

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



School Improvement Plan (SIP)

East Ridge High School

2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: East Ridge High School	District Name: Lake
Principal: Julie M. Robinson-Lueallen	Superintendent: Dr. Susan Moxley
SAC Chair: Tracey Everett	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.

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Julie Robinson-Lueallen	Master of Education, University of Southern Mississippi Bachelor of Science in Business Administration, Tusculum College Certification: Educational Leadership (All Levels), School Principal (All Levels), Business Education (Grades 6-12), Reading Endorsement	3	14	<p>Principal of East Ridge High School 2011-2012, School Grade "Pending", Total FCAT Points 529, Total Performance Points 204, Total Gain Points 259, Reading Mastery 51%, Math Mastery 70%, Science Mastery NA, Writing-(3.5) 83%, Improve Reading 61%, Improve in Math 66%, Lowest 25% Improve in Reading 62%, Lowest 25% Improve in Math 70%. Participation/Performance "Pending".</p> <p>Principal of East Ridge High School 2010-2011, School Grade "B" Total FCAT Points 442, Total Performance Points 226, Total Gain Points 216, Reading Mastery 47%, Math Mastery 69%, Science Mastery 33%, Writing Mastery 77%, Reading LG 49%, Math LG 70%, Lowest 25% Improve in Reading 43%, Lowest 25% Improve in Math 54%; AYP: No Subgroups made AYP in Math, No Subgroups except Blacks made AYP in Reading 31% via Safe Harbor, All Subgroups met Writing AYP; White 95%, Black 95%, Hispanic 91%, Asian 94%, Econ. Dis 93%, ELL 71%, SWD 86%.</p> <p>Principal of Eustis Middle School 2009-2010, School Grade "A"-559 Points, Reading Mastery 76, Math Mastery 68, Science Mastery 54, Writing Mastery 89%, Lowest 25% improve in Reading 75, Lowest 25% improve in Math 63, AYP:77% No, Black and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP in Reading. White, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP in Math.</p> <p>Principal of Eustis Elementary School 2008-2009, School Grade: "A" -625 Points, AYP: Yes: Reading Mastery 78%, Math Mastery 79%, Science Mastery 68%, Writing Mastery 98%.Lowest 25% improve in Reading, Lowest 25% improve in Math, AYP-African American and Hispanic made via Safe Harbor or Growth Model.</p> <p>Principal of Eustis Elementary School 2007-2008, School Grade "A" -574 Points, AYP: Yes, Reading Mastery 74%, Math Mastery 76%, Science Mastery 43%, Writing Mastery 83%. Lowest 25% improve in Reading, Lowest 25% improve in Math, AA, American and Hispanic made AYP via Safe Harbor or Growth Model.</p>

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

Assistant Principal I	Sebrina Dillon-Banks	<p>Master of Science-Educational Leadership from Nova Southeastern University</p> <p>Bachelor of Science in Communication Disorders/Minor in Special Education from Middle Tennessee State University</p>	8	7	<p>Assistant Principal at East Ridge High School 2011-2012, School Grade “Pending”, Total FCAT Points 529, Total Performance Points 204, Total Gain Points 259, Reading Mastery 51%, Math Mastery 70%, Science Mastery NA, Writing-(3.5) 83%, Improve Reading 61%, Improve in Math 66%, Lowest 25% Improve in Reading 62%, Lowest 25% Improve in Math 70%. Participation/Performance “Pending”.</p> <p>Assistant Principal at East Ridge High School 2010-2011, School Grade “B” , Total FCAT Points 442, Total Performance Points 226, Total Gain Points 216, Reading Mastery 47%, Math Mastery 69%, Science Mastery 33%, Writing Mastery 77%, Reading LG 49%, Math LG 70%, Lowest 25% Improve in Reading 43%, Lowest 25% Improve in Math 54%; AYP: No Subgroups made AYP in Math, No Subgroups except Blacks made AYP in Reading 31% via Safe Harbor, All Subgroups met Writing AYP; White 95%, Black 95%, Hispanic 91%, Asian 94%, Econ. Dis 93%, ELL 71%, SWD 86%.</p> <p>Assistant Principal at East Ridge High School 2009-2010, School Grade "Unknown", Reading Mastery 44%, Math Mastery 76%, Science Mastery 33%, Lowest 25% improve in Reading 37%, Lowest 25% improve in Math 58%, AYP:69% No, White, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP in Reading. Black Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP in Math.</p>
Assistant Principal I	Jacob Stein	<p>Educational Specialist. Educational Leadership: NOVA University</p> <p>Masters in Varying Exceptionalities: NOVA University</p> <p>BA/Physical Education: West Liberty State</p> <p>Certifications: Educational Leadership, Exceptional Education K-12, Physical Education K-8 Science</p>	7	3	<p>Assistant Principal at East Ridge High School 2011-2012, School Grade “Pending”, Total FCAT Points 529, Total Performance Points 204, Total Gain Points 259, Reading Mastery 51%, Math Mastery 70%, Science Mastery NA, Writing-(3.5) 83%, Improve Reading 61%, Improve in Math 66%, Lowest 25% Improve in Reading 62%, Lowest 25% Improve in Math 70%. Participation/Performance “Pending”.</p> <p>Assistant Principal at East Ridge High School 2010-2011, School Grade “B” , Total FCAT Points 442, Total Performance Points 226, Total Gain Points 216, Reading Mastery 47%, Math Mastery 69%, Science Mastery 33%, Writing Mastery 77%, Reading LG 49%, Math LG 70%, Lowest 25% Improve in Reading 43%, Lowest 25% Improve in Math 54%; AYP: No Subgroups made AYP in Math, No Subgroups except Blacks made AYP in Reading 31% via Safe Harbor, All Subgroups met Writing AYP; White 95%, Black 95%, Hispanic 91%, Asian 94%, Econ. Dis 93%, ELL 71%, SWD 86%.</p> <p>Assistant Principal at Windy Hill Middle School 2009-2010 School Grade: “A” School, Reading Mastery 67%, Math Mastery 67%; AYP 77%, Black, ELL, and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP in</p>

