FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Citrus Elementary School	District Name: Orange County
Principal: Delaine Bender	Superintendent: Barbara Jenkins
SAC Chair: Jackie Dawson	Date of School Board Approval: 1/29/13

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

Ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress.

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Delaine Bender	B.S. Elementary Education, M.E. Educational Leadership	3	5	2011-2012: Principal Citrus Elementary School, School Grade - B; 62% met high standards in reading, 60% met high standards in math, 73% met high standards in writing, 54% met high standards in science, 66% made learning gains in reading, 62% made learning gains in math, 63% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 51% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math 2010-2011: Principal Citrus Elementary School, School Grade - B; 73% met high standards in reading, 79% met high standards in math, 82% met high standards in writing, 41% met high standards in science, 63% made learning gains in reading, 56% made learning gains in math, 69% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 56% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math;AYP-No-74% 2009-2010: Principal Citrus Elementary School, School Grade - A; 78% met high standards in reading, 83% met high standards in math, 85% met high standards in writing, 46% met high standards in science, 71% made learning gains in reading, 70% made learning gains in math, 59% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 73% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-No-97% 2008-2009: Assistant Principal Citrus Elementary School, School Grade - A; 79% met high standards in reading,74% met high standards in math, 86% met high standards in writing, 44% met high standards in science, 75% made learning gains in reading, 59% made learning gains in math, 74% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 64% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-No-92% 2007-2008: Assistant Principal Lake Whitney Elementary School, School Grade - A; 90% met high standards in reading, 86% met high standards in math, 79% met high standards in writing, 65% met high standards in science, 66% made learning gains in reading, 62% made learning gains in math, 58% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 58% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-No-97% 2006-2007: Assistant Principal Lake Whitney Elementary School, School Grade - A; 92% met high standards in reading, 91% met high standards in math, 87% met high standards in writing, 72% met high standards in science, 86% made learning gains in reading, 77% made learning gains in math, 94% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 66% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-Yes-100%

| Assistant Principal | Timothy Frank | B.A. Elementary Education, M.S. Educational Leadership | 0 | 6 | 2011-2012: Assistant Principal Whispering Oak Elementary School, School Grade - A; 72% met high standards in reading, 72% met high standards in math, 84% met high standards in writing, 74% met high standards in science, 72% made learning gains in reading, 69% made learning gains in math, 71% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 56% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math

Ocean Palms Elementary, St. Johns County 2010-2011 School Grade - A; 94% of students reading at or above grade level, 72% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading, 68% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading, All subgroups met the criteria for NCLB. 93% of students at or above grade level in math, 58% of students making a year's worth of progress in math, 56% of struggling students making a years' worth of progress in math. All subgroups met the criteria for NCLB.

Julington Creek Elementary, St. Johns County 2008-2010 School Grade - A; 95% of students reading at or above grade level, 75% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading, 81% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading. All subgroups met the criteria for NCLB. 95% of students at or above grade level in math, 63% of students making a year's worth of progress in math, 76% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math. All subgroups met the criteria for NCLB.

Switzerland Point Middle School, St. Johns County 2007-2008 A; 85% of students reading at or above grade level, 63% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading, 58% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading. Students with Disabilities in this school need improvement in Reading. 86% of students at or above grade level in math, 77% of students making a year's worth of progress in math, 69% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math. Students with Disabilities in this school need improvement in Math.

Mill Creek Elementary, St. Johns County 2006- 2007 A; 86% of students reading at or above grade level, 72% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading, 54% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading. Students with Disabilities in this school need improvement in Reading. 81% of students at or above grade level in math, 55% of students making a year's worth of progress in math, 48% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math. Students with Disabilities in this school need improvement in Math. |

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

<u>Instructional Coaches</u>

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)
Math, Reading, Science	Ellen Smith	Bachelor of Science Elementary Education	3	3	2011-2012: Curriculum Resource Teacher School, School Grade - B; 62% met high standards in reading, 60% met high standards in math, 73% met high standards in writing, 54% met high standards in science, 66% made learning gains in reading, 62% made learning gains in math, 63% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 51% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math 2010-2011: Curriculum Resource Teacher Citrus Elementary School, School Grade - B; 73% met high standards in reading, 79% met high standards in math, 82% met high standards in writing, 41% met high standards in science, 63% made learning gains in reading, 56% made learning gains in math, 69% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 56% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-No-74% 2009-2010: Curriculum Resource Teacher Citrus Elementary School, School Grade - A; 78% met high standards in reading, 83% met high standards in math, 85% met high standards in writing, 46% met high standards in science, 71% made learning gains in reading, 70% made learning gains in math, 59% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 73% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-No-97%
Math, Reading, Science	Christy Howell	Bachelor of Science Elementary Education	10	0	2011-2012: Curriculum Resource Teacher School, School Grade - B; 62% met high standards in reading, 60% met high standards in math, 73% met high standards in writing, 54% met high standards in science, 66% made learning gains in reading, 62% made learning gains in math, 63% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 51% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math

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

Highly Effective Teachers

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. 95% of all teachers at Citrus Elementary School are highly qualified. Teachers are hired and recruited based on the OCPS hiring and recruitment process and on the individual needs of our school.	Principal Assistant Principal	On-going
2. Teachers who are new to Citrus Elementary School are paired with a veteran teacher to assist with effective classroom strategies.	Principal Assistant Principal	On-going
3. All Teachers at Citrus Elementary school participate in school-based professional development opportunities which focus on Destination College, PLCs, Response to Intervention, Marzano's High-EffectStrategies and effectively utilizing data to inform instruction.	Leadership Team	On-going

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
5% (2) of the staff and paraprofessionals were rated below highly effective. No teachers are teaching out of field.	To enhance their teaching skills we will provide examples of how to write learning goals and scales, model effective instructional techniques, and provide them with a minimum of 2 formal and 4 informal observations with direct feedback.

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]).

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

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	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
47	4% (2)	49% (23)	38% (18)	9% (4)	28% (13)	98% (46)	4% (2)	0% (0)	96% (45)

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Heidi McClure	Victoria Orem	Ms. McClure has spent 14 years in education with all 14 having been in kindergarten. She has a vast working knowledge of the expectations in kindergarten and will be able to assist Ms. Orem in getting off to a positive start.	The mentor and the mentee will meet on a biweekly basis as a part of the Professional Learning Community model. During these meetings they will discuss best practices, such as utilizing data to inform instruction, effective instructional strategies and SMART goals. The mentee will have multiple opportunities to observe the mentor, as well as the mentor observing the mentee. The purpose of these observations for both the mentor and mentee is coaching, questioning and feedback. Our Reading Coach will also work with the mentee on how to successfully implement small group instruction during the 90 minute reading block using center rotation activities which will meet the needs of the multi-tiered learners in the classroom.
Irene Lowry	Mary Meeks	Mrs. Lowry is an experienced teacher with over 25yrs, of experience. Mrs. Lowry has demonstrated the ability to increase student achievement through effectively implementing the Response to Intervention process and utilizing her student data to inform instruction. These skills will assist Ms. Meeks in meeting the needs of all of her learners.	The mentor and the mentee will meet on a biweekly basis as a part of the Professional Learning Community model. During these meetings they will discuss best practices, such as utilizing data to inform instruction, effective instructional strategies and SMART goals. The mentee will have multiple opportunities to observe the mentor, as well as the mentor observing the mentee. The purpose of these observations for both the mentor and mentee is coaching, questioning and feedback. Our Reading Coach will also work with the mentee on how to successfully implement small group instruction during the 90 minute reading block using center rotation activities which will meet the need of the multi-tiered learners in the classroom.
Debbie Jackson	Nadine Weidman	Ms. Jackson is entering her tenth year as a classroom teacher. She has spent four years teaching second grade. Her classroom management skills will assist Ms. Weidman in creating a safe positive learning environment for her students.	The mentor and the mentee will meet on a biweekly basis as a part of the Professional Learning Community model. During these meetings they will discuss best practices, such as utilizing data to inform instruction, effective instructional strategies and SMART goals. The mentee will have multiple opportunities to observe the mentor, as well as the mentor observing the mentee. The purpose of these observations for both the mentor and mentee is coaching, questioning and feedback. Our Reading Coach will also work with the mentee on how to successfully implement small group instruction during the 90 minute reading block using center rotation activities which will meet

