

# Florida Department of Education



**DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP)  
Form SIP-1**

Proposed for 2012-2013

**2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

**PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS**

**School Information**

School Name: Zephyrhills High School	District Name: Pasco County
Principal: Steven Van Gorden	Superintendent: Heather Fiorentino
SAC Chair: John Kinsman	Date of School Board Approval:

**Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:**

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

[High School Feedback Report](#)

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

**Administrators**

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

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

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

Principal	Steven Van Gorden	MA Educational Leadership BS Secondary Social Studies; School Principal (All levels), Social Studies (5-9) Social Studies (6-12)	3	12	5 years Principal Hudson Middle School: 2004-2005 B 2005-2006 C 2006-2007 B 2007-2008 C 2008-2009 A Zephyrhills High School: 2009-2010 B 2010-2011 C
Assistant Principal	John Taylor	Ed.D. Educational Leadership and Policy Studies MA Educational Leadership MA Special Education MA Religious Education BA Religion; Educational Leadership (K-12), Gifted endorsed Specific Learning Disabilities (K-12)	9	10	Zephyrhills High School: 2001-2007 C 2007-2008 B 2008-2009 C 2009-2010 B 2010-2011 C
Assistant Principal	Scott Davey	MA Educational Leadership BA Secondary Education: Social Studies;  Educational Leadership (K-12) Social Studies (6-12)	2	10	Bloomington High School 2002-2004 A Blake High School 2004-2007 C Hudson High School: 2007-2008 C 2008-2009 D 2009-2010 C Zephyrhills High School: 2010-2011 C
Assistant Principal	Andressa Williams	MA Educational Leadership BA Special Education; Educational Leadership (K-12) Middle Grades Integrated Curriculum (5-9) Varying Exceptionalities (K-12)	1	2	Dr. John Long Middle School: 2010-2011 A
Assistant Principal					

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

### Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Ann Bowlin	Educational Leadership K-12 Elementary Education 1-6 ESOL Endorsement Primary Education K-3 Reading K-12	9	3	Zephyrhills High School: 2001-2007 C 2007-2008 B 2008-2009 C 2009-2010 B 2010-2011 Not yet determined
Mathematics					

### 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. District guidelines will be followed to retain and recruit highly qualified teachers.	Principal/Assistant Principals	On-going
2. Professional development opportunities will be made available to instructional personnel.	Principal/Assistant Principals and K12 Literacy Coach, Staff Development.	June 2013
3. Professional Learning Communities (weekly)	Administration and Leadership Team (Department Heads)	June 2013
4.		

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

***Non-Highly Effective Instructors***

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

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

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

***Staff Demographics***

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
98	2% (2)	32% (32)	38% (38)	28% (28)	30% (30)	0% (0)	14% (14)	2% (2)	16% (16)

***Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan***

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities

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

<p>Jan Anderton</p>	<p>Kyle Deck</p>	<p>Mentor pairings were determined on the following basis: Mentor teacher certification(s), Mentor/Mentee current teacher assignment(s), Mentor Clinical-Ed Training completion, Mentor’s years of teaching experience, and Mentor’s ability to work with others by teaching and coaching. In addition, each mentor has been evaluated as being a highly skilled teacher in instructional skills and classroom management. Both teachers are math certified.</p>	<p>New teachers will take part in the Teacher Induction Program (Pasco), attend an orientation during planning week, and participate in bi-monthly meetings with the mentor coordinator, and mentors. Mentors/Mentees will meet as needed to discuss common lesson planning and incorporation of best practice strategies. Mentees will have the opportunity to observe Model classrooms and discuss their observations with their Mentors and supervising assistant principals.</p>
<p>Eileen Bonsignore</p>	<p>Lisa Daswon</p>	<p>Mentor pairings were determined on the following basis: Mentor teacher certification(s), Mentor/Mentee current teacher assignment(s), Mentor Clinical-Ed Training completion, Mentor’s years of teaching experience, and Mentor’s ability to work with others by teaching and coaching. In addition, each mentor has been evaluated as being a highly skilled teacher in instructional skills and classroom management.</p>	<p>New teachers will take part in the Teacher Induction Program (Pasco), attend an orientation during planning week, and participate in bi-monthly meetings with the mentor coordinator, and mentors. Mentors/Mentees will meet as needed to discuss common lesson planning and incorporation of best practice strategies. Mentees will have the opportunity to observe Model classrooms and discuss their observations with their Mentors and supervising assistant principals.</p>
<p>Natalie Edgeman</p>	<p>Andrew Forsman</p>	<p>Mentor pairings were determined on the following basis: Mentor teacher certification(s), Mentor/Mentee current teacher assignment(s), Mentor Clinical-Ed Training completion, Mentor’s years of teaching experience, and Mentor’s ability to work with others by teaching and coaching. In addition, each mentor has been evaluated as being a highly skilled teacher in instructional skills and classroom management. Both teachers are science certified.</p>	<p>New teachers will take part in the Teacher Induction Program (Pasco), attend an orientation during planning week, and participate in bi-monthly meetings with the mentor coordinator, and mentors. Mentors/Mentees will meet as needed to discuss common lesson planning and incorporation of best practice strategies. Mentees will have the opportunity to observe Model classrooms and discuss their observations with their Mentors and supervising assistant principals.</p>

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

### Additional Requirements

#### **Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only**

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

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

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011



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

Other
-------

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

<b>School-Based MTSS/RtI Team</b>
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.  The school-based RtI Leadership Team is comprised of the following members: principal, assistant principals, behavior specialist, Student Services Supervisor (from District Office), school psychologist, all school department heads, classroom teachers in the areas of reading/math/science, literacy coach, AP coordinator, social worker, and guidance staff. The principal/ assistant principal provides a common vision for the use of data based decision-making in order to maintain a sound, effective academic program for all students to ensure the opportunity for each student to reach their highest potential.
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 PS/RtI Leadership Team will meet regularly (bi-monthly) to review data and progress monitoring school focus areas. The team will use this information to create effective learning environments and recognize students. After determining that there is effective Tier 1- Core Instruction in place, the team will identify students who are not meeting identified academic targets. These students will be referred to the school-based RtI Leadership Team. The SBIT will use the Problem Solving Model to conduct all meetings. Based on data and discussion, the team will identify students who are in need of additional academic and/or behavioral support. An intervention plan will be developed which identifies a student's specific areas of deficiencies and appropriate research-based interventions to address these deficiencies. The team will ensure the necessary resources are available and the intervention is implemented with fidelity. Each case will be assigned a case liaison to support the interventionist and report back on all data collected for further discussion at future meetings. The leadership team will also identify the professional development activities needed for the staff to have the knowledge and resources necessary to implement the interventions.
Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?  The school-based RtI team utilized the previous year's data, information on Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 targets and focused attention on deficient areas (FCAT scores and the lowest 25%, AYP and subgroups, strengths and weaknesses of intensive programs, mentoring, tutoring, and other services).
MTSS Implementation

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

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.

Data collected on students may include but is not limited to:

- Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)
- FCAT Writes
- ACT/SAT/CPT
- Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)
- Progress Monitoring Plans PMP
- Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR)
- Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)
- Core K12 Assessments (Math & Science)
- Teacher Created Common Assessments (within departments)
- Office Discipline Referrals
- Retentions
- Number of credits by grad-plan year
- Attendance (absences/tardies)

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The school-based RtI team will provide in-services to the faculty on designated professional development days, and during faculty meetings.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

In-service trainings will continue to provide the faculty training and support in best practices. Teachers of common subject areas will be provided weekly planning opportunities to discuss lesson plans, tools, strategies, and interventions for their specific subject areas.

### *Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)*

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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

Van Gorden – Principal  
John Taylor – Assistant Principal  
Scott Davey – Assistant Principal  
Andressa Williams – Assistant Principal  
Ann Bowlin - Literacy Coach  
Julie Moore – Guidance Counselor  
Valarie Farrell – Graduation Enhancement Coach  
Janet Anderton – Mathematics Representative  
Dawn Paul - Reading Representative  
Aimee Stryker - ESE Representative  
Camille Reynolds - Technology Specialist  
Kelly Anderson – Media Specialist

\* This entire function is part of the entire school-based leadership team.

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

The LLT will meet twice a month. The purpose of this team will be to help drive curriculum initiatives in the areas of reading and writing. The LLT will also look at data collected from many areas (i.e. FCAT, FAIR, Mini Assessments, etc.), and use that information, along with our current initiatives, to make student-focused decisions for the development of our student's literacy.