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

					reading or math; Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in reading.
--	--	--	--	--	---

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

<p>Assistant Principal II</p>	<p>Paul Wheeler</p>	<p>Educational Specialist in Educational Leadership from National Louis University Master of Science in Guidance and Counseling from Barry University Bachelor of Arts in History from St. Anselm College</p>	<p>7</p>	<p>7</p>	<p>Assistant Principal at East Ridge High School 2011-2012, School Grade “Pending”, Total FCAT Points 529, Total Performance Points 204, Total Gain Points 259, Reading Mastery 51%, Math Mastery 70%, Science Mastery NA, Writing-(3.5) 83%, Improve Reading 61%, Improve in Math 66%, Lowest 25% Improve in Reading 62%, Lowest 25% Improve in Math 70%. Participation/Performance “Pending”.</p> <p>Assistant Principal at East Ridge High School 2010-2011, School Grade “B” , Total FCAT Points 442, Total Performance Points 226, Total Gain Points 216, Reading Mastery 47%, Math Mastery 69%, Science Mastery 33%, Writing Mastery 77%, Reading LG 49%, Math LG 70%, Lowest 25% Improve in Reading 43%, Lowest 25% Improve in Math 54%; AYP: No Subgroups made AYP in Math, No Subgroups except Blacks made AYP in Reading 31% via Safe Harbor, All Subgroups met Writing AYP; White 95%, Black 95%, Hispanic 91%, Asian 94%, Econ. Dis 93%, ELL 71%, SWD 86%.</p> <p>Assistant Principal at East Ridge High School 2009-2010, School Grade "Unknown", Reading Mastery 44%, Math Mastery 76%, Science Mastery 33%, Lowest 25% improve in Reading 37%, Lowest 25% improve in Math 58%, AYP:69% No, White, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP in Reading. Black Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP in Math.</p>
<p>Assistant Principal II</p>	<p>Melissa Frana</p>	<p>Educational Specialist in Educational Leadership from National Lewis University Master in Physical Education Mississippi State University Bachelor of Science-Health and Human Performance University of Florida</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>Teacher at East Ridge High School 2011-2012, School Grade “Pending”, Total FCAT Points 529, Total Performance Points 204, Total Gain Points 259, Reading Mastery 51%, Math Mastery 70%, Science Mastery NA, Writing-(3.5) 83%, Improve Reading 61%, Improve in Math 66%, Lowest 25% Improve in Reading 62%, Lowest 25% Improve in Math 70%. Participation/Performance “Pending”.</p> <p>Teacher at East Ridge High School 2010-2011, School Grade “B” , Total FCAT Points 442, Total Performance Points 226, Total Gain Points 216, Reading Mastery 47%, Math Mastery 69%, Science Mastery 33%, Writing Mastery 77%, Reading LG 49%, Math LG 70%, Lowest 25% Improve in Reading 43%, Lowest 25% Improve in Math 54%; AYP: No Subgroups made AYP in Math, No Subgroups except Blacks made AYP in Reading 31% via Safe Harbor, All Subgroups met Writing AYP; White 95%, Black 95%, Hispanic 91%, Asian 94%, Econ. Dis 93%, ELL 71%, SWD 86%.</p> <p>Teacher at East Ridge High School 2009-2010, School Grade "Unknown", Reading Mastery 44%, Math Mastery 76%, Science Mastery 33%, Lowest 25% improve in Reading 37%, Lowest 25% improve in Math 58%, AYP:69% No, White, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP in Reading. Black Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities did</p>

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

					not make AYP in Math.
Assistant Principal II	Brent Frazier	Educational Leadership M. Ed. Degree: Educational Leadership; BA Middle Grade Science	0	0	<p>Instructional Dean at Leesburg Elementary: 2011-12</p> <p>Teacher at Carver Middle School: 2010-2011 School Grades “ B” ,Meeting High Standards in Reading 63% , Meeting High Standards in Math 63%, Meeting High Standards in Writing 89% , Meeting High Standards in Science 46%, Making Learning Gains in Reading 55% , Making Learning Gains in Math 61% , Lowest 25% Improve in Reading 61% , Lowest 25% Improve in Math 65% , AYP (No), White – No, Black-No, Econ Dis-No, AYP math White-No, Black-No, Econ Dis-No.</p> <p>Teacher at Carver Middle School: 2009-2010 School Grade “A” , Meeting High Standards in Reading 69% .Meeting High Standards in Math 67% , Meeting High Standards in Writing 89% , Meeting High Standards in Science 54% , Making Learning Gains in Reading 62% , Making Learning Gains in Math 66% , Lowest 25% Improve in Reading 66% , Lowest 25% Improve in Math 59% , AYP Reading (No), White-No, Black-No, Econ Dis-No, AYP Math White-No, Black No, Econ Dis-No.</p>