			the need of the multi-tiered learners in the classroom.
Lamarda Brooks	Natalie Montijo	Ms. Brooks has been an effective teacher for thirteen years with three years in third grade. She has demonstrated the ability to differentiate instruction in her classroom. In addition, she is knowledgeable in using strategies to meet the needs of those students who meet or exceed grade level expectations.	The mentor and the mentee will meet on a biweekly basis as a part of the Professional Learning Community model. During these meetings they will discuss best practices, such as utilizing data to inform instruction, effective instructional strategies and SMART goals. The mentee will have multiple opportunities to observe the mentor, as well as the mentor observing the mentee. The purpose of these observations for both the mentor and mentee is coaching, questioning and feedback. Our Reading Coach will also work with the mentee on how to successfully implement small group instruction during the 90 minute reading block using center rotation activities which will meet the need of the multi-tiered learners in the classroom.
Nicole Devlin	Amy Simpson	Ms. Devlin is beginning her fourth year in teaching fourth grade. Her strengths in teaching writing and her ability to work collaboratively with the fourth grade team will benefit Mrs. Simpson in creating strong writers and develop a sense of unity among the fourth grade team.	The mentor and the mentee will meet on a biweekly basis as a part of the Professional Learning Community model. During these meetings they will discuss best practices, such as utilizing data to inform instruction, effective instructional strategies and SMART goals. The mentee will have multiple opportunities to observe the mentor, as well as the mentor observing the mentee. The purpose of these observations for both the mentor and mentee is coaching, questioning and feedback. Our Reading Coach will also work with the mentee on how to successfully implement small group instruction during the 90 minute reading block using center rotation activities which will meet the need of the multi-tiered learners in the classroom.
Ruthie Antmann	Deanna Price	Ms. Antmann has been the music teacher at Citrus Elementary School for five years. Her knowledge of the students, community, and faculty members will allow Ms. Price to identify the teaching styles of the instructional staff and to support art within the classrooms.	The mentor and the mentee will meet on a biweekly basis as a part of the Professional Learning Community model. During these meetings they will discuss best practices, such as utilizing data to inform instruction, effective instructional strategies and SMART goals. The mentee will have multiple opportunities to observe the mentor, as well as the mentor observing the mentee. The purpose of these observations for both the mentor and mentee is coaching, questioning and feedback. Our Reading Coach will also work with the mentee on how to successfully implement small group instruction during the 90 minute reading block using center rotation activities which will meet the need of the multi-tiered learners in the classroom.

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 NA

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

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
Other

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

School-Based MTSS/MTSS Team
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team: Delaine Bender- Principal, Timothy Frank - Assistant Principal, School Psychologist - Kelly Eastman, Staffing Specialist - Jackie Hoffmeyer, Ellen Smith – CRT, Reading Resource - Christine Howell, Amy Combs – Reading Resource Teacher, Wendy Bolduc – ESE Teacher, Shannon Stuckey – Speech Pathologist

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

Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts? The school based MTSS Leadership team meets on a weekly basis to monitor student progress and to identify those students who may need to go through the MTSS process. Those students are identified by utilizing the OCPS Decision Making Form which helps to determine what the problem is, why it is occurring, an instruction/intervention plan and progress monitoring. The MTSS Leadership team works with grade level MTSS representatives to coordinate MTSS efforts through communicating with their grade level teammates on how to identify Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 students, how to effectively deliver an intervention and how to progress monitor students using the MTSS graphing template.
Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the MTSS problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? The school based MTSS leadership team assists in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan by identifying those students in the lowest 25% and subgroups who need intensive monitoring through the MTSS process. The MTSS problem solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP by disaggregating FCAT data to determine school wide objectives and goals for the upcoming school year. Once objectives and goals have been set, the MTSS leadership team consistently refers to the SIP during MTSS meetings to determine if progress is being made toward the established goals.
MTSS Implementation
Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.   The data sources used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, and science are FCAT 2.0 data, Edusoft benchmark assessments, Edusoft mini-assessments, IStation and FAIR data. The data source used to summarize data at each tier for writing is monthly school-wide writing prompts. The data sources used to summarize data at each tier for behavior is SMS. The data management system used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing and behavior is the information management system (IMS).
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. The data source used to summarize data at each tier for writing is monthly school-wide writing prompts.   The plan to continue to train staff on MTSS is through monthly and bi-weekly staff and team meetings. During the meetings the focus will be on how to identify Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 students, how to use the OCPS Decision making plan to determine intervention implementation and how to monitor student progress using the MTSS graphing template.
Describe the plan to support MTSS.   The leadership team with work with all faculty members and provide training to support their implementation of MTSS. We will analyze data and discuss student needs at our weekly MTSS meeting to ensure we decrease the disproportionate classification in Special Education.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

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

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Delaine Bender – Principal, Timothy Frank - Assistant Principal, Christine Howell – Instructional Resource Teacher, Ellen Smith - Curriculum Resource Teacher, Jackie Hoffmeyer – Staffing Specialist/CCT, Amy Combs-Reading Resource Teacher
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The school-based LLT will meet on a bi-weekly basis to disaggregate student data and to develop a plan of action to address the needs of the Lowest 25% and Tier 3 students who are not meeting mastery on in class, school and/or district assessments.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? The major initiative of the LLT this year for students in grades K-1 is to decrease the number of students who are reading below grade level according to Houghton Mifflin and FAIR data. This will be done by the following: *Include a 30 minute reading intervention block within the master schedule. *Continue to provide a Reading Intervention teacher for those struggling readers above the 120 minutes in the classroom. *Ability group students by reading level for reading intervention block. *Utilize I-Station which is a computer based reading intervention program which is based upon the student's individual reading level. *Reading Intervention teacher will utilize specific intervention programs as follows: K-1: Early Reading Tutor and Phonemic Awareness. 2-5: Kaleidoscope *Continue the use of the FAIR progress monitoring tool kit. *The LLT will meet regularly to review data and student progress. The major initiative of the LLT this year for students in grades 2-5 will be to decrease the number of students who are below grade level in reading by at least 10%. This will be done by the following: *Include a 30 minute reading intervention block within the master schedule. *Continue to provide a Reading Intervention teacher for those struggling readers above the 120 minutes in the classroom. *Ability group students by reading level for reading instruction. *The LLT will meet with teachers regularly to review student data and move students into groups based on progress.

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.

*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.

NA

*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?

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

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

<div style="border:1px solid black; height:80px;"></div>

*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?

NA

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?

NA

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.