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

The major initiatives of the LLT this year will be implementing Instructional Focus Calendars across all curriculum areas, and integrating reading, math, and writing across content areas.

### ***Public School Choice***

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

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

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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

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

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

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

Reading goals from the School Improvement Plan are incorporated within each teacher's Individual Professional Development Plan. The Literacy Coach, Leadership Team, and instructional staff will facilitate and participate in professional development activities focusing on the development and infusion of Best Practices within content areas. Teachers will use FCAT, FAIR, and Core K12 assessment results in order to analyze data to drive instruction within their classes throughout the year. The integration of teaching reading strategies by every teacher will be monitored through administrative walkthroughs, classroom observations, and reviews of lesson plans.

### ***\*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?

ZHS offers many courses that offer academic skills as well as career pathways. Several courses through the CTE department and the Health Academy give students opportunities to gain career specific skills and possible industry certification. College-bound students can take Honors, AP, and Dual Enrollment courses. AP students have the ability to earn college credit through course-specific exams. Students interested in the military may enroll in NJROTC courses to learn military procedures and policies. These courses integrate academic and career skill sets that facilitate seamless transitions into the workforce, military, secondary technical institutions, community colleges or universities.

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?

The guidance counselors and career specialist work together to plan and implement a comprehensive career development program designed to assist students, parents and staff in promoting career awareness and opportunities in order to facilitate a student's academic decisions throughout high school. At the beginning of each year, students are required to register and create an account in ePEP and facts.org as part of their guidance program to enhance their knowledge of their goals, interests, and talents. Grade-level specific activities facilitate progress this process:  
9<sup>th</sup> grade students: CHOICES Interest Inventory  
10<sup>th</sup> grade students: PLAN test and follow-up  
11<sup>th</sup> grade students: PSAT Test

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

12<sup>th</sup> grade students: Post Grad Plans

11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grade students are given the opportunity to take the ASVAB test and the “My Florida Ready to Work”.

### *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](#).

There are numerous opportunities for students to access resources and prepare for public postsecondary level readiness.

Students have opportunities to begin preparations through preparation courses for and participation in the PLAN, PSAT, SAT, Ready to Work, and ASVAB. The SAT/ACT is held on campus monthly and guidance counselors facilitate the registration process as well as the paperwork for fee-waivers for low-income students. The PLAN/PSAT tests are administered to interested students once a year. ESE transition information is also provided for students and parents as needed. CTE courses and OJT opportunities are made available for students whenever possible.

The Career Resource Specialist is available to meet with students on an individual basis and regularly schedules an array of military and college representatives to visit campus to discuss opportunities, answer questions, provide catalogues and literature, and help students prepare for the transition from high school. Students have access to the Career Resource Center where they can access the following information: Careers, Employability Skills, Technical schools, Colleges, Universities, Military options, Financial Aid, and Scholarships.

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

**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]).

<b>Reading Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
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		
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.</b>	1A.1. Students demonstrate weakness in reading comprehension.	1A.1. Students will receive instruction to practice reading comprehension skills using strategies including but not limited to: Two-Column Notes, Higher Order Questions, Student Generated Questions (Best Practices).	1A.1. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	1A.1. Review of FAIR and FCAT data. Weekly discussion of classroom progress monitoring data. Review of lesson plans and evidence collected/observed during walkthroughs.	1A.1. FCAT reports, FAIR reports, Walkthrough data, Lesson Plans, Bi-Monthly Progress Monitoring data		

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

Reading Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, 51% (398) of students tested will demonstrate proficiency at Achievement Level 3.							
46% (345)	51% (398)						
		1A.2. Student weakness in vocabulary.	1A.2. All teachers will regularly implement explicit instruction on key vocabulary and vocabulary skills within the content area taught for content-specific words and affixes. School Leadership will develop and disseminate "Root of the Week" to all classrooms.	1A.2. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	1A.2. Review of FAIR and FCAT data. Review of lesson plans and evidence collected/observed during walkthroughs.	1A.2. FCAT reports FAIR reports Walkthrough data Lesson Plans	
		1A.3. Student weakness in reading fluency.	1A.3. Students will receive instruction and opportunity to practice Reading Fluency using strategies including the following: Repeated Reading, Teacher Read Aloud, Partner Reading and SSR.	1A.3. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	1A.3. Review of FAIR and FCAT data. Review of lesson plans and evidence collected/observed during walkthroughs.	1A.3. FCAT reports, FAIR Reports, Walkthrough Data, Lesson Plans	
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.</b>	1B.1. Students demonstrate weakness in reading comprehension.	1B.1. Students will receive instruction to practice reading comprehension skills using strategies including but not limited to: Two-Column Notes, Higher Order Questions, Student Generated Questions (Best Practices).	1B.1. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	1B.1. Review of FAIR and FCAT data. Review of lesson plans and evidence collected/observed during walkthroughs.	1B.1. FCAT reports, FAIR reports, Walkthrough data, Lesson Plans		



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

Reading Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, 20% (2) of the students will score at Achievement Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.</i>							
	10% (1)	20% (2)					
		1A.2. Student weakness in vocabulary.	1A.2. All teachers will regularly implement explicit instruction on key vocabulary and vocabulary skills within the content area taught for content-specific words and affixes. School Leadership will develop and disseminate "Root of the Week" to all classrooms.	1A.2. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	1A.2. Review of FAIR and FCAT data. Review of lesson plans and evidence collected/observed during walkthroughs.	1A.2. FCAT reports FAIR reports Walkthrough data Lesson Plans	
		1A.3. Student weakness in reading fluency.	1A.3. Students will receive instruction and opportunity to practice Reading Fluency using strategies including the following: Repeated Reading, Teacher Read Aloud, Partner Reading and SSR.	1A.3. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	1A.3. Review of FAIR and FCAT data. Review of lesson plans and evidence collected/observed during walkthroughs.	1A.3. FCAT reports, FAIR Reports, Walkthrough Data, Lesson Plans	

## 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		
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.</b>	2A.1. Lack of reading integrated across content areas.	2A.1. Monthly reading comprehension activities will be implemented school-wide. Teachers will incorporate content specific reading on regular basis. ("Best Practices")	2A.1. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	2A.1. Review of school-wide progress on monthly reading comprehension activities and common assessments. Review of FAIR and FCAT data. Review of lesson plans and evidence collected/observed during walkthroughs.	2A.1. Mini assessments, FCAT reports, FAIR reports, Walkthrough data, Lesson Plans		
<b>Reading Goal #2A:</b> <i>By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, 25% (195) of the students will score at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	21.5% (169)	25% (195)					
		2A.2. Student weakness in vocabulary.	2A.2. School Leadership will develop and disseminate "Root of the Week" to all classrooms.	2A.2. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	2A.2. Review of FAIR and FCAT data. Review of lesson plans and evidence collected/observed during walkthroughs.	2A.2. FCAT reports, FAIR reports, Walkthrough data, Lesson Plans	
		2A.3. Student weakness in reading fluency.	2A.3. Students will receive instruction and opportunities to practice fluency in reading using strategies including the following: Repeated Reading, Teacher Read Aloud, Partner Reading and SSR.	2A.3. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	2A.3. Review of FAIR and FCAT data. Review of lesson plans and evidence collected/observed during walkthroughs.	2A.3. FCAT reports, FAIR reports, Walkthrough data, Lesson Plans	