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)
Literacy Coach	Renee Hoskinson	K-12 Admin Supervision K-6 Elem Education Reading Endorsement ESOL Endorsement	0	9	<p>2011-2012: Literacy Coach: at Windy Hill Middle School; School Grade "A"</p> <p>2010-2011: Asst. Principal at Windy Hill Middle School; School Grade "B"--- Reading Mastery 63%, Math Mastery 65%, Writing Mastery 95%, Science Mastery 47%; AYP 67%, Reading Learning Gains 60%, Reading Lowest 25%--64%, Math Learning Gains 70%, Math Lowest 25%-- 57%. No subgroups made AYP in Reading; the White subgroup made Safe Harbor in Math.</p> <p>2009-2010: Literacy Coach: at Windy Hill Middle School; "A" School, Reading Mastery 67%, Math Mastery 67%; AYP 77%, Black, ELL, and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP in reading or math; Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in reading.</p>

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

Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Induction Into Knighthood Orientation Program	Jacob Stein, Assistant Principal/TQR and selected lead teachers	New Teachers set up with highly effective and teachers who are focused on students achievement.
2. Associate Mentors for teachers new to the school. Provides answers to questions and concerns related to day to day operations and curriculum needs.	Assigned Associate Teacher Mentor	All Year (August-June)
3. Mentor teachers for teachers new to the profession. Assists in the successful completion of the Teacher Orientation Program/Portfolio and professional development	Assigned lead teachers; Nationally Board Certified teachers; Instructional Coach; Teacher Quality and Retention Administrator	August 8 2012- June 2013 Ongoing As needed
4. Month PLC with all teachers new to East Ridge High School	Jacob Stein, TQR Administrator	August 8, 2012-June 2013

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
Zero Percent (0%) Out of Field –Staff & Paraprofessional 36.59% (45) Not Highly Effective According to our Evaluation Instrument –Instructional Units	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to support through our District Module Site on TEAM Evaluation. • Recommend Staff Develop Modules for TEAM-LRC (Saturday Sessions) • Administrative and Peer Mentoring

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
123	4.88 (6)	33.33 (41)	51.22 (63)	10.57 (13)	51.22 (63)	63.41 (78)	12.2.(15)	4.88 (6)	12.2 (15)

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
Dr. Opal Mahoney	Jemison –Martin/Melson	New to Department	Planning ,Collaboration, and TEAM
Craig Shaffer		New to Math Department/Teaching	Planning ,Collaboration, and TEAM

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

Mr. Stalma		New to Language Arts Department	Planning ,Collaboration, and TEAM

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
Other

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

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team	
Identify the school-based RtI Leadership Team.	Julie Robinson-Lueallen, Principal: Supports the use of data-based decision -making strategies, assures the implementation of RtI and will ensure adequate professional development for school staff.
	Sebrina Dillon-Banks - Assistant Principal - Team Leader: Will set time, dates and agendas for meetings, ensure team members are contributing, refers to action plan and ensures utilization of data to support students/meetings.
	Ben Griffin, School Social Worker; Stacy Keaveny, Guidance Counselor -Provides information of services and expertise in assessments and interventions with students. Liaison with community and families in support of student success and achievement.
	Kristine Cavinder, ESE Specialist: Will collect data on students and will provide best practices collaboration with general education teachers.
	Renee Hoskinson, Literacy Coach - Data Master: Provide in-depth guidance on K-12 Reading plan. Will collect and analyze data for the RtI and PBS team. Will also support the implementation of the Tier Intervention Plans and provide instructional support to general education teachers. Nicole Marconi, ESE Teacher; Coral Hanson, ESE Teacher: Will participate in student data collection, will assist with instructional strategies for Tier 3 instruction. Will collaborate with general education teachers.
	Sebrina Dillon-Banks and Jacob Stein Assistant Principals- RtI/PBS Coaches - Will develop, lead and evaluate with RtI/PBS team the school standards and programs. Will identify patterns of student need and will liaise with the district personnel for staff development needs, intervention strategies, progress monitoring, data collection and analysis.
	Linda Wice, School Psychologist: Will help in the interpretation analysis of data collected. Will provide support for interventions as well as professional development and technical assistance.
	General education teachers who will provide information about curriculum and will participate in data collection and will collaborate with other teachers in the implementation of Tier 1-3 instruction in an as-needed basis. Dr. Opal Mahoney- Reading, Maria Rodriguez-Vargas- Language Arts, Nicole Moses-Science, Betty Howard-Math, Grant Mollett-Social Studies

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

Describe how the school-based RtI Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate RtI efforts? The leadership team will focus on how we involve all groups, students, staff, administrators, parents, in the development and maintenance of a single school culture where the focus is on student achievement with the goal of college and career readiness.
The team will meet once a week to collect and analyze data on students as well as teachers, which will then link to instructional decisions. Individual students will be monitored for progress in reaching benchmarks. Where there is risk of students not meeting benchmarks, the team will collaborate and build consensus on the best strategies to increase achievement. The team will be responsible for and participate in problem solving, research on best practices, evaluation of programs and implementation and decision-making strategies. Classroom teachers will be involved in the RtI meetings as necessary.
Describe the role of the school-based RtI Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? The Leadership Team has attended summer training, and has had several meetings to date. The Leadership team will meet with the School Advisory Council to education them on RtI/PBS and how it relates to East Ridge High School. Data will be provided on the Tier 1,2,3 targets and the Behaviors that will be addressed by the team. The Leadership Team will ask for input and consensus by the SAC Committee in the development of the SIP.
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?
MTSS Implementation
Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior. Tier 1-3 Reading: FCAT math scores, EOC scores, Lake Benchmark Assessment, ACT/SAT scores, eSembler, AS400, Edusoft, and FLDOE state/district/school reports. Tier 1-3 Science: FCAT Science scores, EOC scores, Lake Benchmark Assessment, ACT/SAT scores, eSembler, AS400, Edusoft, and FLDOE state/district/school reports. Tier 1-3 Writing: FCAT Writing scores, Lake Benchmark Assessment, ERHS school –wide writing plan feedback, ACT/SAT scores, eSembler, AS400, Edusoft, and FLDOE state/district/school reports. Tier 1-3 Behavior: PBS, Social Contracting, Attendance Policy, Lake County Schools Student Code of Conduct, AS400, and FLDOE state/district/school reports.
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. A team from the RtI Committee will be sent to Interventions Team Training in November and will provide training to ERHS Faculty through PLC’s.
Describe the plan to support MTSS. MTSS will be supported directly through the RtI Committee, to include weekly meetings. Teachers are involved in the MTSS process during RtI meetings as the team identifies the problem, possible solutions and interventions. Teachers, as they frequent RtI meetings will then be able to utilize the MTSS process with expertise within their classroom.