NA

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	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	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
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.			1A.1. The need to increase the use of differentiated instruction to meet the needs of our diverse population.	1A.1. Provide staff development and modeling in differentiated instructional strategies.	1A.1. Curriculum Resource Teachers, Classroom teachers, Administrators	1A.1. Progress Monitoring, Collaboration during PLC meetings, Observations (Classroom Walk-throughs).	1A.1. Benchmark Tests, FAIR,STAR Reading Assessment, DRA, HM Assessments; AR, FCAT.
Reading Goal #1A: By June 2013, 33% (130) of our students in grades 3-5 will score at a level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test 2.0.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 28% (117) students scored at a level 3	Reading Goal #1A: By June 2013, 35% (136) of our students in grades 3-5 will score at a level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test 2.0					
			1A.2. Teachers not fully trained in the MTSS process.	1A.2. Staff development on effectively utilizing MTSS	1A.2. Principal Assistant Principal Leadership Team	1A.2. Weekly MTSS meetings, Bi-Weekly Professional Learning Communities meetings.	1A.2. Teachers effective use of the OCPS MTSS Decision Making Form, MTSS graphing template and progress monitoring through weekly Mini-assessments.
			1A.3. Students not having the prerequisite skills to achieve	1A.3. Identified students needing Tier II students will utilize	1A.3 Principal Assistant Principal	1A.3. Classroom Observations Weekly benchmark mini-	1A.3. Progress Monitoring data, Results of the 2013

		grade level mastery	IStation to enhance their learning. Tier III reading intervention will go to SSMART ZONE (reading intervention class) during their special area time.	Reading Resource Teacher	assessments.	FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.
		1A.4. Teachers not differentiating their instruction and providing enrichment Opportunities.	1A.4. Ability group in grades 3-5.	1A.4. Principal Assistant Principal	1A.4. Weekly benchmark mini-assessments Weekly data meetings	1A.4. Progress monitoring Results of the 2012 FCAT Math 2.0
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: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* / *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* / *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		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. The number of students who are absent and miss the direct instruction that is provided to enhance their learning.	2A.1. Monitor student attendance rates on a bi-weekly basis at the MTSS team meeting.	2A.1. Registrar Assistant Principal	2A.1. Reduction in % of absences.	2A.1. Monthly attendance reports printed from the student management system (SMS)
Reading Goal #2A: By June 2013, 32% (126) of our students in grades 3-5 will score at a level 4 or above on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test 2.0.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 29% (124) students scored at a level 4 or above in FCAT Reading	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 34% (132) students will score at a level 4 or above in FCAT Reading					
			2A.2. Reading Core not aligned with the NGSS	2A.2. Provide teachers additional time to gather resources that align with NGSS and Common Core.	2A.2. Principal Assistant Principal Reading Resource Teacher Curriculum Resource Teacher	2A.2. Weekly benchmark mini-Assessments Bi-Weekly Professional Learning Community meetings.	2A.2. Increase in the percentage of students scoring at a level 4 or above on the 2013 Reading portion of FCAT 2.0.
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: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			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

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. The number of students who are absent and miss the direct instruction that is provided to enhance their learning.	3A.1. Monitor student attendance rates on a bi-weekly basis at the MTSS team meeting.	3A.1. Registrar Assistant Principal	3A.1. Reduction in % of absences.	3A.1. Monthly attendance reports printed from the student management system (SMS)
Reading Goal #3A: In June of 2013, 76% (195) of students in grades 3-5 will make **learning gains 3 on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test 2.0.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 71% (206) students made learning gains in FCAT Reading 2.0	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 76% (195) students will make learning gains in FCAT Reading 2.0					
			3A.2. Teachers not fully trained in the MTSS process.	3A.2. Staff development on effectively utilizing MTSS.	3A.2. Principal Assistant Principal Leadership Team	3A.2. Weekly MTSS meetings, Bi-Weekly Professional Learning Communities meetings.	3A.2. Teachers' effective use of the OCPS MTSS Decision Making Form, MTSS graphing template and progress monitoring through weekly benchmark mini-assessments.
			3A.3. Students not having the prerequisite skills to achieve grade level mastery.	3A.3. Tier II students will utilize IStation to enhance their learning. Tier III reading intervention will go to SSMART ZONE (reading intervention class) during their special area time.	3A.3 Principal Assistant Principal Reading Resource Teacher	3A.3. Classroom Observations Weekly mini-assessments	3A.3. Progress Monitoring data Results of the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
			3A.4. Students not prepared for the higher rigor of the NGSSS Standards.	3A.4. Teachers will use Webb's Depth of Knowledge to focus on asking higher level questions.	3A.4. Principal Assistant Principal Leadership Team	3A.4. Students' ability to solve multi-step problems will increase.	3A.4. Scores on FCAT, Benchmark assessments, mini-benchmarks

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

3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Reading Goal #3B: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4: In June of 2013, 74% (47) of students in low 25% will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test 2.0.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 69% (46) students in low 25% made learning gains	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 74% (47) students in low 25% will make learning gains	4A.1. Difficulty for teachers to adequately monitor the progress of students in our subgroups.	4A.1. Create a flexible data wall identifying all students showing inadequate progress on the different assessments that will allow teachers the ability to manipulate individual students according to progress.	4A.1. Classroom teachers, Resource teachers, Administration	4A.1. FCIM and regularly scheduled data meetings.	4A.1. HM Assessments, FAIR, Benchmark testing, STAR Renaissance Reading
			4A.2. Teachers not fully trained in the MTSS process.	4A.2. Staff development on effectively utilizing MTSS.	4A.2. Principal Assistant Principal Leadership Team	4A.2. Weekly MTSS meetings, Bi-Weekly Professional Learning Communities meetings.	4A.2. Teachers effective use of the OCPS MTSS Decision Making Form, MTSS graphing template and progress monitoring through weekly benchmark mini-assessments.

		4A.3. Students not having the prerequisite skills to achieve grade level mastery.	4A.3. Tier II students will utilize IStation to enhance their learning. Tier III reading intervention will go to SSMART ZONE (reading intervention class) during their special area time.	4A.3 Principal Assistant Principal Reading Resource Teacher	4A.3. Classroom Observations Weekly benchmark mini-assessments	4A.3. Progress Monitoring data Results of the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.

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**	58%	62%	66%	69%	73%	77%
Reading Goal #5A: In July 2012, 62% of all students, 66 % of Asian students, 56% of black students, 56% of Hispanic students, 74% of white students 44% of ELL students, 10% of SWD students and 55% of Econ Dis students scored at the proficiency level on FCAT Reading 2.0. Our goal is by July 2013, 62% of All students, 79% of Asian students, 58% of black students, 57% of Hispanics students, 70% of white students, 52% of ELL students, 10% of SWD students and 55% of Econ Dis students will score at Level 3 or above on the FCAT Reading 2.0.							

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. Students not having the prerequisite skills to achieve grade level mastery.	5B.1. Tier II students will utilize IStation to enhance their learning. Tier III reading intervention will go to SSMART ZONE (reading intervention class) during their special area time.	5B.1. Principal Assistant Principal Reading Resource Teacher	5B.1. Classroom Observations Weekly benchmark mini-assessments	5B.1. Progress Monitoring data, Results of the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.
Reading Goal #5B: By June 2013, all subgroups will expect to make AMO as	2012 Current Level of Performance:* By June 2012, student	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, all subgroups					

follows: White : 70% Black: 58% Hispanic: 57% Asian:79% American Indian: 47%	subgroups not making AMO is as follows: White : 74% Black: 56% Hispanic: 56% Asian:66% American Indian: 64%	will expect to make AMO as follows: White : 70% Black: 58% Hispanic: 57% Asian:79% American Indian: 47% %					
			5B.2. Teachers not knowing how to effectively differentiate instruction.	5B.2. Provide training for teachers on how to effectively differentiate instruction in the classroom	5B.2. Principal Assistant Principal Instructional Support Teacher Curriculum Resource Teacher	5B.2. Classroom Observations Weekly data meetings	5B.2. Increased number of students making learning gains on the 2013 Reading and Math FCAT 2.0.
			5B.3. Not having enough teachers to teach after-school tutoring	5B.3. Provide incentives for teachers who teach after-school tutoring	5B.3. Principal Assistant Principal	5B.3. The number of teachers who sign up to teach after school tutoring.	5B.3. Providing after school tutoring to the maximum amount of students.