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

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

<p><b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.</b></p>	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
<p><u>Reading Goal #2B:</u> <i>By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, 90% (9) of the students will score at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	80% (8)	90% (9)					
		1A.2. Student weakness in vocabulary.	1A.2. All teachers will regularly implement explicit instruction on key vocabulary and vocabulary skills within the content area taught for content-specific words and affixes. School Leadership will develop and disseminate "Root of the Week" to all classrooms.	1A.2. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	1A.2. Review of FAIR and FCAT data. Review of lesson plans and evidence collected/observed during walkthroughs.	1A.2. FCAT reports FAIR reports Walkthrough data Lesson Plans	
		2A.3. Student weakness in reading fluency.	2A.3. Students will receive instruction and opportunities to practice fluency in reading using strategies including the following: Repeated Reading, Teacher Read Aloud, Partner Reading and SSR.	2A.3. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	2A.3. Review of FAIR and FCAT data. Review of lesson plans and evidence collected/observed during walkthroughs.	2A.3. FCAT reports, FAIR reports, Walkthrough data, Lesson Plans	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</b>	3A.1. A need for Professional Development in Instructional Strategies to improve student achievement.	3A.1. Professional Development opportunities will be made available to teachers in multiple areas, such as: Unlocking the Secrets, CAR-PD, CRISS strategies, technology integration, and Differentiated Instruction.	3A.1. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	3A.1. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as FAIR and common assessments.	3A.1. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during Walkthroughs.		
<b>Reading Goal #3A:</b> <i>By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, 61% (476) of students tested will demonstrate learning gains in reading.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	51% (360)	61% (476)					
		3A.2. Student's weakness in the area of reading comprehension.	3A.2. Students will receive instruction to practice reading comprehension skills using strategies including but not limited to: Two-Column Notes, Higher Order Questions, Student Generated Questions.	3A.2. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	3A.2. Review of FAIR and FCAT data. Review of lesson plans and evidence collected/observed during walkthroughs.	3A.2. FCAT reports, FAIR reports, Walkthrough data, Lesson Plans	

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

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

		3A.3. Lack of reading integrated across content areas.	3A.3. Monthly reading comprehension activities will be implemented school-wide. Teachers will incorporate content specific reading on regular basis.	3A.3. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	3A.3. Review of school-wide progress on monthly reading comprehension activities. Review of FAIR and FCAT data. Review of lesson plans and evidence collected/observed during walkthroughs.	3A.3. Mini assessments, FCAT reports, FAIR reports, Walkthrough data, Lesson Plans	
<b>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</b>	3A.1. A need for Professional Development in Instructional Strategies to improve student achievement.	3A.1. Professional Development opportunities will be made available to teachers in multiple areas, such as: Unlocking the Secrets, CAR-PD, CRISS strategies, technology integration, and Differentiated Instruction.	3A.1. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	3A.1. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as FAIR and common assessments.	3A.1. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during Walkthroughs.		
<b>Reading Goal #3B:</b> <i>By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, 100% (8) of students tested will demonstrate learning gains in reading.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<b>100% (8)</b>	<b>100% (8)</b>					
		3A.2. Student's weakness in the area of reading comprehension.	3A.2. Students will receive instruction to practice reading comprehension skills using strategies including but not limited to: Two-Column Notes, Higher Order Questions, Student Generated Questions.	3A.2. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	3A.2. Review of FAIR and FCAT data. Review of lesson plans and evidence collected/observed during walkthroughs.	3A.2. FCAT reports, FAIR reports, Walkthrough data, Lesson Plans	

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

		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	
--	--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--

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



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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b>	4A.1. Core programs are not always implemented with fidelity.	4A.1. Reading teachers will implement the Read180 program with fidelity - utilizing all available components and resources of the program and assistance/training provided by K12 Literacy Specialist.	4A.1. ZHS Admin team and K12 Literacy Coach	4A.1. Review of FCAT, FAIR, and Read180 diagnostic components to monitor student progress. Observations and walkthroughs with a review of lesson plans to monitor implementation with fidelity.	4A.1. FCAT, FAIR, Read180 data, walkthrough/observations, and lesson plans.		
<b>Reading Goal #4A:</b> <i>By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, 25% (16) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in reading.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	15% (14)	25% (16)					
		4A.2. Students in this quartile often have attendance issues.	4A.2. Teachers will meet and discuss student progress regularly where they will identify patterns of attendance issues and work with other groups to provide early support and interventions.	4A.2. ZHS Admin team, ZHS Leadership Team, Graduation Enhancement Coach, Social Worker, Rtl Team	4A.2. Monitor attendance rates and identify beneficial strategies used to encourage better attendance.	4A.2. Attendance reports	

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

		4A.3. Students in this quartile often demonstrate behaviors not conducive to the learning environment.	4A.3. Teachers utilize PS/Rtl procedures/behavior matrix to provide support for necessary interventions by teaching and modeling appropriate behaviors on campus.	4A.3. ZHS Admin team, ZHS Leadership team, Rtl team, and Discipline Committee	4A.3. Discipline Committee and Rtl team will track referrals and other support interventions through the S.W.I.T.S. data system.	4A.3. S.W.I.T.S. data collection system and/or Incidence Reports	
<b>4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b>	4A.3. Students in this quartile often demonstrate behaviors not conducive to the learning environment.	4A.3. Teachers utilize PS/Rtl procedures/behavior matrix to provide support for necessary interventions by teaching and modeling appropriate behaviors on campus.	4A.3. ZHS Admin team, ZHS Leadership team, Rtl team, and Discipline Committee	4A.3. Discipline Committee and Rtl team will track referrals and other support interventions through the S.W.I.T.S. data system.	4A.3. S.W.I.T.S. data collection system and/or Incidence Reports		
<b>Reading Goal #4B:</b> <i>By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, 100% (8) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in reading.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance.*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance.*</u>					
	<i>100% (8)</i>	<i>100% (8)</i>					
		4A.2. Students in this quartile often have attendance issues.	4A.2. Teachers will meet and discuss student progress regularly where they will identify patterns of attendance issues and work with other groups to provide early support and interventions.	4A.2. ZHS Admin team, ZHS Leadership Team, Graduation Enhancement Coach, Social Worker, Rtl Team	4A.2. Monitor attendance rates and identify beneficial strategies used to encourage better attendance.	4A.2. Attendance reports	
		4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
<b>5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>						
<p><b>Reading Goal #5A:</b></p> <p><i>By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, 50% of students in each ethnicity subgroup (White: 300, Hispanic: 50) will make Adequate Yearly Progress in reading.</i></p>							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		

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

Reading Goal #5B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	White: 36%(411) Lv 3,4 or 5 Hispanic:40% (40) Lv 3,4 or 5	White: 50%(300) Lv 3,4 or 5 Hispanic:50% (50) Lv 3,4 or 5					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
<b>Reading Goal #5C:</b> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		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		

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

<p><b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b></p>	<p>5D.1. Instruction does not always meet the needs of individual students.</p>	<p>5D.1. Teachers will plan for and implement instruction to include more cooperative learning and differentiation of instruction to meet the needs of the individual students within each class by incorporating strategies they've learned through professional development opportunities/trainings provided to them.</p>	<p>5D.1. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.</p>	<p>5D.1. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as FAIR and common assessments.</p>	<p>5D.1. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during walkthroughs and classroom observations.</p>		
<p><b>Reading Goal #5D:</b> <i>By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, 50% (46) of 'Students with Disabilities' will make satisfactory progress in reading.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>46% (140) at Lv 1 &amp; 2</p>	<p>50% (46) make AYP (Levels 3, 4, or 5)</p>					
		<p>5D.2. Students may struggle with strategies as a result of their disabilities.</p>	<p>5D.2. Teachers will follow students' Individual Education Plans to ensure that the students' accommodations are followed carefully. ESE department will ensure that classroom teachers have a copy of the IEPs for each student assigned.</p>	<p>5D.2. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, ZHS ESE department, classroom teachers.</p>	<p>5D.2. Review of lesson plans for implementation of appropriate strategies and accommodations as indicated by IEPs.</p>	<p>5D.2. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during walkthroughs and classroom observations.</p>	



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

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>	5E.1. Instruction does not always meet the needs of individual students.	5E.1. Teachers will plan for and implement instruction to include more cooperative learning and differentiation of instruction to meet the needs of the individual students within each class by incorporating strategies they've learned through professional development opportunities & trainings provided to them.	5E.1. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	5E.1. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as FAIR and common assessments.	5E.1. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during walkthroughs and classroom observations.		
<b>Reading Goal #5E:</b> <i>By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, 50% (234) of 'Economically Disadvantaged' students will make satisfactory progress in reading.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	36% (170) at Lv 3, 4, or 5	50% (234) at Lv 3, 4, or 5					

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

		5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	
		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	

**Reading Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities</b> <small>Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.</small>						
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
Reading and Learning Strategies	All	K12 Coach and/or District Trainer	School-wide	Lunch or planning periods, ongoing	Monitoring implementation through observations/ walkthroughs and lesson plans.	ZHS Admin team & K12 reading coach
Read 180 Training	All	District Reading Trainer	Read 180 teacher(s)	Professional Development days and/or designated training dates	Monitoring implementation through observations/ walkthroughs and lesson plans.	ZHS Admin team & K12 reading coach
PS/RtI	All	District PS/RtI Trainer	PS/RtI team	Designated training dates throughout year	Roll-out of PS/RtI planning and Implementation of components	PS/RtI team
Professional Learning Communities	All	Admin	School-wide	Meetings bi-monthly	Admin monitoring monthly	Admin, selected Leadership