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

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

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team	
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).	
Julie Robinson-Lueallen, Principal	
Paul Wheeler, Assistant Principal	
Renee Hoskinson, Literacy Coach	
Stacey Keaveny, Guidance Counselor	
Lucessie McGriff, CTE Department Chair	
John Stalma, Language Arts Department Chair	
Mary McCann, PE Department Chair	
Nicole Moses, Science Department Chair	
Vince Santo, Fine Arts Department Chair	
Kristine Cavinder, Exceptional Student Education, Department Chair	
Grant Mollett, Social Studies Department Chair	
Joyce White, Foreign Language Department Chair	
Craig Shaffer, Math Department Chair	
Suzanne McClure, Media	
Nicole Marconi, ESE Reading	
Jacob Stein, Assistant Principal	
Opal Mahoney ,Reading Department Chair	
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).	
Monthly meetings will be held on the third Monday of each month.	
The Literacy Coach (The Principal, Assistant Principals) will provide agenda items. Renee Hoskinson (Literacy Coach) will document items discussed and distribute appropriately.	

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

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? The Implementation of the 2012-13 School Wide Literacy Plan. The Literacy Leadership Team will identify and discuss reading curriculum materials to include reading resources. The team will also plan and develop a school-wide Literacy Plan that geared toward the Common Core Standards. The focus will be on increasing the performance of all subgroups (underperforming subgroups) in reading and school-wide literacy strategies; hence preparing students for college and career readiness.

Public School Choice

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

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

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

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

****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?

Teachers will attend in-services conducted by our literacy coaches on reading strategies in all disciplines. Teachers will document in their lesson plans literary strategies used in their lessons. All of the benchmarks will be given priority especially Reading. Additionally we have scheduled the majority of our freshman and sophomore based on their 8th grade FCAT scores into year-long Language Arts Courses. We utilize Read 180 for level one freshman in reading. Each grade level has Intensive Reading classes designed to help them with FCAT skills. At this point, Reading will be the priority for us this year. We will utilize our Literacy Coach to help develop weekly tips and strategies for our teachers. We have scheduled staff development training for our teachers in implementing AVID, Common Core Reading Standards, Webb's Depth of Knowledge, Text Complexity, Differentiated Instruction, and Utilizing Data to Drive Instruction.

FCAT retake students are identified and properly placed for reading intervention strategies. We will also identify our lowest 25% in reading and develop a plan for monitoring their progress. All reading intervention programs developed and utilized will be monitored. Consistent classroom walk-throughs will take place to monitor the process.

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

**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?

Each Academy has created Interdisciplinary projects to incorporate all or most of the subject areas in order to provide students with real life problems and examples in order to show integration of various subject matters and the real world. ERHS houses 14 CTE programs of which 8 programs provide students the ability of earning an industry certification before graduating high school

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?

1. Increasing enrollment and eligibility for AP course/ Increase performance rate in AP Courses.
2. Utilizing PERT scores to increase awareness of further opportunities in postsecondary study.
3. Informing parents of preparations that need to be made for a student going to college by offering parent information nights for each grade level.
4. Publishing in print and on the website, all information needed to make postsecondary plans.
5. Continuing an AVID program that will address the needs of first generation students and encourage them to seek admission and acceptance to a 4 year university.
6. Encourage college visits by university admissions representatives.
7. Utilization of ePEPs or Choices and the use of FACTS.org for preparation and planning for college.
8. Increasing CTE within the academies and student industry certification opportunities for credits.

Postsecondary Transition

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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](#).

According to the 2010 High School Feedback 49.3% of the East Ridge High School 2010 graduates completed a college preparatory curriculum.

Respectively, the percent of graduates who took the SAT/ACT/CPT and scored at or above the college -level cut scores were the following: Math 68.9%,

Reading 77.5%, Writing 81.1% All three subjects 62.1% The report also indicates that approximately 49.5% of the East Ridge High School 2008

graduates attended some post secondary institution.

East Ridge High School will institute the following strategies to improve the student readiness for public postsecondary success:

- Expand the college/university presentations to the Junior class

- . Transition to the Common Core Standards

- Partner with Lake/Sumter Community College to market the College Financial Aid Night.

- Encourage more participation in Advanced Placement and Dual Enrollment courses when registering students for the upcoming school year.

CTE Teachers will educate students/parents on Bright Futures and Gold Seal opportunities.

- Provide opportunities for students to review college websites through ADAPT activities.

- Provide a page on the school website for FAQs regarding access to college/university enrollment expectations.