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. Reading Goal #5C: By June 2013, 52% of our ELL students will score at the satisfactory level.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* By June 2012, 44% of our ELL students scored at the satisfactory level.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, 52% of our ELL students will score at the satisfactory level.	5C.1. Language barriers that result with students exposed to multiple languages at home.	5C.1. Integrate science and social studies into the language arts curriculum throughout the school year to increase exposure to higher level vocabulary and increase proficiency in reading.	5C.1. Classroom Teachers, Administration	5C.1. Formative and summative assessments and monitoring computer program progress.	5C.1. FCAT, FAIR, Benchmark Assessments.

			5C.2. Teachers not fully trained in the MTSS process.	5C.2. Staff development on effectively utilizing MTSS.	5C.2. Principal Assistant Principal Leadership Team	5C.2. Weekly MTSS meetings, Bi-Weekly Professional Learning Communities meetings	5C.2. Teachers effective use of the OCPS MTSS Decision Making Form, MTSS graphing template and progress monitoring through weekly benchmark mini-assessments.
			5C.3. Students not having the prerequisite skills to achieve grade level mastery	5C.3. Tier II students will utilize IStation to enhance their learning. Tier III reading intervention will go to SSMART ZONE (reading intervention class) during their special area time.	5C.3 Principal Assistant Principal Reading Resource Teacher	5C.3. Classroom Observations Weekly mini-assessments	5C.3. Progress Monitoring data, Results of the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.
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. Reading Goal #5D: By June 2013, 30% of our SWD students will score at the satisfactory level.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* By June 2012, 10% of our SWD students scored at the satisfactory level.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, 30% of our SWD students will score at the satisfactory level.	5D.1. The number of students who are absent and miss the direct instruction that is provided to enhance their learning.	5D.1. Monitor student attendance rates on a bi-weekly basis at the MTSS team meeting.	5D.1. Registrar Assistant Principal	5D.1. Reduction in % of absences	5D.1. Monthly attendance reports printed from the student management system (SMS)
			5D.2. Teachers not fully trained in the MTSS process	5D.2. Staff development on effectively utilizing MTSS	5D.2. Principal Assistant Principal Leadership Team	5D.2. Weekly MTSS meetings, Bi-Weekly Professional Learning Communities meetings	5D.2. Teachers effective use of the OCPS MTSS Decision Making Form, MTSS graphing template and progress monitoring through weekly benchmark

					mini-assessments.
		5D.3. Students not having the prerequisite skills to achieve grade level mastery	5D.3. Tier II students will utilize IStation to enhance their learning. Tier III reading intervention will go to SSMART ZONE (reading intervention class) during their special area time.	5D.3 Principal Assistant Principal Reading Resource Teacher	5D.3. Classroom Observations Weekly benchmark mini-assessments	5D.3. Progress Monitoring data, Results of the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.

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. Reading Goal #5E: By June 2013, 55% of our Econ Dis. students will score at the satisfactory level.	5D.1. The number of students who are absent and miss the direct instruction that is provided to enhance their learning.	5D.1. Monitor student attendance rates on a bi-weekly basis at the MTSS team meeting.	5D.1. Registrar Assistant Principal	5D.1. Reduction in % of absences	5D.1. Monthly attendance reports printed from the student management system (SMS)
2012 Current Level of Performance:* By June 2012, 55% of our Econ Dis. students scored at the satisfactory level. / **2013 Expected Level of Performance:*** By June 2013, 55% of our SWD students will score at the satisfactory level.	5D.1. Students lack material resources needed for classroom.	5D.1. Supply students with backpacks and classroom supplies. Provide each child a planner for organization and parent communications.	5D.1. Resource Teachers, Administration	5D.1. Observation of students in the classroom.	5D.1. Observation Progress reports and report cards.
	5D.3. Students not having the prerequisite skills to achieve grade level mastery	5D.3. Students needing Tier 3 reading intervention will go to SSMART ZONE (reading intervention class) during their special area time.	5D.3 Principal Assistant Principal Reading Resource Teacher	5D.3. Classroom Observations Weekly benchmark mini-assessments	5D.3. Progress Monitoring data, Results of the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.

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
Data Analysis	K-5	Teachers	School-wide	Weekly	Scheduled in advance	Principal, Assistant Principal

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

Differentiated Instruction	K-5	Reading Resource Teacher, Instructional Support Teacher, District Literacy coach	School-wide	TBD	Scheduled in advance	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Resource Teacher
PLC using data to drive instruction	K-5	Grade level team leader	School-wide	1st and 3rd Wednesdays of each month	Member of the leadership team assigned to a grade level attends the meetings	Principal, Assistant Principal

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
Kaleidoscope	Direct, Explicit Instruction Program for Lowest Performers	School Budget	**3,791.97**
FL Ready workbooks for grades 3-5 in reading and for after school tutoring	Florida Ready is a powerful combination of assessment and intensive instruction that is aligned to the NGSSS.	School Budget	**8,591.06**
			Subtotal: 12,383.03
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Renaissance AR	Assess students' reading with four types of quizzes: Reading Practice, Vocabulary Practice, Literacy Skills, and Textbook Quizzes.	School Budget	**4,198.00**
IStation	Comprehensive computer based reading program that assesses and instructs students at their current reading level.	School Budget	**6,500.00**
			Subtotal: 10,698.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Integrating Common Core	Response to Literature Training	School Budget	1,245
Teacher evaluation training	The Art and Science of Teaching	Title 2	1,200
			Subtotal: 2,445
Other			

August 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
Teachers observing other teachers	Substitute	School Budget	900
			Subtotal: 900
			Total: 26,426.03

End of Reading Goals

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. CELLA Goal #1: By June 2013, (55 or more) ELL students will increase proficiency in listening/speaking from 60% (62) students to 66% (55) students.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: 60% (62) students scored proficient in listening/speaking	1.1. The number of students who are absent and miss the direct instruction that is provided to enhance their learning.	1.1. Monitor student attendance rates on a bi-weekly basis at the MTSS team meeting.	1.1. Registrar Assistant Principal	1.1. Reduction in % of absences	1.1. Monthly attendance reports printed from the student management system (SMS)
		2.1. Language barriers that result with students exposed to multiple languages at home.	2.1. Integrate science and social studies into the language arts curriculum throughout the school year to increase exposure to higher level vocabulary and increase proficiency in reading.	2.1. Classroom Teachers, Administration	2.1. Formative and summative assessments and monitoring computer program progress.	2.1. FCAT, FAIR, Benchmark Assessments.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
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. The number of students who	2.1. Monitor student attendance	2.1. Registrar	2.1. Reduction in % of	2.1. Monthly attendance

CELLA Goal #2:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:	are absent and miss the direct instruction that is provided to enhance their learning.	rates on a bi-weekly basis at the MTSS team meeting.	Assistant Principal	absences	reports printed from the student management system (SMS)
By June 2013, ELL students will increase proficiency by 10% from 40% (40) students to 44% (37) students	40% (40) students scored proficient in reading	2.2. Teachers not knowing how to effectively differentiate instruction	2.2. Provide training for teachers on how to effectively differentiate instruction in the classroom	2.2. Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach Curriculum Resource Teacher	2.2. Classroom Observations Weekly data meetings	2.2. Increased number of students making learning gains on the 2012 Reading and Math FCAT 2.0
		2.3. Students not having the prerequisite skills to achieve grade level mastery.	2.3. Identified students needing Tier 3 reading intervention will go to SSMART ZONE (reading intervention class) during their special area time.	2.3 Principal Assistant Principal Reading Resource Teacher	2.3. Classroom Observations Weekly mini-assessments	2.3. Progress Monitoring data Results of the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment

