Rubric for problem solving expectations, Math Journal table of contents page, Core K12 Pre and Post Math Assessments FCAT	
		5C.3. Teacher's ability to set learning goals with individual students.	5C.3. Implementation of learning goals set and monitored by students and teachers for short term and long term learning goals in math.	5C.3. Instructional staff, Literacy Coach, Administration, Students	5C.3. 1) Review student goal folders with students 2) Reflect and debrief on implementation of student learning goals with grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	5C.3. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT Learning goal folders/student graphs	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5D.1. Instructional staff has limited experience with integrating higher order questions to promote higher-level thinking and complex problem solving.	5D.1. Instructional staff will implement higher order questioning strategies and mathematical practices of the common core standards.	5D.1. Team Leaders, Grade-level teams, Administration	5D.1. 1) Review Core K12 and pre/post math assessments 2) Reflect on implementation of higher order questioning 3) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	5D.1. Core K12 Pre and Post Math Assessments FCAT		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
By June 2013, our Students with Disabilities making satisfactory progress in math will increase from 30% to 35% as evidenced by FCAT.							
	30% (13)	35%					
		5D.2. Instructional staff's awareness and ability to challenge all learners with complex problem solving.	5D.2. Instructional staff will meet as a grade-level team to develop problems that require higher order problem solving. Each student will use higher order problem solving skills to solve the weekly problem in their math journal.	5D.2. Team Leaders, Grade-level teams	5D.2. 1) Review weekly student work and rubrics 2) Reflect on implementation of complex problem-solving 3) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	5D.2. Rubric for problem solving expectations, Math Journal table of contents page, Core K12 Pre and Post Math Assessments FCAT	
		5D.3. Teacher's ability to set learning goals with individual students.	5D.3. Implementation of learning goals set and monitored by students and teachers for short term and long term learning goals in math.	5D.3. Instructional staff, Literacy Coach, Administration, Students	5D.3. 1) Review Student goal folders with students 2) Reflect and debrief on implementation of student learning goals with grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	5D.3. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT Learning goal folders/student graphs	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5E.1. Instructional staff has limited experience with integrating higher order questions to promote higher-level thinking and complex problem solving.	5E.1. Instructional staff will implement higher order questioning strategies and mathematical practices of the common core standards.	5E.1. Team Leaders, Grade-level teams, Administration	5E.1. 1) Review Core K12 and pre/post math assessments 2) Reflect on implementation of higher order questioning 3) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	5E.1. Core K12 Pre and Post Math Assessments FCAT		
<u>Mathematics Goal #5E:</u> By June 2013, our Economically Disadvantaged students making satisfactory progress in math will increase from 42% to 50% as evidenced by FCAT.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	42% (63)	50%					

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

		5E.2. Instructional staff's awareness and ability to challenge all learners with complex problem solving.	5E.2. Instructional staff will meet as a grade-level team to develop problems that require higher order problem solving. Each student will use higher order problem solving skills to solve the weekly problem in their math journal.	5E.2. Team Leaders, Grade-level teams	5E.2. 1) Review weekly student work and rubrics 2) Reflect on implementation of complex problem-solving 3) Debrief strategy instruction in grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	5E.2. Rubric for problem solving expectations, Math Journal table of contents page, Core K12 Pre and Post Math Assessments FCAT	
		5E.3. Teacher's ability to set learning goals with individual students.	5E.3. Implementation of learning goals set and monitored by students and teachers for short term and long term learning goals in math.	5E.3. Instructional staff, Literacy Coach, Administration, Students	5E.3. 1) Review Student goal folders with students 2) Reflect and debrief on implementation of student learning goals with grade-level teams to assess effectiveness and adjust accordingly	5E.3. FAIR Curriculum-based Assessments FCAT CELLA Learning goal folders/student graphs	

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Mathematics Professional Development

<p>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.</p>						
<p>PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus</p>	<p>Grade Level/ Subject</p>	<p>PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader</p>	<p>PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)</p>	<p>Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)</p>	<p>Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>
<p>PLC-Common Grade Mtgs</p>	<p>K-5</p>	<p>Admin/Lit. Coach</p>	<p>All instructional staff</p>	<p>Weekly</p>	<p>Common weekly grade-level meetings</p>	<p>Administration</p>

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

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
		n/c	\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Total: \$0.00			

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.	1A.1. Students are not exposed to practice with answering higher order questions.	1A.1. Teachers will collaborate during grade-level planning to select complex science text and develop higher order questioning.	1A.1. Administration, Grade Level Facilitator	1A.1. Observations, student work and participation, science lab questioning	1A.1. FCAT Core K12 Assessments Walkthroughs		
Science Goal #1A: By June 2013, students achieving FCAT proficiency will increase from 42% to 50%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	42% (36)	50%.					