- Invite former East Ridge High School graduates who have a demonstrated successful transition to postsecondary education to speak to Junior and

Senior class members.

- Continue to offer/expand CTE programs that offer students the opportunity to earn Industry Certifications in the students chosen career field, for which they can receive postsecondary articulated credit.

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.			1A.1. Students having experienced recurring failures with standardized testing	1.1. Lead students to demonstrated successes through a variety of research based tools – AVID Strategies, Read 180, Reading Plus, Impact Books, Edge Series etc.	1.1. Principal Administrative Team Literacy Coach Reading Teachers Literacy Team	1.1 Ongoing progress monitoring through FAIR assessment, reporting functions of Reading Plus, Read 180, Teacher Assessment and class work.	1.1. PMRN, Reading Plus, Read 180, and Edusoft
Reading Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Increase the number of students achieving proficiency in reading by 15% by reducing the number of level 1 and 2 students	51%	58%					
			1.2. Student Attendance	1.2. Attendance Waiver with incentives for attendance and disincentives for truancy.	1.2. Principals Administrators Teachers	1.2. P.B.S. monthly data sessions School Attendance Reports	1.2. County databases – AS400 and FIDO
			2A.3. Instructional Focus – Rigor Blending –Common Core Implementation	2A.3. Teachers Work in PLC-Lesson Study Groups to increase the rigor and accountability of what is being taught and learned.	2A.3. Administration and Teachers	2A.3. Increase teacher collaboration time for Lesson Study and Development.	2A.3. CWT’s , Teacher Evaluations, Student Work and Assessments
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Reading Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Providing the data violates student confidentiality.	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.			2.1. Students unprepared to enter the workforce, or on track to enter a four-year college	2.1. School Wide Implementation of <u>Common Core State Standards</u> School-wide implementation of Lesson Study, Cornell Note Taking and School Wide-Literacy Plan	2.1. Principal Administrative Team Classroom Teachers Literacy Coach	2.1. Ongoing monitoring of standardized testing, including FAIR,FCIM, FCAT retakes, ACT and teacher made instruments	2.1. PMRN, FCAT Star, ACT results, e-Sembler
Reading Goal #2A: Increase the % of 9th and 10th Grade Students scoring at or above level 4 in reading by 10%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	9 th -31%	9 th -34%					
	10 th -25%	10 th -28%					
			2.2. Students willingness to participate in upper level classes due to lack of information of benefits of rigorous classes	2.2. Advanced Placement Parent Information Night	2.2. Assistant Principal, Sebrina Dillon-Bank (AP Coordinator) and AP Teachers	2.2. Increased enrollment in upper level classes, dual enrollment and AP classes	2.2. AS400, scheduler, schedule
			2A.3. Instructional Focus – Rigor Blending –Common Core Implementation	2A.3. Teachers Work in PLC-Lesson Study Groups to increase the rigor and accountability of what is being taught and learned.	2A.3. Administration and Teachers	2A.3. Increase teacher collaboration time for Lesson Study and Development.	2A.3. CWT's , Teacher Evaluations, Student Work and Assessments
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Reading Goal #2B: Providing the data violates student confidentiality.	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>					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3A.1. Students having experienced recurring failures with standardized testing	3A.1 School-wide implementation of Lesson Study, Cornell Note Taking and School Wide-Literacy Plan	3A.1. Principal Administrative Team Classroom Teachers Literacy Coach	3A.1. Ongoing explicit instruction, differentiation, progress monitoring through FAIR assessment, reporting functions of Reading Plus, Read 180, FCAT Explorer/FOCUS, Teacher Assessment and class work.	3A.1. FAIR progress monitoring, Edusoft, FOCUS, Reading Plus
Reading Goal #3 Increase by 10% the number of students making reading gains	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	61%	67%					
			3A.2. Developing the higher order questions that will challenge students while at the same time address the content. Balancing inquiry based teaching with traditional teaching methods to meet the needs of all students	3A.2. The use of common board configuration will assure all students can identify daily expectations, learning objectives, and assignments in all classrooms. Teachers planning lessons and sharing ideas.	3A.2. Administration	3A.2. Students will have a visual reference of the day’s expectations and essential question. If teachers are sharing their effective lessons and strategies with colleagues.	3A.2. Classroom Walk through by Administrators
		2A.3. Instructional Focus – Rigor Blending –Common Core Implementation	2A.3. Teachers Work in PLC-Lesson Study Groups to increase the rigor and accountability of what is being taught and learned.	2A.3. Administration and Teachers	2A.3. Increase teacher collaboration time for Lesson Study and Development.	2A.3. CWT’s , Teacher Evaluations, Student Work and Assessments	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Reading Goal #3B: Providing the data violates student confidentiality.	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>					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4A: Increase the number of lower quartile student making learning gains in reading by 10%	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	4A.1. Students having experienced recurring failures with standardized testing	4.A1. Lead students to demonstrated successes through a variety of research based tools – Reading Plus, Impact! and Edge Series texts	4.A1. Principal Administrative Team Literacy Coach All Teachers Literacy Team	4.A1. Ongoing progress monitoring through D/F List, FAIR assessment, reporting functions of Reading Plus, Read 180, teacher assessment and class work	4.A1. PMRN Reading Plus e-Sembler
	62%	68%					
4A3.. Students negative behavior increasing due to failure in academic classes			4A3 . Positive Behavior System (PBS)Grades 9-12	4A3.. PBS Team, Administration, Classroom Teachers	4A3.. Data analysis of school-wide discipline by incidents. To re-focus the school culture from discipline/punishment toward positive behavior and academics. Data analysis of teacher referrals to provide profession development in classroom management.	4A3. Reduction in suspensions, success in academic classes	
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.