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

**Reading Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/ materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Read 180 materials and training	Read 180 manuals, materials, and texts	District funding	N/A
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Read 180 Technology	Software and internet resources	District funding	N/A
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Best Practices Professional Development	PD offered during planning time	NA: Trainings provided by school and district based instructional personnel	N/A
Read180 Professional Development	PD offered during planning time	NA: Trainings provided by school and district based instructional personnel	N/A
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Student and staff recognition (PS/RtI)	Donations and SAC funding (if approved)	Community donations and SAC (if approved)	Not yet determined
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:</b>			

*End of Reading Goals*

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

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

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

<b>CELLA Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition</b>					
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	

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

<p><b>1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 1.1. Language</li> <li>● No/Limited access to resources</li> <li>● No/Limited access to native language support (both at home and in school)</li> <li>● No/Limited opportunities to practice during the day</li> <li>● No/Limited prior formal schooling</li> <li>● Out of Field Teachers (not trained)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 1.1. Placement in Developmental Language Arts (select middle and high schools only)</li> <li>● Supplemental language learning software usage</li> <li>● Imagine Learning software funded through Title III (select elementary schools only)</li> <li>● Tell Me More language learning software funded through Title III (middle and high schools only)</li> <li>● Access to additional language development resources (books, dictionaries, instructional assistant, etc.)</li> <li>● Highly qualified teachers (ESOL certified/endorsed)</li> <li>● Use of best practices in the classroom</li> <li>● Coaching by the ESOL Resource Teacher for faculty and staff</li> <li>● ESOL endorsement course and other trainings for faculty and staff</li> <li>● Parent involvement and education</li> </ul>	<p><u>1.1. Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Principal</li> <li>● Assistant Principals</li> <li>● ESOL Resource Teacher</li> <li>● Classroom teacher</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 1.1. Administrative Walk-throughs</li> <li>● Teacher Evaluations/Observations</li> <li>● Student data from language learning software programs</li> <li>● Student data from FCAT, CELLA and other classroom assessments</li> <li>● AMAO data (growth and proficiency)</li> <li>● Lesson Plans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 1.1. CELLA (Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing)</li> <li>● FCAT (Reading and Writing)</li> <li>● Florida Writes</li> <li>● CELLA Online (District Eligibility test)</li> <li>● Language Learning software assessments</li> <li>● Imagine Learning reports (select elementary schools only)</li> <li>● Tell Me More assessments (middle and high schools only)</li> </ul>	
---	---	---	--	---	---	--

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

<p><b>CELLA Goal #1:</b> BY the end of the 2012-2013 school year, 50% (34) of all ELL students will be proficient in Listening/Speaking .</p>	<p>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</p>					
	<p>During the 2011-2012 school year, 31% (21) of all ELL students were proficient in Listening/Speaking.</p>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
<p>Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>	
<p><b>2. Students scoring proficient in reading.</b></p>	<p>2.1. See Barriers from Cella Goal 1</p>	<p>2.1. See strategies for Cella Goal 1</p>	<p>2.1. See Cella Goal 1</p>	<p>2.1. See Cella Goal 1</p>	<p>2.1. See Cella Goal 1</p>	
<p><b>CELLA Goal #2:</b> At the end of the 2012-2013 school year, 50% (15) of all E.L.L. students will be proficient in reading</p>	<p>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:</p>					



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

	During the 2011-2012 school year, 5% (6) of all ELL students were proficient in Listening/Speaking..					
		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**

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	
<b>3. Students scoring proficient in writing.</b>	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	
<b>CELLA Goal #3:</b>  At the end of the 2012-2013 school year, 50% (20) of all E.L.L. students will be proficient in reading	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
	During the 2011-2012 school year, 25% (10) of all ELL students were proficient in Writing					
		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**

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

**CELLA Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

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

*End of CELLA 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	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		
<p><b>1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>2.1. Students struggle with multi-step problems.</p>	<p>3.1. Teachers will regularly teach and model strategies for how to solve multi-step problems and give students opportunities for practice. Teachers will incorporate solving multi-step problems into lessons, quizzes, and tests regularly.</p>	<p>3.1. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.</p>		<p>3.1. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as Core K12 and common assessments.</p>	<p>3.1. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during classroom observations and walkthroughs.</p>		

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

<b>Mathematics Goal #1:</b> <i>By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, 30% (3) of the students tested will score at Achievement Levels 4, 5, and 6.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u> *	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u> *					
	40% (4)	50% (5)					
		1.2. Students struggle with higher order thinking questions.	3.2. Teachers will incorporate higher-order thinking questions into lessons, quizzes, and tests regularly in order to better prepare students for the application of higher order thinking skills within the content area.	3.2. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	3.2. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as Core K12 and common assessments.	3.2. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during classroom observations and walkthroughs.	
		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		

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

<p><b>2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>2.1. Students struggle with multi-step problems.</p>	<p>3.1. Teachers will regularly teach and model strategies for how to solve multi-step problems and give students opportunities for practice. Teachers will incorporate solving multi-step problems into lessons, quizzes, and tests regularly.</p>	<p>3.1. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.</p>	<p>3.1. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as Core K12 and common assessments.</p>	<p>3.1. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during classroom observations and walkthroughs.</p>		
<p><b>Mathematics Goal #2:</b>  <i>By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, 100% (8) of the students tested will score at or above Achievement Level 7.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>100% (8)</p>	<p>100% (8)</p>					
		<p>2.2. Students struggle with higher order thinking questions.</p>	<p>3.2. Teachers will incorporate higher-order thinking questions into lessons, quizzes, and tests regularly in order to better prepare students for the application of higher order thinking skills within the content area.</p>	<p>3.2. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.</p>	<p>3.2. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as Core K12 and common assessments.</p>	<p>3.2. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during classroom observations and walkthroughs.</p>	
		<p>2.3.</p>	<p>2.3.</p>	<p>2.3.</p>	<p>2.3.</p>	<p>2.3.</p>	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b>	3.1. Students struggle with multi-step problems.	3.1. Teachers will regularly teach and model strategies for how to solve multi-step problems and give students opportunities for practice. Teachers will incorporate solving multi-step problems into lessons, quizzes, and tests regularly.	3.1. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	3.1. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as Core K12 and common assessments.	3.1. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during classroom observations and walkthroughs.		
<b>Mathematics Goal #3:</b> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		3.2. Students struggle with higher order thinking questions.	3.2. Teachers will incorporate higher-order thinking questions into lessons, quizzes, and tests regularly in order to better prepare students for the application of higher order thinking skills within the content area.	3.2. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	3.2. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as Core K12 and common assessments.	3.2. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during classroom observations and walkthroughs.	



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

		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>4. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b>	3.1. Students struggle with multi-step problems.	3.1. Teachers will regularly teach and model strategies for how to solve multi-step problems and give students opportunities for practice. Teachers will incorporate solving multi-step problems into lessons, quizzes, and tests regularly.	3.1. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	3.1. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as Core K12 and common assessments.	3.1. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during classroom observations and walkthroughs.		
<b>Mathematics Goal #4:</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	100% (8)						
	100% (8)	100% (8)					
		3.2. Students struggle with higher order thinking questions.	3.2. Teachers will incorporate higher-order thinking questions into lessons, quizzes, and tests regularly in order to better prepare students for the application of higher order thinking skills within the content area.	3.2. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	3.2. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as Core K12 and common assessments.	3.2. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during classroom observations and walkthroughs.	

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

		4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	
--	--	------	------	------	------	------	--

*End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals*

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

**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]).

<b>Algebra 1 EOC Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
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		
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.</b>	1.1. Students struggle with multi-step problems.	1.1. Teachers will regularly teach and model strategies for how to solve multi-step problems and give students opportunities for practice. Teachers will incorporate solving multi-step problems into lessons, quizzes, and tests regularly. 1.2. Teachers will meet in PLC to plan teaching of ALG 1 standards	1.1. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team. 1.2. All Alg 1 teachers, department head, admin over Math.	1.1. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as Core K12 and common assessments.	1.1. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during classroom observations and walkthroughs.		