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

		1A.2. Adequate time to focus in subject area of science.	1A.2. Incorporate complex text and science-focused text into reading and other subject areas.	1A.2. Administrators, Teachers	1A.2. Grade-level planning classroom assessments	1A.2.FCAT Core K12 Assessments	
		1A.3. Students are not engaged in science experiments that promote complex problem solving.	1A.3. Differentiate science experiments for each grade level that promote complex problem solving with AIMS curriculum.	1A.3. Administration	1A.3. Meet as a grade level team to plan and debrief the effectiveness of the strategy.	1A.3. Science Lab sign-up sheet Interactive Student Notebooks FCAT Core K12 Assessments Walkthroughs	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Science Goal #1B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.	2A.1. Students have not had enough practice analyzing and processing scientific data and knowledge.	2A.1. The use of interactive science notebooks. Students will reflect and write to explain their thinking.	2A.1. Administration, Grade-level Facilitators	2A.1. Notebook rubrics, curriculum assessments, Core K12, Formative Assessments	2A.1. FCAT Core K12 Assessments Classroom Assessments		
Science Goal #2A: By June 2013, students achieving above proficiency in FCAT Science will increase from 10% to 20%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	10% (8)	20%					
		2A.2. Staff does not have knowledge of implementing interactive notebooks.	2A.2. Presentation and examples presented during planning week.	2A.2. Administration, Grade-level Facilitators	2A.2. Notebook rubrics, curriculum assessments, Core K12, Formative Assessments	2A.2. FCAT Core K12 Assessments Classroom Assessments	
		2A.3. Students are not engaged in science experiments that promote complex problem solving.	2A.3. Differentiate science experiments for each grade level that promote complex problem solving with AIMS curriculum.	2A.3. Administration, Team Leaders	2A.3. Meet as a grade level team to plan and debrief the effectiveness of the strategy.	1A.3. Science Lab sign-up sheet Interactive Student Notebooks FCAT Core K12 Assessments Walkthroughs	

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

2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Science Goal #2B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Weekly PD/Common Core	K-5	Pabst/Martin	All instructional staff	Weekly	Lesson study development	Grade-level Facilitators
Interactive Notebook Trng	K-5	Leidy/Kruza	All instructional staff	Fall 2013	Lesson study development	Grade-level Facilitators
AIMS Planning	K-5	Pabst	K-5 teacher leaders	Summer 2012 and school year	Grade-level planning, Science Lab sign up, Science question board	Administrators, Grade-level Facilitators

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Provide AIMS experiments	AIMS curriculum	School Budget (textbooks)	\$250.00
AIMS Science Experiments	Science Lab Materials	Science Consumables	\$ 100.00
Subtotal: \$350.00			
Technology			

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Grade-level Science planning each week.	School-based/AIMS	n/c	\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Total: \$350.00			

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.	1A.1. Following the MMH writing curriculum does not provide adequate practice/ instruction and modeling for CCSS.	1A.1. 1) Students will use journals across the curriculum to support/ defend their thinking. 2) Writer's camp offered in winter for all 4 th grade students. 3) Provide all instructional staff with writer's workshop approach to allow for implementation of strategies.	1A.1. Literacy Coach, Assistant Principal	1A.1. Collaboration at grade level team meetings to discuss effectiveness of journals.	1A.1. FCAT Writes BOY/MOY/EOY Writing Samples Journals		
Writing Goal #1A: By June 2013, students will increase their writing fluency level from 81% to 86% as evidenced by FCAT Writes.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	81% (66)	86%					
		1A.2. Lack of knowledge of CCSS	1A.2. Weekly PD with CCSS	1A.2. Literacy coach	1A.2. Team Meetings	1A.2.FCAT Writes BOY/MOY/EOY Writing Samples Journals	