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

Reading Goal #4B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Providing the data violates student confidentiality.	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.
			4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011		All -51 American Indian-45 Asian-69 African American-43	All -59 American Indian-58 Asian-72 African American-48	All -63 American Indian-63 Asian-75 African American-54	All-67 American Indian-67 Asian-77 African American-59	All-71 AI-71 Asian-80 AA-64	All-76 AI-75 Asian-83 AA-69
	Reading Goal #5A: Reduce the reading achievement gap by 10% each year in subgroups not on track to close the achievement gap by 2017.		Hispanic-36 White-59 ELL-12 SWD-20 ED-42	Hispanic-53 White-65 ELL-26 SWD-33 ED-52	Hispanic-57 White-69 ELL-33 SWD-40 ED-57	Hispanic-62 White-72 ELL-41 SWD-47 ED-61	Hispanic-67 White-76 ELL-48 SWD-53 ED-66	Hispanic-72 White-79 ELL-56 SWD-60 ED-71
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	Reading Goal #5B:		5C.1. Students having experienced recurring failures with standardized testing	5C.1. Lead students to demonstrated successes through a variety of research based tools – Reading Plus, Impact! and Language! Series, Differentiated Instruction, Support Facilitation.	5C.1. Principal Administrative Team Literacy Coaches Achievement Liaisons Teachers Reading Leadership Team	5C.1. Ongoing progress monitoring through Instructional Focus calendars, FAIR assessment, reporting functions of Reading Plus and teacher assessment and class work.	5C.1. PMRN Reading Plus ESemblem and teacher anecdotal records Edusoft	
	Decrease the number of White and Black students not making satisfactory progress in reading by 10%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*						
	Decrease the number of Hispanic and American Indian students not making satisfactory progress in reading by 20% .	White 41% Black:57% Hispanic:64% American Indian:55%	White:37% Black:49% Hispanic:51% American Indian: 44%	5C.2. Teachers in non-core classes not providing opportunities for reading.	5C.2. All teachers will receive weekly literacy-related tips to expand instruction strategies employed across all curriculums	5C.2. Literacy Coaches, Administrators	5C.2. Review FAIR data reports to track performance gains, and Classroom Walk-throughs	5C.2. Review FAIR data reports to track performance gains, and Classroom Walk-throughs
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.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
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5C.1. Communication of content to ELL Students	5C.1. Provide Dictionaries in student language Provide an ELL Teacher Assistant to support instruction in Language Arts and other Content Areas	5C.1. ELL Teachers District ELL Support Principal Administration Content Teachers	5C.1. Teacher Assessment of Growth Progress Reports to ELL Teacher, Parents and Administration	5C.1. CWT's Student Assessments
<u>Reading Goal #5C:</u> Decrease the number of ELL Students not making satisfactory progress in reading by 27%	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 88	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 64					
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5C.1. Students having experienced recurring failures with standardized testing	5C.1. Lead students to demonstrated successes through a variety of research based tools – Reading Plus, Impact! and Language! Series, Differentiated Instruction, Support Facilitation.	5C.1. Principal Administrative Team Literacy Coaches Achievement Liaisons Teachers Reading Leadership Team	5C.1. Ongoing progress monitoring through Instructional Focus calendars, FAIR assessment, reporting functions of Reading Plus and teacher assessment and class work.	5C.1. PMRN Reading Plus E-Sembler and teacher anecdotal records Edusoft
<u>Reading Goal #5D:</u> Decrease the number of Students with Disabilities not making satisfactory progress in reading by 20%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 80	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 64					
			5C.2. Teachers in non-core classes not providing opportunities for reading.	5C.2. All teachers will receive weekly literacy-related tips to expand instruction strategies employed across all curriculums	5C.2. Literacy Coaches, Administrators	5C.2. Review FAIR data reports to track performance gains, and Classroom Walk-throughs	5C.2. Review FAIR data reports to track performance gains, and Classroom Walk-throughs
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.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
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5A.1. Students having experienced recurring failures with standardized testing	5A.1. Lead students to demonstrated successes through a variety of research based tools – Reading Plus, Impact! and Edge Series texts.	5A.1. Literacy Coaches Achievement Liaisons Teachers Reading Leadership Team	5A.1. Ongoing progress monitoring through FAIR assessment, reporting functions of Reading Plus and teacher assessment and class work.	5A.1. PMRN Reading Plus e-Sembler
Reading Goal #5E: Decrease the number of Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in reading by 10%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	58	52					
			5A.2. Teachers not using data to individualize instruction for struggling students	5A.2. Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)for grades 9-12 identified as Level 1, 2, 3) In-services on using data in the classroom and data chats	5A.2. Literacy Coaches, Achievement Liaisons	5A.2. Implementation and use of program. On-going progress monitoring of student data	5A.2. Standardized tests Scores/data
		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

Reading Professional Development

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

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

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

Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
School Wide Literacy Plan Implementing Common Core and AVID Reading Strategies	All content areas 9-12	ERHS Common Core Team	All Instructional Staff and Paraprofessionals	August 24, 2012 –June 8, 2013	Content Meeting Evaluations (Formal/Informal) Classroom Walkthroughs Surveys on implementation and effectiveness	ERHS – TQR Jacob Stein Administration and Department Chairs
Connecting to Common Core through Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM)	9-12	District Curriculum Department	All Instructional Staff in Language Arts and Reading Departments	November 15, 2012	Content Meeting Evaluations (Formal/Informal) Classroom Walkthroughs Surveys on implementation and effectiveness	ERHS – TQR Jacob Stein Administration and Department Chairs
Reading Instruction, -Task Cards increasing rigor and complexity for the Common Core	All content areas 9-12	District Curriculum Department	All Instructional Staff	September 20, 2012-Dec 20, 2012	Content Meeting Evaluations (Formal/Informal) Classroom Walkthroughs Surveys on implementation and effectiveness	ERHS – TQR Jacob Stein Administration and Department Chairs