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.		3.1. The number of students who are absent and miss the direct instruction that is provided to enhance their learning.	3.1. Monitor student attendance rates on a bi-weekly basis at the MTSS team meeting.	3.1. Registrar Assistant Principal	3.1. Reduction in % of absences	3.1. Monthly attendance reports printed from the student management system (SMS)
CELLA Goal #3: By June 2013, ELL students will increase proficiency in writing by 10% from 43% (45) students to 47% (47) students	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : 43% (45) students scored proficient in writing					
		3.2. Teachers not knowing how to effectively differentiate instruction	3.2. Provide training for teachers on how to effectively differentiate instruction in the classroom	3.2. Principal Assistant Principal Instructional Support Curriculum Resource Teacher	3.2. Classroom Observations Weekly data meetings	3.2. Increased number of students making learning gains on the 2013 Reading FCAT 2.0
		3.3. Students lacking prior knowledge of correct use of	3.3. Teachers will provide extra practice in using grammar	3.3. Classroom Teacher Principal	3.3. Improved scores on the students' monthly writing	3.3. Monthly school-wide writing prompts,

		grammar.	correctly.	Assistant Principal	assessments	WriteScore assessments for 3rd and 4th grades.

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
Kaleidoscope	Direct, Explicit Instruction Program for Lowest Performers	School Budget	Included above
FL Ready workbooks for grades 3-5 in reading and for after school tutoring	Florida Ready is a powerful combination of assessment and intensive instruction that is aligned to the NGSSS.	School Budget	Included above
			Subtotal:0
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
IStation	Comprehensive computer based reading program that assesses and instructs students at their current reading level.	School Budget	Included above
Renaissance AR	Assess students' reading with four types of quizzes: Reading Practice, Vocabulary Practice, Literacy Skills, and Textbook Quizzes.	School Budget	Included above
			Subtotal:0
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	NA
			Subtotal:0
Other			

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

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. Mathematics Goal #1A: By June 2013, 35% (135) of our students in grades 3-5 will score at a level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Math Test 2.0				1.B.1. Some students are not proficient in basic facts and lack the foundational skills needed to achieve higher level thinking.	1.B.1. Continue with computer-based basic facts proficiency (FASTT Math). Use of manipulatives and mental models.	1.B.1. Classroom Teachers, Resource Teachers and Administration.	1.B.1. Collection of student work and common assessments.	1.B.1. Benchmark Test, 2013 FCAT Math Test 2.0.
	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*						
	28% (116) students scored at a level 3	35% (136) students will score at a level 3						
				1B.2. Teachers not fully trained in the MTSS process.	1B.2. Staff development on effectively utilizing MTSS.	1B.2. Principal Assistant Principal Leadership Team	1B.2. Weekly MTSS meetings, Bi-Weekly Professional Learning Communities meetings	1B.2. Teachers effective use of the OCPS MTSS Decision Making Form, MTSS graphing template and progress monitoring through weekly benchmark mini-assessments.
				1B.3. Not having enough teachers to teach after-school tutoring.	1B.3. Provide incentives for teachers who teach after-school tutoring.	1B.3. Principal Assistant Principal	1B.3. The number of teachers who sign up to teach after school tutoring.	1B.3. Providing after school tutoring to the maximum amount of students.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1B: *NA*				1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*						
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*						
				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 Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1. The number of students who are absent and miss the direct instruction that is provided to enhance their learning.	2A.1. Monitor student attendance rates on a bi-weekly basis at the MTSS team meeting.	2A.1. Registrar Assistant Principal	2A.1. Reduction in % of absences.	2A.1. Monthly attendance reports printed from the student management system (SMS).
Mathematics Goal #1A: By June 2013, 37% (143) of our students in grades 3-5 will score at a level 4 or 5 on the 2013 FCAT Math Test 2.0	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 31% (128) students scored at a level 4 or 5	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 34% (132) students will score at a level 4 or 5	2A.2. Teachers not differentiating their instruction and providing enrichment opportunities.	2A.2. Ability group for the 60 minute Math block in grades 3-5.	2A.2. Principal Assistant Principal	2A.2. Weekly mini-assessments Weekly data meetings	2A.2. Progress monitoring Results of the 2013 FCAT Math 2.0.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Mathematics Goal #2B: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	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. The number of students who are absent and miss the direct instruction that is provided to enhance their	3A.1. Monitor student attendance rates on a bi-weekly basis at the MTSS team meeting.	3A.1. Registrar Assistant Principal	3A.1. Reduction in % of absences.	3A.1. Monthly attendance reports printed from the student management system (SMS).
Mathematics Goal #3A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

			learning.				
By June 2013, 71% (182) of our students in grades 3-5 will show learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math Test 2.0	66% (276) students made a learning gains in math	71% (276) students will make a learning gains in math	3A.2. Teachers not differentiating their instruction and providing remediation and enrichment opportunities	3A.2. Ability group for the 60 minute Math block in grades 3-5.	3A.2. Principal Assistant Principal	3A.2. Weekly mini-assessments Weekly data meetings	3A.2. Progress monitoring Results of the 2013 FCAT Math 2.0.

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
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4: By June 2013, 61% (39) students of our lowest 25% in grades 3-5 will show learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math Test 2.0	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 56% (38) students in the lowest 25% made learning gains	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 61% (39) students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains	4A.1. The number of students who are absent and miss the direct instruction that is provided to enhance their learning.	4A.1. Monitor student attendance rates on a bi-weekly basis at the MTSS team meeting.	4A.1. Registrar Assistant Principal	4A.1. Reduction in % of absences.	4A.1. Monthly attendance reports printed from the student management system (SMS).
			4A.2. Some students are not proficient in basic facts and lack the foundational skills needed to achieve higher level thinking.	4A.2. Continue with computer-based basic facts proficiency (FASTT Math). Use of manipulatives and mental models.	4A.2. Classroom Teachers, Resource Teachers and Administration.	4A.2. Collection of student work and common assessments.	4A.2. Benchmark Test, Results of the 2013FCAT Math Test 2.0.
			4A.3. Not having enough teachers to teach after-school tutoring.	4A.3. Provide incentives for teachers who teach after-school tutoring.	4A.3. Principal Assistant Principal	4A.3. The number of teachers who sign up to teach after school tutoring.	4A.3. Providing after school tutoring to the maximum amount of students.

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

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**	62%	66%	69%	73%	76%	80%
Mathematics Goal #5A: In July 2012, 60% of all students, 72 % of Asian students, 49% of black students, 55% of Hispanic students, 72% of white students, 46% of ELL students, 20% of SWD students and 52% of Econ Dis students scored at the proficiency level on FCAT Math 2.0. Our goal is by July 2013, 66% of All students, 90% of Asian students, 58% of black students, 59% of Hispanics students, 78% of white students, 56% of ELL students, 37% of SWD students and 58% of Econ Dis students will score at Level 3 or above on the FCAT Math 2.0.							