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

		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Writing Goal #1B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Writer's Camp	4	Craig/Martin	4 th grade level	Winter 2012-13	Student writing samples	Administration
Weekly PD	K-5	Martin	School-wide	2012-2013 school year	Student writing samples	Lit. Coach/ Administration
Use of Response Journals	K-5	Team Facilitators	PLC	Weekly during PLC	Teacher Observations /Student Journals	Admin/ Grade-level PLC Facilitators

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00

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

Subtotal: \$0.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Common Core for Writing	School-based	N/A	\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Total: \$0.00			

End of Writing Goals

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance						
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Attendance	1.1. Lack of parental concern for being absent or tardy to school.	1.1. 1) Use school/team newsletters to encourage being present and on time for school. 2) Work with business partner to provide incentives for on-time behavior and for perfect attendance.	1.1. Administration, Social Worker	1.1. Quarterly reports reviewed at Behavior Support meetings, referrals made to Social Worker	1.1. Attendance Reports		

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

<p>Attendance Goal #1: By June 2013, the attendance rate will increase from 94.7% to 96%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>94.7% (580)</i></p>	<p><i>96%</i></p>					
	<p><u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u></p>					
	<p><i>179</i></p>	<p><i>120</i></p>					
	<p><u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u></p>					
	<p><i>102</i></p>	<p><i>50</i></p>					
		<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	
		<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	

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

Attendance Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Incentives to reduce tardiness and absentee rate.	Rewards	Business Partners	\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00

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

Subtotal: \$0.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Total: \$0.00			

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension						
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Suspension	1.1. Our school Tier 1 and Tier 2 behavior plan does not always meet the needs of our students with the most severe behavior.	1.1. Implement a Tier 3 behavior plan specific to the needs of our students with the most severe behaviors.	1.1. School Psychologist, Behavior Specialist, Administrators, Behavior Support Committee	1.1. Tier 3 Behavior plan data collection tool, monthly Behavior Support committee discussion/review, parent contact/conference notes	1.1. SBIT/TBIT Data collection Tool for Tier 3 Intervention		

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

Suspension Goal #1: By June 2013, the number of out-of-school or in-school suspensions will decrease by 10% or more.	<u>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u>					
	7	0					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>					
	7	0					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>					
	10	9					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>					
	6	5					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Tier 3 Intervention	K-12	School Psych	School-wide	Fall 2012	Swamp Committee Review, SBIT	School Psych, Administration

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Total: \$0.00			

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

1. Dropout Prevention	1.1. Elementary students are not aware of the importance of completing their education in relation to future career goals.	1.1. Through the Great American Teach-In students will learn from guest speakers the importance of completing their education in order to meet their career goals.	1.1. Guidance Counselor, Classroom Teachers	1.1. Guidance Counselor, Administration, Observations	1.1. Dropout Reports		
<u>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</u> During the 2012-13 school year the dropout rate at New River will remain at 0%. <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>	<u>2012 Current Dropout Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*</u>					
	0%	0%					
	<u>2012 Current Graduation Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*</u>					
	0	0					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

Professional Development							
---------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

(PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Great American Teach-In	K-5	Mrs. Thom	School-wide	November 2012	Observations, GATI Sign-In	Guidance—Mrs. Thom

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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Total: \$0.00			

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Upload Option-For schools completing the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) please include a copy for this section.

Online Template- For schools completing the PIP a link will be provided that will direct you to this plan.

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Parent Involvement	I.1. Parents do not respond to paper copies of communications.	I.1. We will expand our communication by establishing and using a Twitter account to communicate to our parents.	I.1. Administration, Technology Specialist, Office staff	I.1. Meet with Technology specialist and School Advisory Council parent members for input and feedback.	I.1. Parent Sign-In Sheets, Parent Satisfaction Survey, SAC parent feedback		
<u>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</u> The percentage of parents who participate in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated, will increase from 50% to 60%	<u>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>					
	50% (300)	60%					

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

		1.2. Parents do not respond to paper copies of communications.	1.2. Set up a mass email for parent communication.	1.2. Administration, Technology Specialist, Office staff	1.2. Meet with Technology specialist and School Advisory Council parent members for input and feedback.	1.2. Parent Sign-In Sheets, Parent Satisfaction Survey, SAC parent feedback	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Parent Involvement Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Twitter Acct. set-up	K-5	S. Loveless	Admin, office staff, teachers	Fall 2012	Parent participation and feedback	Admin, Technology Spec.