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

<p><b>Algebra 1 Goal #1:</b>   <i>By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, 46% (147) of the students tested will score at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>41% (105)</p>	<p>46% (147)</p>					
		<p>1.2. Students struggle with higher order thinking questions.</p>	<p>1.2. Teachers will incorporate higher-order thinking questions into lessons, quizzes, and tests regularly in order to better prepare students for the application of higher order thinking skills within the content area.</p>	<p>1.2. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.</p>	<p>1.2. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as Core K12 and common assessments.</p>	<p>1.2. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during classroom observations and walkthroughs.</p>	
		<p>1.3. Lessons do not often incorporate multiple levels of Depth of Knowledge activities.</p>	<p>1.3. Teachers will be offered professional development focusing on how to create/plan for lessons that incorporate multiple levels of Depth of Knowledge activities.</p>	<p>1.3. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.</p>	<p>1.3. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as Core K12 and common assessments.</p>	<p>1.3. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during classroom observations and walkthroughs.</p>	
<p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>		

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

<p><b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.</b></p>	<p>2.1. Students struggle with multi-step problems.</p>	<p>2.1. Teachers will regularly teach and model strategies for how to solve multi-step problems and give students opportunities for practice. Teachers will incorporate solving multi-step problems into lessons, quizzes, and tests regularly.</p>	<p>2.1. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.</p>	<p>2.1. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as Core K12 and common assessments.</p>	<p>2.1. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during classroom observations and walkthroughs.</p>		
<p><b>Algebra Goal #2:</b> <i>By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, 10% (75) of the students tested will score at or above Achievement Levels 4 &amp; 5 in Algebra 1.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>2% (13)</p>	<p>10% (75)</p>					
		<p>2.2. Students struggle with higher order thinking questions.</p>	<p>2.2. Teachers will incorporate higher-order thinking questions into lessons, quizzes, and tests regularly in order to better prepare students for the application of higher order thinking skills within the content area.</p>	<p>2.2. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.</p>	<p>2.2. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as Core K12 and common assessments.</p>	<p>2.2. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during classroom observations and walkthroughs.</p>	

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

		2.3. Lessons do not often incorporate multiple levels of Depth of Knowledge activities.	2.3. Teachers will be offered professional development focusing on how to create/plan for lessons that incorporate multiple levels of Depth of Knowledge activities.	2.3. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	2.3. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as Core K12 and common assessments.	2.3. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during classroom observations and walkthroughs.	
--	--	---	--	---	---	--	--

**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	
<b>3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	Baseline data 2010-2011 <i>? n/a?</i>	<b>23%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>73%</b>
<b>Algebra 1 Goal #3A:</b>  <i>By the end of the 2016/2017 school year, the school will reduce the achievement gap in Algebra by 50%.</i>							
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		
<b>3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.</b>	3B.1. Instruction does not always meet the needs of individual students.  White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1. Teachers will plan for and implement instruction to include more cooperative learning and differentiation of instruction to meet the needs of the individual students within each class by incorporating strategies they've learned through professional development opportunities/trainings provided to them.	3B.1. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	3B.1. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as CoreK12 and common assessments.	3B.1. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during classroom observations and walkthroughs.		

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

<p><b>Algebra 1 Goal #3B:</b></p> <p><i>By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, % more of the students tested within each subgroup will make satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i></p> <p>White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p>	<p><i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i></p> <p>White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p>					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	



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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.</b>	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.		
<b>Algebra 1 Goal #3C:</b> <i>By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, 50% (12) of "English Language Learners " will make Adequate Yearly Progress in Algebra I.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	0 students made satisfactory progress in Alg 1.	By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, 50% (12) of "English Language Learners " will make Adequate Yearly Progress in Algebra I.					
		3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	
		3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.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		
<b>3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.</b>	3D.1. Instruction does not always meet the needs of individual students.	3D.1. Teachers will plan for and implement instruction to include more cooperative learning and differentiation of instruction to meet the needs of the individual students within each class by incorporating strategies they've learned through professional development opportunities/trainings provided to them.	3D.1. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	3D.1. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as Core K12 and common assessments.	3D.1. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during classroom observations and walkthroughs.		
<b>Algebra 1 Goal #3D:</b> <i>By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, 50% (19) of "Students with Disabilities" will make Adequate Yearly Progress in Algebra 1.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	5 % (9)	25% (12)					

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

		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**

**June 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		
<b>3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.</b>	3E.1. Instruction does not always meet the needs of individual students.	3E.1. Teachers will plan for and implement instruction to include more cooperative learning and differentiation of instruction to meet the needs of the individual students within each class by incorporating strategies they've learned through professional development opportunities/trainings provided to them.	3E.1. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	3E.1. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as Core K12 and common assessments.	3E.1. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during classroom observations and walkthroughs.		
<b>Algebra 1 Goal #3E:</b> <i>By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, 50% (80) of "Economically Disadvantaged" will make Adequate Yearly Progress in Algebra 1.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	36% (52)	50% (80)					

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

		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*

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

**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						
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 Geometry.	1.1. Students struggle with multi-step problems.	1.1. Teachers will regularly teach and model strategies for how to solve multi-step problems and give students opportunities for practice. Teachers will incorporate solving multi-step problems into lessons, quizzes, and tests regularly.	1.1. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	1.1. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as Core K12 and common assessments.	1.1. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during classroom observations and walkthroughs.		



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

<p><b>Geometry Goal #1:</b> <i>By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, 30% (175) of the students tested will score at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>25% (151)</p>	<p>30% (175) of all students tested will achieve level 3</p>					
		<p>1.2. Students struggle with higher order thinking questions.</p>	<p>1.2. Teachers will incorporate higher-order thinking questions into lessons, quizzes, and tests regularly in order to better prepare students for the application of higher order thinking skills within the content area.</p>	<p>1.2. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.</p>	<p>1.2. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as Core K12 and common assessments.</p>	<p>1.2. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during classroom observations and walkthroughs.</p>	
		<p>1.3. Lessons do not often incorporate multiple levels of Depth of Knowledge activities.</p>	<p>1.3. Teachers will be offered professional development focusing on how to create/plan for lessons that incorporate multiple levels of Depth of Knowledge activities.</p>	<p>1.3. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.</p>	<p>1.3. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as Core K12 and common assessments.</p>	<p>1.3. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during classroom observations and walkthroughs.</p>	
<p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:</p>	<p><u>Anticipated Barrier</u></p>	<p><u>Strategy</u></p>	<p><u>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</u></p>	<p><u>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</u></p>	<p><u>Evaluation Tool</u></p>		

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

<p><b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.</b></p>	<p>2.1. Students struggle with multi-step problems.</p>	<p>2.1. Teachers will regularly teach and model strategies for how to solve multi-step problems and give students opportunities for practice. Teachers will incorporate solving multi-step problems into lessons, quizzes, and tests regularly.</p>	<p>2.1. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.</p>	<p>2.1. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as Core K12 and common assessments.</p>	<p>2.1. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during classroom observations and walkthroughs.</p>		
<p><b>Geometry Goal #2:</b> <i>By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, _% ( ) of the students tested will score at or above Achievement Levels 4 &amp; 5 in Geometry.</i></p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p>					
	<p>53% (316)</p>	<p>58% (333) of all students tested will achieve level 4 or higher in Geometry</p>					
		<p>2.2. Students struggle with higher order thinking questions.</p>	<p>2.2. Teachers will incorporate higher-order thinking questions into lessons, quizzes, and tests regularly in order to better prepare students for the application of higher order thinking skills within the content area.</p>	<p>2.2. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.</p>	<p>2.2. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as Core K12 and common assessments.</p>	<p>2.2. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during classroom observations and walkthroughs.</p>	

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

		2.3. Lessons do not often incorporate multiple levels of Depth of Knowledge activities.	2.3. Teachers will be offered professional development focusing on how to create/plan for lessons that incorporate multiple levels of Depth of Knowledge activities.	2.3. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	2.3. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as Core K12 and common assessments.	2.3. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during classroom observations and walkthroughs.	
--	--	---	--	---	---	--	--