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 mathematics.**		5B.1. The number of students who are absent and miss the direct instruction that is provided to enhance their learning.	5B.1. Monitor student attendance rates on a bi-weekly basis at the MTSS team meeting.	5B.1. Registrar Assistant Principal	5B.1. Reduction in % of absences.	5B.1. Monthly attendance reports printed from the student management system (SMS).	
Mathematics Goal #5B: By June 2013, all subgroups will expect to make AMO as follows: White : 78% Black: 58% Hispanic: 59% Asian:90% American Indian: 58%	**2012 Current Level of Performance:*** By June 2012, student subgroups not making AMO is as follows: White : 72% Black: 49% Hispanic: 55% Asian:72% / **2013 Expected Level of Performance:*** By June 2013, all subgroups will expect to make AMO as follows: White : 78% Black: 58% Hispanic: 59% Asian:90%						

	American Indian: 79%	American Indian: 58%					
			5B.2. Teachers not fully trained in the MTSS process.	5B.2. Staff development on effectively utilizing MTSS.	5B.2. Principal Assistant Principal Leadership Team	5B.2. Weekly MTSS meetings, Bi-Weekly Professional Learning Communities meetings	5B.2. Teachers effective use of the OCPS MTSS Decision Making Form, MTSS graphing template and progress monitoring through weekly Mini-assessments.
			5B.3. Some students are not proficient in basic facts and lack the foundational skills needed to achieve higher level thinking.	5B.3. Continue with computer-based basic facts proficiency (Symphony Math & FAST Math). Use of manipulatives and mental models.	5B.3. Classroom Teachers, Resource Teachers and Administration.	5B.3. Collection of student work and common assessments.	5B.3. Benchmark Test, results of the 2013 FCAT Math Test 2.0.

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. Language barriers that result with students exposed to multiple languages at home.	5C.1. Teach reading strategies to solve word problems in the area of math.	5C.1. Classroom Teachers, Administration	5C.1. Formative and summative assessments and monitoring computer program progress.	5C.1. FCAT, FAIR, Benchmark Assessment s
Mathematics Goal #5C: By June 2013, 56% of our ELL students will score at the satisfactory level.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* By June 2012, 46% of our ELL students scored at the satisfactory level.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, 56% of our ELL students will score at the satisfactory level.	5C.2. Teachers not fully trained in the MTSS process.	5C.2. Staff development on effectively utilizing MTSS.	5C.2. Principal Assistant Principal Leadership Team	5C.2. Weekly MTSS meetings, Bi-Weekly Professional Learning Communities meetings	5C.2. Teachers effective use of the OCPS MTSS Decision Making Form, MTSS graphing template and progress monitoring through weekly Mini-assessments.
			5C.2. Teachers not differentiating their instruction and providing remediation and	5C.2. Ability group for the 60 minute Math block in grades 3-5.	5C.2. Principal Assistant Principal	5C.2. Weekly mini-assessments Weekly data meetings	5C.2. Progress monitoring Results of the 2013 FCAT Math 2.0.

scored at the satisfactory level.	the satisfactory level.					
		5E.2. Teachers not differentiating their instruction and providing remediation and enrichment opportunities	5E.2. Ability group for the 60 minute Math block in grades 3-5.	5E.2. Principal Assistant Principal	5E.2. Weekly mini-assessments Weekly data meetings.	5E.2. Progress monitoring Results of the 2012 FCAT Math 2.0.
		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School 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.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
Mathematics Goal #1A: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.

Mathematics Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
NA	*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	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.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.
Mathematics Goal #2A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
NA	*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Mathematics Goal #2B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
NA	*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					

		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	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.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.
Mathematics Goal #3A: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Mathematics Goal #3B: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			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

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
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.
Mathematics Goal #4: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.

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**						
Mathematics Goal #5A: *NA*							

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 mathematics.			5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.
Mathematics Goal #5B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

NA	*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	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.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
Mathematics Goal #5C: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	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.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
Mathematics Goal #5D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

NA	*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	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.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.
Mathematics Goal #5E: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

High School 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
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Mathematics Goal #1: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Mathematics Goal #2: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.
Mathematics Goal #3: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

Algebra 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Algebra I EOC)*

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

Algebra 1 EOC 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
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #1: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.

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

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

		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Algebra Goal #2: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* — *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* / *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**						
Algebra 1 Goal #3A: NA							
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	

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.**			3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3B: *NA.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3C: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.
			3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3D.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3D: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3E: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Geometry EOC)*

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

Geometry EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:					
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Geometry Goal #1: *NA* — 2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* — 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Geometry Goal #2: *NA* — 2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* — 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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		2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2011-2012**					
Geometry Goal #3A: *NA*						

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
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.**		3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Geometry Goal #3B: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

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
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.
Geometry Goal #3C: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.
			3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.
Geometry Goal #3D: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.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 subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.
			3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics 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	K - 2	Instructional Coaches	All teachers in grades K-2	Ongoing	PLC Meetings monthly	Principal Assistant Principal
Differentiated Instruction	K-5	Instructional Support Teacher Curriculum Resource Teacher	School-wide	Ongoing	PLC Meetings monthly	Principal Assistant Principal

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
Envision Math Interactive Homework workbook.	Supplemental resource used for practice and to reinforce concepts taught in the classroom.	School Budget	815.76
FL Ready workbooks for grades 3-5 in math and for after school tutoring	Florida Ready is a powerful combination of assessment and intensive instruction that is aligned to the NGSSS.	School Budget	3,772.60
			Subtotal: 4,588.36
Envision Math Interactive Homework workbook.			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
FAST Math	Computer program to enhance fluency of basic facts.	School Budget	Previous purchase
			Subtotal: 0
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: 4,588.36

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. Need for a hands-on approach to experiencing science	1A.1. The school will continue using the Science Boot camp program.	1A.1. Principal Assistant Principal	1A.1. Improvement in the progress monitoring through benchmark tests, mini-assessments.	1A.1. Progress monitoring through benchmark tests, mini-assessments and results of 2013 FCAT Science Test 2.0.
Science Goal #1A: By June 2013, 53% (71) of our students in 5th grade will score at a level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Science Test 2.0	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 48% (85) students scored at a level 3	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 53% (71) students will score at a level 3					
			1A.2. Implementation of the new science curriculum.	1A.2. Teachers will attend trainings on the new series.	1A.2. Principal Assistant Principal	1A.2. Principal Assistant Principal	1A.2. Progress monitoring through benchmark tests, mini-assessments and results of 2013 FCAT Science Test 2.0.
			1A.3.	1A.3	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
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: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.

			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	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. Need for a hands-on approach to experiencing science	2A.1. The school will begin using the Science Boot camp program.	2A.1. Principal Assistant Principal	2A.1. Increase in the percentage of students scoring at or above a level 3 on the Science FCAT	2A.1. Progress monitoring through benchmark tests, mini-assessments and FCAT.
Science Goal #2A: By June 2013, 13% (17 or more) of our students in 5th grade will score at a level 4 or 5 on the 2013 FCAT Science Test 2.0	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 11% (20) students scored at a level 4 or 5 on the 2013 FCAT Science Test 2.0	2013Expected Level of Performance:* 13% (17 or more) students will score at a level 4 or 5 on the 2013 FCAT Science Test 2.0					
			2A.2. Implementation of the new Fusion science curriculum	2A.2. Teachers will attend trainings on the new series	2A.2. Principal Assistant Principal	2A.2. Bi-Weekly MTSS meetings, Bi-Weekly Professional Learning Communities meetings	2A.2. Progress monitoring through benchmark tests, mini-assessments and FCAT.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
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: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

High School 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
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Science Goal #1: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Science Goal #2: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					

		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

Biology 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Biology I EOC)*

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

Biology 1 EOC 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
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Biology 1 Goal #1: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Biology 1 Goal #2: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in*					

	this box.	this box.					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

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
Science Boot Camp Refresher Training	5th grade	Boot Camp Consultant	5th grade teachers	August 2, 2012	Data meetings, PLC meetings	Administration

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
Science Boot Camp	Boot Camp is aligned to the state standards and is designed to promote testing efficiency on state tests while learning through fun and games	School Budget	**Prior Expense**
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	NA
			Subtotal:

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

Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Incorporating the Fusion Science curriculum into daily classroom lessons.	Trainings, hands-on practice	NA	NA
Science Boot Camp Refresher Training	Teacher Training	School Budget	$300
			Subtotal: 300
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**
			Subtotal:
			Total: 300.00

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				
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. Writing Goal #1A: By June 2013, 80% (97) of our students in 4th grade will score at a level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writing Test 2.0	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 73% (96) students scored at a level 3 or higher	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 80% (97) students will score at a level 3 or higher	1A.1. Teachers not differentiating their instruction and providing remediation and enrichment opportunities	1A.1. Modeling, individual conferencing with students .	1A.1. Classroom Teacher Principal Assistant Principal	1A.1. Review of students' Writing samples.	1A.1. Monthly school-wide writing samples and Write Score in grades 3 and 4.
			1A.2. The new scoring of the FCAT Writes with more emphasis on structure, grammar, and spelling.	1A.2. Spend more time teaching the structure of writing, proper punctuation, and use of grammar.	1A.2. Principal Assistant Principal Reading Resource Teacher	1A.2. Write Score assessments, monthly writing prompts.	1A.2. Write Score assessments and FCAT Writes.