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
Best Practices -Sharing	Substitute Teachers	Discretionary Budget	\$2,000.00
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Reading Centers for Intensive Reading/LA	25 iPads/Ipads Cart –Reading Department	SAI-School Discretionary	13,000
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			

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

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Best Practices -Sharing	Substitute Teachers	Discretionary Budget	\$2,000.00
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Reading Goals

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

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1: Increase the number of students achieving proficiency by 15%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: Based upon 2012 CELLA data, 50% of students were proficient in listening/speaking.	1.1. Attendance	1.1. Direct parent contact when students are in violation of the attendance policy	1.1. ELL Coordinator and Assistant Coordinator	1.1. Students abide by attendance policy	1.1. AS400 and FIDO
		1.2. Students lack knowledge of the purpose of the testing	1.2. Test preparation session	1.2. Test Coordinator and ELL Coordinator	1.2. Pre/Post Evaluation	1.2. "How Well Do I Understand?" system
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2: Increase the number of students achieving proficiency by 17%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: Based upon 2012 CELLA data, 8% of students were proficient in reading.	2.1. Students expect failures with standardized testing	2.1. Rosetta Stone, AR, Passport Reading Journeys III	2.1. ELL Teacher	2.1. Progress Monitoring, FAIR	2.1. PMRN Reading, eSembler, AR
		2.2. Students lack knowledge of the purpose of the testing	2.2. Test preparation session	2.2. Test Coordinator and ELL Coordinator	2.2. Pre/Post Evaluation	2.2. "How Well Do I Understand?" system
		2.3. Testing Environment	2.3. Use regular classroom for CELLA testing	2.3. Test Coordinator	2.3. Test Administration Process	2.3. Observation.

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.		3.1 Lack of systemized writing instruction	3.1. School-wide literacy plan Person:	3.1. Administration, all teachers	3.1. Practice writing tests	3.1. Individual meetings with students regarding writing scores
<u>CELLA Goal #3:</u>	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u>					
Increase the number of students achieving proficiency by 22%.	Based upon 2012 CELLA data, 18% of students were proficient in reading	3.2. Students lack knowledge of the purpose of the testing	3.2. Test preparation session	3.2. : Test Coordinator and ELL Coordinator	3.2. Pre/Post Evaluation	3.2. "How Well Do I Understand?" system
		3.3. Testing Environment	3.3. Use regular classroom for testing	3.3. CELLA Test Coordinator	3.3. Test Administration Process	3.3. Observation

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

End of CELLA Goals

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
Mathematics Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<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>					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Mathematics Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
Mathematics Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<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>					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Mathematics Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.
Mathematics Goal #2A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Mathematics Goal #2B: Providing the data violates student confidentiality.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #3A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #3B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.
Mathematics Goal #4A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.
Mathematics Goal #4B: Providing the data violates student confidentiality.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.
			4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Mathematics Goal #5A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	Baseline data 2010-2011							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	
			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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
Mathematics Goal #5C: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <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
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
Mathematics Goal #5D: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.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
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.
Mathematics Goal #5E: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
Mathematics Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<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>					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Mathematics Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.
Mathematics Goal #2A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Mathematics Goal #2B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #3A:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #3B:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.
Mathematics Goal #4A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.
Mathematics Goal #4B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.
			4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Mathematics Goal #5A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	Baseline data 2010-2011							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	
			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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
Mathematics Goal #5C: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <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
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
Mathematics Goal #5D: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.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
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.
Mathematics Goal #5E: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

High School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1.1. Students who do not have support at home to help with mathematics. Changes in testing from FCAT 2.0 to EOC tests for Algebra I and Geometry	1.1. Develop Instructional focus calendar for FCIM bell ringers that gives extra time to areas where our data shows weaknesses. Use of flipped classes and technology to allow students to gain additional teaching through online videos and practice.	1.1. Administration, Testing Coordinator	1.1. Show master of benchmarks through charting student data and teacher/student data chats from weekly mini-assessments.	1.1. Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) Mini-assessments, Lake County benchmark assessment progress monitoring midyear, EOC Math
Mathematics Goal #1: Increase the number of proficient students by 4% according to the Math EOC. Providing the data violates student confidentiality.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>	1.2. Student fear of taking higher level courses	1.2. Develop focus lessons that go more in depth and concentrate more time on higher percentage EOC strand utilizing differentiated instruction.	1.2. Math Teachers, Administrators	1.2. Show master of benchmarks through charting student data and teacher/student data chats from weekly mini-assessments.	1.2. FCIM Mini-assessments, Lake County benchmark assessment progress monitoring midyear, EOC testing
			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
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2.1. Developing the higher order questions that will challenge students while at the same time address the content. Balancing inquiry based teaching with traditional teaching methods to meet the needs of all students.	2.1. The use of common board configuration will assure all students can identify daily expectations, learning objectives, and assignments in all classrooms. Teachers planning lessons and sharing ideas.	2.1. Administration	2.1. Students will have a visual reference of the day's expectations and essential question. If teachers are sharing their effective lessons and strategies with colleagues.	2.1. Classroom Walk through by Administrators.
Mathematics Goal #2: Increase by 3% the number of students scoring levels 7 and above according to the EOC Math Test by utilizing more high order thinking questions, inquiry based teaching, and math process standards into advanced math courses Providing the data	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <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.
	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