**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		
<b>3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	<b>Baseline data 2011-2012</b> <u>78% of all students at level 3 or higher in Geometry</u>	<b>80%</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>89%</b>	
<u>Geometry Goal #3A:</u> <i>By the end of the 2016/2017 school year, the school will reduce the achievement gap by 50%.</i>							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p><b>3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.</b></p>	<p>3B.1. Instruction does not always meet the needs of individual students.  White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p>	<p>3B.1. Teachers will plan for and implement instruction to include more cooperative learning and differentiation of instruction to meet the needs of the individual students within each class by incorporating strategies they've learned through professional development opportunities/trainings provided to them.</p>	<p>3B.1. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.</p>	<p>3B.1. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as CoreK12 and common assessments.</p>	<p>3B.1. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during classroom observations and walkthroughs.</p>		
<p><b>Geometry Goal #3B:</b>  <i>By the end of the 2012/2013 school year,_% more of the students tested within each subgroup will make satisfactory progress in Geometry.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p>	<p><i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p>					

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

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.</b>	3C.1. Inability to comprehend math related terms in native language due to language load.	3C.1. Increase fluency of terms through the use of differentiated instruction and inclusion within the learning environment. Dictate validity and reliability of materials to ensure materials are testing appropriate skills.	3C.1. ESOL Resource Teacher ZHS admin team Co-Math Department Heads Math teachers	3C.1. Review of FCAT and Benchmark testing data.	3C.1. FCAT Data Benchmark Data		
<b>Geometry Goal #3C:</b>  <i>By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, 50% (2) of "English Language Learners " will make Adequate Yearly Progress in Geometry.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	0 % (0)	50% (2)					



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

		3D.2. Students will struggle with higher ordering thinking questions.	3D.2. Teachers will incorporate higher order thinking questions according to Webb's Depth of Knowledge into lessons, quizzes, and tests to better prepare students for the use of higher order thinking skills. Teachers will also use data from Benchmark testing to help guide their focus within the Instructional Focus Calendars.	3D.2. ZHS admin team Co-Math Department Heads Math teachers	3D.2. Review of FCAT and Benchmark testing data.	3D.2. FCAT Data Benchmark Data	
		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		
<b>3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.</b>	3D.1. Students will struggle with math concepts as a result of their disabilities.	3D.1. Teachers will follow students Individual Education Plans to ensure that the student's accommodations are met.	3D.1. ZHS admin team ESE Case Manager Co-Math Department Heads Math teachers	3D.1. Review of FCAT and Benchmark testing data.	3D.1. FCAT Data Benchmark Data		

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

<b>Geometry Goal #3D:</b>  <i>By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, % ( ) of "Students with Disabilities" will make Adequate Yearly Progress in Geometry.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		3D.2. Students will struggle with higher ordering thinking questions.	3D.2. Teachers will incorporate higher order thinking questions according to Webb's Depth of Knowledge into lessons, quizzes, and tests to better prepare students for the use of higher order thinking skills. Teachers will also use data from Benchmark testing to help guide their focus within the Instructional Focus Calendars.	3D.2. ZHS admin team ESE Case Manager Co-Math Department Heads Math teachers	3D.2. Review of FCAT and Benchmark testing data.	3D.2. FCAT Data Benchmark Data	
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.</b>	3E.1. Students will struggle due to low socioeconomic status.	3E.1. Teachers will provide opportunities for students to use technology that may not be in the home through the use of the learning lab and "rolling computer labs."	3E.1. ZHS admin team Student Success Team Co-Math Department Heads Math Teachers	3E.1. Review of FCAT and Benchmark testing data.	3E.1. FCAT data Benchmark data		
<b>Geometry Goal #3E:</b> <i>By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, _% ( ) of "Economically Disadvantaged Students " will make Adequate Yearly Progress in Geometry.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					

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

		3E.2. Students will struggle with higher ordering thinking questions.	3E.2. Teachers will incorporate higher order thinking questions according to Webb's Depth of Knowledge into lessons, quizzes, and tests to better prepare students for the use of higher order thinking skills. Teachers will also use data from Benchmark testing to help guide their focus within the Instructional	3E.2. FCAT data Benchmark data	3E.2. Review of FCAT and Benchmark testing data.	3E.2. FCAT data Benchmark data	
		3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	

*End of Geometry EOC Goals*

**Mathematics Professional Development**

<p><b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities</b> Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.</p>						
<p>PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus</p>	<p>Grade Level/ Subject</p>	<p>PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader</p>	<p>PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)</p>	<p>Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)</p>	<p>Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>
<p>Math and Learning Strategies.</p>	<p>All</p>	<p>K12 Coach, Math Department Head and/or District Trainer</p>	<p>School-wide</p>	<p>Lunch or planning periods, ongoing</p>	<p>Monitoring implementation through observations/ walkthroughs and lesson plans.</p>	<p>ZHS Admin team &amp;</p>

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

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

PS/RtI	All	District PS/RtI Trainer	PS/RtI team	Designated training dates throughout year	Roll-out of PS/RtI planning and Implementation of components	PS/RtI team

**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
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Professional Learning Communities	PLC's required regular meeting during planning time.	N.A. – District and school supported	N/A
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Staff Recognition Student Recognition	Pending SAC Approval	Community resources SAC	TBD
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:</b>			

*End of Mathematics Goals*

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

**Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals**

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

<b>High School Science Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
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		
<b>1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.</b>	1.1. Science instruction does not always include student-centered learning activities, labs, and technology.	1.1. Teachers will include student-centered activities within their courses by incorporating supplemental and technology resources available through the course textbook as well as strategies learned through professional development opportunities.	1.1. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	1.1. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as Core K12 and common assessments.	1.1. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during classroom observations and walkthroughs, Biology EOC		



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

<p><b>Science Goal #1:</b> <i>By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, 33% (1) of the students tested will score at Achievement Levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>33% (1)</p>	<p>66% (2)</p>					
		<p>1.2. Student attendance issues (tardies and absences).</p>	<p>1.2. Implementation of a tardy table. Rtl Team will review attendance data. Student recognition of positive behaviors on campus.</p>	<p>1.2. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.</p>	<p>1.2. Review of student tardy and absence records/reports. Review of participation in the Positive Behavior Reward System.</p>	<p>1.2. Attendance reports</p>	
		<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	
<p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>		

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

<p><b>2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.</b></p>	<p>1.1. Science instruction does not always include student-centered learning activities, labs, and technology.</p>	<p>1.1. Teachers will include student-centered activities within their courses by incorporating supplemental and technology resources available through the course textbook as well as strategies learned through professional development opportunities.</p>	<p>1.1. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.</p>	<p>1.1. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as Core K12 and common assessments.</p>	<p>1.1. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during classroom observations and walkthroughs, Biology EOC</p>		
<p><u>Science Goal #2:</u> <i>By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, 66% (2) of the students tested will score at or above Achievement Level 7 in Science.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>33% (1)</p>	<p>66% (2)</p>					
		<p>2.1. Students struggle with higher order thinking questions.</p>	<p>2.1. Teachers will incorporate higher-order thinking questions into lessons, quizzes, and tests regularly in order to better prepare students for the application of higher order thinking skills within the content area.</p>	<p>2.1. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.</p>	<p>2.1. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as Core K12 and common assessments.</p>	<p>2.1. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during classroom observations and walkthroughs.</p>	

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

		2.2. Lessons do not often incorporate multiple levels of Depth of Knowledge activities.	2.2. Teachers will be offered professional development focusing on how to create/plan for lessons that incorporate multiple levels of Depth of Knowledge activities.	2.2. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	2.2. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as Core K12 and common assessments.	2.2. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during classroom observations and walkthroughs.	