		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: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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
Write From the Beginning/Response to Literature	K-5	Select K-4 teachers	K-5 teachers	On-going	Monthly writing prompts	Principal Assistant Principal
Write Score	3 and 4	Curriculum Resource Teacher	3rd and 4th grade teachers	On-going	Monthly writing prompts	Principal Assistant Principal

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
WriteScore	Writing assessment tool that provides	School Budget	$2,850.33

	feedback on areas needing refinement		
			Subtotal: 2,850.33
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	NA
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	NA
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: 2,850.33

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(required in year 2014-2015)*

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

Civics EOC 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
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Civics Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

NA	*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
<u>Civics Goal #2:</u> *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

Civics 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
NA						

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Civics Goals

U.S. History End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(required in year 2013-2014)*

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

U.S. History EOC 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
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.

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

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

U.S. History Goal #1: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
U.S. History Goal #2: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

U.S. History 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
NA						

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

U.S. History 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:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of U.S. History Goals

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

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

Attendance Goal #1: At the end of the 2012-2013 school year, the attendance rate will have increased from 96.7% (751) to 98% (687) 22% (171) of the students had 10 or more absences 18% (126) of the students had 10 or more tardies		1.1. Parents not sending their children to school on time.	1.1. Send connect orange messages informing parents of school hours. Including school hours on the parent newsletter.	1.1. Principal Assistant Principal Registrar	1.1. Generate monthly attendance reports utilizing SMS.	1.1. At least a 3% decrease in the amount of absences and tardies at the end of the 2012-2013 school year in comparison to the previous year.
	96.7% (751) school-wide 22% (171) of the students had 10 or more absences	98% (687) school-wide For the 12-13 year 18% (126) or less Students will have 10 or more absences				
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) 22% (171) students had 10 or more absences	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)) 17% (119 or fewer) students will have 10 or more absences				
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) 18% (147) students had 10 or more tardies	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) 14% (98 or fewer) students will have 10 or more tardies				

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

	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
	96.7% (751) school-wide 22% (171) of the students had 10 or more absences	98% (688) school-wide For the 12-13 year 17% (119) or less Students will have 10 or more absences					
			1.2. Parents taking vacations during school days.	1.2. Publicize the school calendar and encourage parents to plan their trips for school holidays.	1.2. Principal Assistant Principal	1.2. Monthly attendance reports.	1.2. End of year attendance rate.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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 procedures	All	Principal	School-wide	8/14/12	Attendance meetings	Registrar Assistant Principal

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
NA	NA	NA	NA

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

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

			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Use Progress Book for attendance	Daily attendance tracker	NA	NA
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Attendance procedures	Faculty Handbook	NA	NA
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	NA
			Subtotal:
			Total: 0

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 Suspension Goal #1: At the end of the 2012-2013 school year, the percentage of students being	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions (8 students) serving in-school suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions (6 or fewer students) serving in-school suspensions	1.1. Lack of an effective classroom management discipline plan.	1.1. Train teachers on how to implement CHAMPS within the classroom. Model and monitor effective CHAMPS expectations ongoing throughout the school	1.1. Principal Assistant Principal	1.1. Classroom Walkthroughs Direct Observations Number of referrals per classroom/teacher.	1.1. The number of discipline referrals that result in out of school suspension.

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

suspended will decreased from 3% to 2%. Suspension Goal #1: At the end of the 2012-2013 school year, the percentage of students being suspended will decreased from 3% (24) to 2% (18).	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School (8 students) serving in-school suspensions 2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions 6% (46 students) serving Out-of-school suspensions 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School 3% (24 students) served Out-of-school suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In –School (6 or fewer students) serving in-school suspensions 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions 5% (35 or fewer students) serving Out-of-school suspensions 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School 2% (18 students or fewer) will serve Out-of-school suspensions	year.			
			1.2. Students' frustration with not being able to be successful when trying to work at grade level.	1.2. Identify the students through the MTSS process and differentiate instruction to meet their needs.	1.2. Principal Assistant Principal	1.2. MTSS weekly team meetings. Number of discipline referrals.	1.2. The number of discipline referrals that result in out of school suspension. MTSS student list
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic 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
CHAMPS	K - 5	Principal Selected teachers who	All Teachers	On-going	Classroom Walkthroughs	Principal Assistant Principal

		have already been trained on CHAMPS procedures.			

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
NA	NA	NA	NA
			Subtotal: 0
			Total: 0
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Track discipline issues on computer	SMS	NA	NA
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
CHAMPS	Behavior system	NA	NA
			Subtotal: 0
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	NA
			Subtotal:
			Total: 0

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

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
1. Dropout Prevention			1.1. Mandatory retention in 3rd grade based on FCAT Reading scores.	1.1. Identify students struggling with reading and provide them with the support they need.	1.1. Principal Assistant Principal MTSS Team	1.1. Weekly MTSS team meetings.	1.1. The number of students scoring a level 1 on the FCAT.
Dropout Prevention Goal #1: In 2013 the number of students retained in 3, 4, and 5 grades will decrease by 25% from 20 students to 15 students.	2012 Current Dropout Rate:* 2.6% (20 students were retained)	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:* 1.8% (13 or fewer students projected to possibly be retained)					
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:* 97.4% (757 students were not retained)	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:* 98.2% (689 students projected to not be retained)					
			1.2. Educating students on how their attendance, academic progress and work ethic will impact their future lives.	1.2. Implement Destination College Strategies in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades. participate in the Teach-In program.	1.2. Principal Assistant Principal	1.2. Classroom Walk-through Participation of Teach-In guests.	1.2. Destination College lesson plans and work samples. Sign-in sheets from Teach-In
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic 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
Differentiating instruction	all	Instructional Coaches	School-wide	On-going	Classroom Walk-through	Principal Assistant Principal 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade teachers

						Resource Teachers

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
NA	NA	NA	NA
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	NA
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	NA
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	NA
			Subtotal:
			Total: 0

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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 Parent Involvement Goal #1: For the 2012-2013 school year, parent participation in school related events will increase to 80% (560) students' parents/guardians.	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:* 75% (575) students' families took an active part in their child's education	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:* 80% (560) students' families will take an active part in their child's education	1.1. Parents have a limited amount of time to attend events.	1.1. PTA & SAC meetings will be held after school rather than in the evening to allow parents to pick up their child and stay for the meetings. PTA meetings will be connected to curriculum nights, concerts, book fairs, etc.	1.1. Principal Assistant Principal	1.1. Attendance rate of parents at open house, meet the teacher night, conferences, PTA and SAC meetings. Parent Survey.	1.1. Sign-in sheets Survey results
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			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
FCAT Night	3-5	Admin Core Team	All	Spring 2013	Exit tickets	Principal Assistant Principal
Curriculum Nights	all	Teachers	School-wide	September 2012	Parent feedback on survey	Principal Assistant Principal