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

Parent Involvement Budget

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Total: \$0.00			

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: During the 1012-13 school year, New River Elementary students will have increased opportunities to be engaged in complex problem solving in science, technology, engineering and math.	1.1 Students are not engaged in science experiments that promote complex problem solving.	1.1 Differentiate science experiments for each grade level that promote complex problem solving with AIMS curriculum.	1.1 Administration, Team Leaders	1.1 Meet as a grade level team to plan and debrief the effectiveness of the strategy.	1.1 AIMS Assessments, FCAT, Core K-12
	1.2. Most students work tasks do not call for applying engineering strategies.	1.2. All K-5 students will engage in the Invention Convention Science curriculum promoting the use of engineering strategies.	1.2. Science Representative, Team Leaders	1.2. Grade level Team planning, Invention convention parent night	1.2. Invention convention project scoring rubrics
	1.3. School curriculum does not always allow for use of Technology.	1.3. Adoption of Social Studies curriculum (TCI) requires the use of technology for classroom instruction.	1.3. Administration, Social Studies Rep, Technology Specialist, Team leaders	1.3. Grade-level team planning and review of implementation and assessments.	1.3. TCI assessments, observations

STEM Professional Development

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

June 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

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

or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Invention Convention	K-5	Carlson	All instructional	Quarter 2	Grade level planning	Carlson—Science Rep.
AIMS Planning	K-5	Pabst	All instructional	Summer 2012 and school year	Grade-level planning, Science Lab sign up, Science question board	Administrators, Grade-level Facilitators
TCI Social Studies	K-5	Dupree/Loveless/ Administrators	All Instructional	Fall 2012	Grade level meetings/training	Dupree/Administrators

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

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
TCI Social Studies Adoption	TCI technology and resource materials	District Textbook Budget	\$14,861.00
Subtotal: \$14,861.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
TCI Social Studies Adoption	TCI technology and resource materials	District and/or school-based	\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Total: \$14,861.00			

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
CTE Goal #1: During the 2012-13 school year, New River students will have an increased awareness of how education can prepare them for their future career goals.	1.1. Elementary students are not aware of the importance of completing their education in relation to future career goals.	1.1. Through the Great American Teach-In students will learn from guest speakers the importance of completing their education in order to meet their career goals.	1.1. Guidance Counselor, Classroom Teachers	1.1. Guidance Counselor, Administration, Observations	1.1. Dropout Reports
	1.2. Students have limited experience with the free enterprise system.	1.2. All 5 th grade students will study the JA Biz Town Curriculum and participate in a business at JA Biz Town.	1.2. Administration, 5 th grade Team Leader	1.2. Grade Level team will review Curriculum assessment data and student reflections.	1.2. Curriculum assessments, Reflections, Biz Town participation performance
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

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

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Great American Teach-In	K-5	Thom	School-wide	November 2012	Observations, GATI Sign-In	Guidance—Thom

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

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Total: \$0.00			

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Additional Goal	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Additional Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box.</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

Additional Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

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

Additional Goal(s) Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Total: \$0.00			

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.			
Reading Budget			
			Total: \$0.00
CELLA Budget			
			Total: \$0.00
Mathematics Budget			
			Total: \$0.00
Science Budget			
AIMS Curriculum Materials		School Textbook Fund	
			\$250.00
AIMS Science Materials		Science Consumable Fund	
			\$100.00
			Total: \$350.00
Writing Budget			
			Total: \$0.00
Civics Budget			
			Total: \$0.00
U.S. History Budget			
			Total: \$0.00
Attendance Budget			
			Total: \$0.00
Suspension Budget			
Incentives for RTi Tier 2 BEP		Internal Funds	
			Total: \$500.00
Dropout Prevention Budget			
			Total: \$0.00
Parent Involvement Budget			
			Total: \$0.00
STEM Budget			
TCI Social Studies Adoption Materials		District Textbook Budget	
			Total: \$14,861.00
CTE Budget			
			Total: \$15,711.00

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

Additional Goals
Grand Total: \$15,711.00

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

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent

- Upload a copy of the Differentiated Accountability Checklist in the designated upload link on the *Upload* page

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

- Yes No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.
Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
During the 2012-13 school year the School Advisory Council will meet monthly to review school data. This data will be comprised of standardized assessments, local assessments, parent surveys, and informal data sources. Based on these data sources the SAC will recommend future goals or request further information to be given about related topics. The SAC will review the SIP goals two times during the year in order to monitor their implementation.

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

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Technology Support for Students (if available)	\$0.00