*End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals*

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

**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]).

<b>Biology 1 EOC Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
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		
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.</b>	1.1. Science instruction does not always include student-centered learning activities, labs, and technology.	1.1. Teachers will include student-centered activities within their courses by incorporating supplemental and technology resources available through the course textbook as well as strategies learned through professional development opportunities.	1.1. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	1.1. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as Core K12 and common assessments.	1.1. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during classroom observations and walkthroughs, Biology EOC		

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

<p><b>Biology 1 Goal #1:</b> <i>By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, 140 (40%) of the students tested will score at Achievement Level 3 in Biology.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>23% (79)</p>	<p>40% (140)</p>					
		<p>1.2. Student attendance issues (tardies and absences).</p>	<p>1.2. Implementation of a tardy table. Rtl Team will review attendance data. Student recognition of positive behaviors on campus.</p>	<p>1.2. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.</p>	<p>1.2. Review of student tardy and absence records/reports. Review of participation in the Positive Behavior Reward System.</p>	<p>1.2. Attendance reports</p>	
		<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	
<p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>		
<p><b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.</b></p>	<p>2.1. Students struggle with higher order thinking questions.</p>	<p>2.1. Teachers will incorporate higher-order thinking questions into lessons, quizzes, and tests regularly in order to better prepare students for the application of higher order thinking skills within the content area.</p>	<p>2.1. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.</p>	<p>2.1. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as Core K12 and common assessments.</p>	<p>2.1. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during classroom observations and walkthroughs.</p>		

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

<b>Biology 1 Goal #2:</b>  <i>By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, 30% (105) of the students tested will score at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	19%(68)	30% (105)					
		2.2. Lessons do not often incorporate multiple levels of Depth of Knowledge activities.	2.2. Teachers will be offered professional development focusing on how to create/plan for lessons that incorporate multiple levels of Depth of Knowledge activities.	2.2. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	2.2. Review of lesson plans for implementation of strategies. Review of student performance through progress monitoring tools, such as Core K12 and common assessments.	2.2. Common assessments to determine student achievement. Attendance for professional development opportunities. Evidence of implementation as recorded in lesson plans and seen during classroom observations and walkthroughs.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

*End of Biology 1 EOC Goals*

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

**Science Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> 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 and Learning Strategies	All	K12 Coach, Science Department Head and/or District Trainer	School-wide	Lunch or planning periods, ongoing	Monitoring implementation through observations/ walkthroughs and lesson plans.	ZHS Admin team
Science Trainings using new textbooks and supplemental materials	Science teachers	Science Department Head or District trainer	Science Teachers	Lunch or planning periods, ongoing	Monitoring implementation through observations/ walkthroughs and lesson plans.	ZHS Admin team
PS/RtI	All	District PS/RtI Trainer	PS/RtI team	Designated training dates throughout year	Roll-out of PS/RtI planning and Implementation of components	PS/RtI team

**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

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Best Practices Professional Development	PD offered during planning time	NA: Trainings provided by school and district based instructional personnel	N/A
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Student and staff recognition (PS/RTI)	Donations and SAC funding (if approved)	Community donations and SAC (if approved)	Not yet determined
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:</b>			

*End of Science Goals*



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

**Writing Goals**

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

<b>Writing Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
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		
<b>1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.</b>	1A.1. Students are not provided with enough opportunities for extended writing activities through their content area classes.	1A.1. Writing workshops will be implemented through content area classes to provide instruction and support through the use of DRAPES and the 6 Traits of Writing methods.	1A.1. Classroom teachers, K12 Literacy Specialist, ZHS Admin team	1A.1. School-wide, classroom, and individual student progress in writing will be monitored through regularly scheduled writing assessments throughout the year.	1A.1. "Bulldog Writes" scores, FCAT writing		
<b>Writing Goal #1A:</b> <i>By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, 85% (306) of the students tested will score at Achievement Level 4 in Writing.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

	81% (292)	85% (306)					
		IA.2. Students have few opportunities to engage in content-specific writing across the curriculum.	IA.2. Teachers will incorporate content-specific writing into their lessons and include opportunities for mini-writing assignments weekly to summarize activities. (Writing across the curriculum)	IA.2. Classroom teachers, K12 Literacy Specialist, ZHS Admin team	IA.2. Administrative and instructional review of bi-monthly writing samples from each class to determine areas of need (for mini-lessons or direct instruction).	IA.2. FCAT Writes and 6 Traits of Writing (core)	
		IA.3.	IA.3.	IA.3.	IA.3.	IA.3.	
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.</b>	IB.1. Students are not provided with enough opportunities for extended writing activities through their content area classes.	IB.1. A school-wide initiative, "Bulldog Writes", and writing workshops will be implemented through content area classes to provide instruction and support through the use of DRAPES and the 6 Traits of Writing methods.	IB.1. Classroom teachers, K12 Literacy Specialist, ZHS Admin team	IB.1. School-wide, classroom, and individual student progress in writing will be monitored through regularly scheduled writing assessments throughout the year.	IB.1. "Bulldog Writes" scores, FCAT writing		
<b>Writing Goal #1B:</b> <i>By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, 100% (6) of the students tested will score at or above Achievement Level 4 in Writing.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	100% (6)	100% (6)					

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

		IB.2. Students have few opportunities to engage in content-specific writing across the curriculum.	IB.2. Teachers will incorporate content-specific writing into their lessons and include opportunities for mini-writing assignments weekly to summarize activities. (Writing across the curriculum)	IB.2. Classroom teachers, K12 Literacy Specialist, ZHS Admin team	IB.2. Administrative and instructional review of bi-monthly writing samples from each class to determine areas of need (for mini-lessons or direct instruction).	IB.2. FCAT Writes and 6 Traits of Writing (core)	
		IB.3.	IB.3.	IB.3.	IB.3.	IB.3.	

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

Writing Professional Development

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> 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
Writing and Learning Strategies	All	K12 Coach, Language Arts Department Head and/or District Trainer	School-wide	Lunch or planning periods, ongoing	Monitoring implementation through observations/ walkthroughs and lesson plans.	ZHS Admin team
PS/RtI	All	District PS/RtI Trainer	PS/RtI team	Designated training dates throughout year	Roll-out of PS/RtI planning and Implementation of components	PS/RtI team

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
<b>Subtotal:</b>			

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

Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Writing Professional Development	PD offered during planning time	NA: Trainings provided by school and district based instructional personnel	N/A
RtI Professional Development	PD offered during planning time	NA: Trainings provided by school and district based instructional personnel	N/A
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Student and staff recognition (PS/RtI)	Donations and SAC funding (if approved)	Community donations and SAC (if approved)	Not yet determined
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:</b>			

*End of Writing Goals*

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

**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]).

<b>Civics EOC Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
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		
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.</b>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
<b>Civics Goal #1:</b> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

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		
<b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.</b>	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
<b>Civics Goal #2:</b> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		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**

**Civics Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> 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

**Civics 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
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount



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

<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:</b>			

*End of Civics Goals*

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

**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]).

<b>U.S. History EOC Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
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		
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.</b>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
<b>U.S. History Goal #1:</b> <i>By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, _% ( ) of the students tested will score at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.		

**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		
<b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.</b>	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
<b>U.S. History Goal #2:</b> <i>By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, _% ( ) of the students tested will score at or above Achievement Levels 4 &amp; 5 in U.S. History.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		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**

**U.S. History Professional Development**

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

**U.S. History Budget (Insert rows as needed)**

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

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

<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:</b>			

*End of U.S. History Goals*

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

**Attendance Goal(s)**

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

<b>Attendance Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance</b>						
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		
<b>1. Attendance</b>	1.1. Attendance issues have progressively worsened due to patterns not being recognized and/or attended to quickly and effectively.	1.1. Teachers will meet and discuss student progress regularly where they will identify patterns of attendance issues and work with other groups to provide early support and interventions.	1.1. ZHS Admin team, ZHS Leadership Team, Graduation Enhancement Coach, Social Worker, RtI Team	1.1. Monitor attendance rates and identify beneficial strategies used to encourage better attendance.	1.1. Attendance reports		
<b>Attendance Goal #1:</b> <i>By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, there will be a 2% increase in student attendance from 75% to 77% of students with good attendance.</i>	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					

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

	<i>Enter numerical data for current attendance rate in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected attendance rate in this box.</i>					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>					
	47%( 728)	25% (375)					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>					
	3%(47)	1% (15)					
		1.2. Student attendance issues (tardies and absences) due to little recognition/consequence in the past.	1.2. Implementation of a tardy table. Rtl Team will review attendance data. Student recognition of positive behaviors on campus.	1.2. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	1.2. Review of student tardy and absence records/reports. Review of participation in the Positive Behavior Reward System.	1.2. Attendance reports	
		1.3. Students with "tardy" issues due to little recognition/consequence in the past.	1.3. Implementation of a tardy table. Rtl Team will review attendance data.	1.3. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	1.3. Review of student tardy and absence records/reports.	1.3. Attendance reports	

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

**Attendance Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> 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
PS/RtI	All	District PS/RtI Trainer	PS/RtI team	Designated training dates throughout year	Roll-out of PS/RtI planning and Implementation of components	PS/RtI team