Parent Involvement Budget

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

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

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
NA	NA	NA	NA
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	NA
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	NA
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	NA
			Subtotal:
			Total: 0

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

STEM Goal #1: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math techniques will be integrated into the curriculum during the 2012 – 2013 school year.	1.1. Lack of training for teachers	1.1. Two teachers will attend the Bridge to STEM training on incorporating STEM concepts into classroom instruction. These teachers will share their knowledge with the rest of the faculty.	1.1. Principal Assistant Principal	1.1. Classroom Walk-through	1.1. Teacher observations
	1.2. Limited time to implement STEM lessons into the Curriculum	1.2. Integrate STEM lessons into all academic areas.	1.2. Principal Assistant Principal	1.2. Lesson Plans, formal and informal observations	1.2. Lesson Plans, Teacher observations, survey
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity					
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.					
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
STEM Strategies	All	Trained Teachers	School-wide	August Year round	PLC Meetings	Principal Assistant Principal

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
Send Kindergarten grade level to STEM Training	Workshop/training	Provided during pre-planning by district	NA
			Subtotal:

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

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

Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	NA
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	NA
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	NA
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

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

CTE Goal #1: *NA*	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	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 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
NA						

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
NA	NA	NA	NA
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	NA
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	NA
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	NA
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

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

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

1. Additional Goal			1.1. Students are not working at grade level and are not able to catch up	1.1. Students not able to work at grade level will be retained early to allow them an opportunity to catch up.	1.1. Classroom Teacher Principal Assistant Principal	1.1. Weekly progress monitoring, differentiating instruction in the classroom.	1.1. FCAT, Benchmark assessments, mini-benchmarks, report cards.
Additional Goal #1: Students will be reading on grade level by age 9, with a 3-5% increase	2012 Current Level :* In 3rd grade there were 59% (74) of the students who scored at grade level	2013 Expected Level :* In 3rd grade 65% (84) of the students will score at grade level.					
			1.2. Students not having the prerequisite skills to achieve grade level mastery.	1.2. Identified students needing Tier 3 reading intervention will go to SSMART ZONE (reading intervention class) during their special area time.	1.2. Principal Assistant Principal Reading Resource Teacher	1.2. Classroom Observations Weekly mini-assessments	1.2. Progress Monitoring data Results of the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
2. Additional Goal			2.1. An ability /willingness to attend evening meetings	2.1. Invite parents in to school to attend curriculum trainings on how they can assist their student.	2.1. Principal Assistant Principal	2.1. Parent feedback during parent conferences, schedule parent training nights.	2.1. Feedback on parent survey.
Additional Goal #2: Provide trainings to allow parents to assist their children with homework.	2012 Current Level :* 2012 Current Level :* 60% (462) of the parents assisted their students with their homework.	2013 Expected Level :* 2013 Expected Level :* 70% (490) of the students' parents will assist their students with their homework.					
			2.2.	2.2.	1.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

3. Additional Goal			3.1. Educating students on how their attendance, academic progress and work ethic will impact their future lives.	3.1. Implement Destination College Strategies in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades. Participate in the Teach-In program.	3.1. Principal Assistant Principal	3.1. Classroom Walk-throughs Participation of Teach-In guests.	3.1. Destination College lesson plans and work samples. Sign-in sheets from Teach-In.
Additional Goal #3: Ensure that students are ready for college or the workplace when they graduate from HS.	2012 Current Level :* 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) 22% (174) students had 10 or more absences.	2013 Expected Level :* 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)) 17% (119 or fewer) students will have 10 or more absences.					
4. Additional Goal			4A.2. Some students are not proficient in basic facts and lack the foundational skills needed to achieve higher level thinking.	4A.2. Continue with computer-based basic facts proficiency (FAST Math). Use of manipulatives and mental models.	4A.2. Classroom Teachers, Resource Teachers and Administration.	4A.2. Collection of student work and common assessments.	4A.2. Unit/chapter tests, Benchmark Test, results of the 2013 FCAT 2.0.
Additional Goal #4: Students who are struggling in math do not have a solid understanding of their basic facts.	2012 Current Level :* For the 2012 FCAT we had 56% (240) of our students score a level 3 or above	2013 Expected Level :* For the 2013 FCAT 61% (236) of our students will score a level 3 or above					
5. Additional Goal			5.1. Lack of understanding in how to differentiate instruction for all learners.	5.1. Teachers will be trained in how to differentiate their instruction in all areas to teach the students at their current functioning level	5.1. Teachers Principal Assistant Principal	5.1. Review of data from unit/chapter tests, benchmark tests.	5.1. Unit/chapter tests, Benchmark Test, results from 2013 FCAT 2.0.
Additional Goal #5: We will decrease the achievement gap for each identified subgroup by 10% by June 30, 2013.	2012 Current Level :* Embedded in Reading 5B p.18 and Math 5B p.30	2013 Expected Level :* Embedded in Reading 5B p.18 and Math 5B p.30					
6. Additional Goal			6.1. The number of students	6.1. Monitor student	6.1. Registrar	6.1. Send letters and connect	6.1. Monthly attendance reports

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

	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
Additional Goal #6: Maintain high Fine Arts enrollment percentage.	In the 2011-2012 school year 0% of our students attended art class.	For the 2012-2013 school year 100% of our students will attend art class.	who are absent and miss the Art special area class.	attendance rates on a bi-weekly basis at the MTSS team meeting.	Assistant Principal	orange messages home encouraging students to arrive on time each and every day. Monitor attendance (absences and tardies) through the MTSS.	printed from the student management system (SMS).
7. Additional Goal			7.1. Too many minorities are being placed in special education classes.	7.1. The MTSS program will be used to provide students remediation to assist them at improving their knowledge and increase the probability of working at grade level.	7.1. Principal Assistant Principal Leadership Team	7.1. Weekly MTSS meetings, Bi-Weekly Professional Learning Communities meetings	7.1. Teachers' effective use of the OCPS MTSS Decision Making Form, MTSS graphing template and progress monitoring through weekly mini-assessments.
Additional Goal #7: Decrease the disproportionate classification in Special Education.	2012 Current Level :* Embedded in the MTSS Implementation plan located on p. 10	2013 Expected Level :* Embedded in the MTSS Implementation plan located on p. 10					

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
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
Destination College	3, 4, and 5	Destination College Team	3rd, 4th, and 5th grade teachers Resource Teachers	On-going	Classroom Walk-throughs	Principal Assistant Principal 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade teachers Resource Teachers

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

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

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

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
NA	NA	NA	NA
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	NA
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	NA
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	NA
			Subtotal:
			Total: 0

End of Additional Goal(s)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.
Reading Budget
Total: 26,426.03
CELLA Budget
Total: 0
Mathematics Budget

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

	Total: 4,588.36
Science Budget	
	Total: 300.00
Writing Budget	
	Total: 2,850.33
Civics Budget	
	Total: 0
U.S. History Budget	
	Total: 0
Attendance Budget	
	Total: 0
Suspension Budget	
	Total: 0
Dropout Prevention Budget	
	Total: 0
Parent Involvement Budget	
	Total: 0
STEM Budget	
	Total: 0
CTE Budget	
	Total: 0
Additional Goals	
	Total:
	Grand Total: 34,164.72

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

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

☐Priority	☐Focus	☐Prevent
NA	NA	NA

Are you reward school? ☐Yes   ☒No
(A reward school is any school that has improved their letter grade from the previous year or any A graded school.)

- 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.
The School Advisory Committee will review the School Improvement Plan for the 2012-2013 school year through updates by the principal and discuss activities, professional development and expenditures are happening as planned. The SAC will develop a Needs Assessment Survey, tally the results of the survey and determine school needs based on results. SAC will provide input into the budget and assist with the development of the 2012-2013 School Improvement Plan.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
NA	