**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
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Tardy Database	Utilized at Tardy Table	Designed in-district	N/A

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



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

Computer & Printer for Tardy Table	Media Center Resource	District purchase/upgrade of computers	N/A
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
RtI Training/Professional Development	PD offered during planning time	NA: Trainings provided by school and district based instructional personnel	N/A
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Student and staff recognition (PS/RtI)	Donations and SAC funding (if approved)	Community donations and SAC (if approved)	Not yet determined
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:</b>			

*End of Attendance Goals*

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

**Suspension Goal(s)**

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

<b>Suspension Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension</b>						
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		
<b>1. Suspension</b>	1.1. Lack of consistency as to appropriate interventions to diffuse disciplinary situations and lack of communication with parents before matters become worse.	1.1.a Teachers utilize PS/RTI procedures to provide support for necessary interventions by teaching and modeling appropriate behaviors on campus.  1.1.b. Teachers and students review to the ZHS behavior matrix regularly throughout the year as they demonstrate appropriate behaviors across campus.	1.1. ZHS Admin team, ZHS Leadership team, RTI team, and Discipline Committee.	1.1. Discipline Committee and RTI team will track referrals and other support interventions through the S.W.I.T.S. data system..	1.1. S.W.I.T.S. data collection system and/or Incidence Reports		
Suspension Goal #1:  <i>By the end of the 2012/2013 school year, there will be a 2% reduction in the percentage of students suspended, in and out of school.</i>	<u>525 ISS days in 2011-2012</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions will be 490</u>					

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

	525 students served ISS in 2011-2012	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School					
	376	376					
	2012 330 Out-of- School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	248	225					
	330 students were suspended out of school during 2011- 2012	A drop of 10%(297) for the number of students suspended out of school					
	248	225					
		1.2. Negative/poor student behavior issues due to little positive recognition in the past.	1.2. Implementation of a Positive Behavior System to recognize good behaviors. RtI Team will review Discipline data.	1.2. ZHS Admin team, K12 Literacy Coach, and ZHS Leadership Team.	1.2. Review of student discipline records/ reports and attendance to Positive Behavior rewards planned throughout the year.	1.2. Discipline reports.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

**Suspension Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> 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
PS/RtI	All	District PS/RtI Trainer	PS/RtI team	Designated training dates throughout year	Roll-out of PS/RtI planning and Implementation of components	PS/RtI team

**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
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
PS/RtI Professional Development	PD offered during planning time	NA: Trainings provided by school and district based instructional personnel	N/A
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Student and staff recognition (PS/RtI)	Donations and SAC funding (if approved)	Community donations and SAC (if approved)	Not yet determined
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:</b>			

*End of Suspension Goals*

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

**Dropout Prevention Goal(s)**

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

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

<b>Dropout Prevention Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention</b>						
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		
<b>1. Dropout Prevention</b>	1.1. Students lack of awareness of graduation requirements and have not earned enough credits and have GPAs > 2.0.	1.1. Through the implementation of APEX Credit Recovery program, and careful monitoring by the Graduation Enhancement and Prevention/ Intervention Counselors, students will have the opportunity to work towards earning credits they have fallen behind in, according to their graduation plan/ cohort.	1.1. GEP, SSAP, Prevention/ Intervention Specialists, Guidance counselors, ZHS Administration team.	1.1. Monitor progress/percent of students targeted within the graduation enhancement program.	1.1. Mastery of progress towards courses completed through the use of the APEX Credit Recovery program.		

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

<b>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</b>  <i>Increase of 2% for Graduation Rate</i>	<u>2012 Current Dropout Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*</u>					
	.5	.2					
	<u>2012 Current Graduation Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*</u>					
	85.3	87.3					
		1.2. Students and parents are not aware of graduation requirements.	1.2. Parents/guardians will be notified about students who are at risk of falling behind through either letter or phone contact.	1.2. ZHS Admin team, guidance counselors, Prevention Intervention Specialist,	1.2. Identify and monitor the progress of At-Risk students through regular reviews of FCAT data, attendance, and GPA.	1.2. FCAT, Attendance reports, GPA/Credits earned by grad-plan reports.	
		1.3 The transition to high school can be very difficult for some students.	1.3. Implementation of a 9th Grade Academy where students are grouped with specific teams of teachers who work closely together to ensure students' needs are met through a gradual release model.	1.3. ZHS Admin team, 9th Grade teams	1.3. Ongoing progress monitoring of students to identify students who are at risk of becoming Off-Track for graduation.	1.3. GPA, Attendance, Credits earned.	

**Dropout Prevention Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or							
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

PLC activity. PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PS/RtI	All	District PS/RtI Trainer	PS/RtI team	Designated training dates throughout year	Roll-out of PS/RtI planning and Implementation of components	PS/RtI team
APEX Training	All	District Trainer and designated AP	APEX teacher, Graduation Enhancement Counselor, Drop-out Intervention Specialist, AP	Designated training dates	Analysis of data regarding performance of students at-risk participating in APEX course	ZHS Admin team



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

**Dropout Prevention Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
APEX Program	Internet based resource/program	N/A: District funding	N/A
Computer Lab for APEX	Computers for Classroom-lab	N/A: Computers shifted from other classrooms and labs not already designated for specific purposes.	N/A
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
PS/RtI Professional Development	PD offered during planning time	NA: Trainings provided by school and district based instructional personnel	N/A
APEX Professional Development	PD offered during planning time and planning week for designated staff	NA: Trainings provided by district based instructional personnel	N/A
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Student and staff recognition (PS/RtI)	Donations and SAC funding (if approved)	Community donations and SAC (if approved)	Not yet determined
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:</b>			

*End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)*

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

**Parent Involvement Goal(s)**

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

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

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

<b>Parent Involvement Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement</b>						
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		
<b>1. Parent Involvement</b>	1.1. Students and families are often engaged in activities outside school.	1.1. Continue offering a variety of after-school programs which will interest a variety of students and family members throughout the year.	1.1. ZHS Admin team, Athletic Director, coaches, and club sponsors	1.1. Review of data collected through surveys and volunteer hours.	1.1. Surveys, volunteer sign-in/out sheets, continued awarding of the 5 Star School Award.		

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

<p><u>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</u></p> <p>At least 60% of ZHS parents will continue their participation in school events and school related activities.</p> <p><i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement*</u></p>					
	<p>Enter numerical data for current level of parent involvement in this box.</p>	<p>Enter numerical data for expected level of parent involvement in this box.</p>					
		<p>1.2. Students and families are often engaged in activities outside school.</p>	<p>1.2. School website and Connect-Ed messages will provide families information about school-based events and functions.</p>	<p>1.2. ZHS Admin team, Athletic Director, coaches, club sponsors, and website coordinator.</p>	<p>1.2. Review of data collected through surveys and volunteer hours.</p>	<p>1.2. Surveys, volunteer sign-in/out sheets, continued awarding of the 5 Star School Award.</p>	
		<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	

## Parent Involvement Professional Development

<p><b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b></p> <p>Please note that each Strategy does not require a</p>						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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

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

**Parent Involvement Budget**

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
School Website and Connect-Ed (phone contact resource)	Technology-based resources to disseminate messages through phone and internet.	N/A: District provided	N/A
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:</b>			

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>STEM Goal #1:</b> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	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.

**STEM Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> <small>Please note that each Strategy does not require a</small>						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

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

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

**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
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:</b>			

*End of STEM Goal(s)*



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

**Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)**

<b>CTE Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
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
<b>CTE Goal #1:</b> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	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**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> <small>Please note that each Strategy does not require a</small>						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

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

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

**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
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:</b>			

*End of CTE Goal(s)*

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

**Additional Goal(s)**

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

<b>Additional Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
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		
<b>1. Additional Goal</b>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
<b>Additional Goal #1:</b> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box.</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

**Additional Goals Professional Development**

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

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

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

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

*End of Additional Goal(s)*

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

**Final Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
<b>Reading Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>CELLA Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Mathematics Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Science Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Writing Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Civics Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>U.S. History Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Attendance Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Suspension Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Dropout Prevention Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Parent Involvement Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>STEM Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>CTE Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Additional Goals</b>	<b>Total:</b>

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

<b>Grand Total:</b>
---------------------



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

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

**Differentiated Accountability**

**School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance**

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

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

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

**School Advisory Council (SAC)**

*SAC Membership Compliance*

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

- Yes       No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.
Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
--	--------

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