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

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

violates student confidentiality.						
-----------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3.1. Prior knowledge Organization by students Student study skills Self confidence in mathematics.	3.1. Pre test to gauge previous knowledge. Provide review of prior topics. Use of Cornell Notes. Using grouping in the classroom to help students gain understanding. The implementation of Instructional Focus Calendars.	3.1. Administration Math Teachers	3.1. Increase in student in class achievement. Increase in student participation. Notebook checks and reviews. Utilizing "How well do I understand" scale.	3.1. Classroom Walk through by Administrators Progress Monitoring: Mini Assessments Teacher Pre and Post Test.
Mathematics Goal #3:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Increase by 3% the number of students making learning gains in math.	<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>					
Providing the data violates student confidentiality.			3.2. With limited professional development, teachers will be reluctant to use an unfamiliar tools and strategies. 3.3. With the current mandated testing, computer lab usage for other activities will be limited.	3.2. Use Cornell notes as an in class note taking tool that will assist in study skill and student engagement.	3.2. Administration Math Teachers	3.2. Student writing activity will explain how higher order was used in the lesson.	3.2. Exit Activity Lesson Plans
			3.3. Teachers implementing use of AVID and WICOR Strategies	3.3. Use of AVID WICOR strategies in the classroom.	3.3. Teacher	3.3. Show mastery of benchmarks through mandated statewide math exam.	3.3. Math EOC Test
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4.1. Prior knowledge Organization by students Student study skills Self confidence in mathematics.	4.1. Pre test to gauge previous knowledge. Provide review of prior topics. Use of Cornell Notes. Using grouping in the classroom to help students gain understanding. The implementation of Instructional Focus Calendars.	4.1. Administration and Math Teachers	4.1. Increase in student in class achievement. Increase in student participation. Notebook checks and reviews. Utilizing "How well do I understand" scale.	4.1. Classroom Walk through "How well do I understand" scale
Mathematics Goal #4:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Increase by 5% the number of students in the lowest quartile (25%) making gains in math.	<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>					
Providing the data violates student confidentiality.			4.2. Identifying and specific targeting of students in the lowest quartile 4.3. With current the mandated testing, computer lab usage for other activities will be limited.	4.2. Review previous year data to clearly identify lowest quartile students.	4.2. Teachers, Test Coordinator, Administration	4.2. Students in this group are identified and support is given in class	4.2. Increase in student performance by the students in the lowest quartile.

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

		Find Barrier on Wheeler email	4.3. Use of flipped classrooms and computer assisted remediation tools that will differentiate instructions for EOC testing.	4.3. Teacher	4.3. Show mastery of benchmarks through mandated statewide math exam.	4.3. Math EOC Test

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]).

Algebra 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.			1.1. Students need remediation not included in current curriculum maps	1.1. Develop instructional focus calendar for FCIM that gives extra time to areas where our data shows weaknesses.	1.1. AP over Mathematics, Math Department Chair, Math Teachers	1.1. Show master of benchmarks through charting student data and teacher/student data chats from weekly mini-assessments.	1.1. Instructional Focus Calendars, Mini-assessments, Lake County benchmark assessment progress monitoring midyear, EduSoft
Algebra 1 Goal #1:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Increase by 10 percentage points the number of students scoring Level 3 by moving 10% of Level 2 students(9) up to Level 3.	38%	42%					
260 Student Test 35% Level 2 91 Students			1.2. Adequate time may not be spent in concept/strand areas of greatest need.	1.2. Use focus lessons through lesson studies that go more in depth and concentrate more time on higher percentage strands (use of item specifications) Utilize common assessments followed by data chats to effectively determine concept/strand areas of greatest need.	1.2. AP over Mathematics Math Department Chair. Math Teachers	1.2. Show master of benchmarks through charting student data and teacher/student data chats from weekly mini-assessments as well as common assessments	1.2. FCIM Mini-assessments, Lake County benchmark assessment progress monitoring midyear, common assessments
			1.3. Students may lack motivation to achieve learning gains in math due to the lack of relevance and differentiated instruction	1.3. Use PENDA as a computer assisted remediation tool that will differentiate instruction for state benchmarks. Increased use of inquiry based facilitation in each classroom	1.3. AP over Mathematics Math Teachers	1.3. Show mastery of benchmarks through mandated statewide math exam and improved student grades	1.3. Benchmark Exams EOC Exams Teacher-made Assessments, Penda reports, EduSoft, Common assessment data
			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

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.			2.1. Teachers having time to collaborate with each other, implement data chats, and lesson study discussions.	2.1. Post more information on Moodle to free up 75% of department meeting time for more collaborative time between department members (data chats/lesson study) Content Writing PLCs held once a month by content	2.1. Math Department Chair AP over Mathematics	2.1 . Teachers incorporate new strategies in lesson plans. Student writing activities explain inquiry bases activities. Students writing also explain how math process standards and higher order thinking were used in the lesson. Lesson study groups meet bi-weekly	2.1. Lesson Study Lesson Plans Advanced Math Classes Student writing activities Benchmark Assessment Progress Monitoring FCAT Math
Algebra Goal #2: Increase by 10 percentage points the number of students scoring Level 3 by moving 10% of Level 3 (10) students up to Level 4 or 5. 260 Student Test 38% Level 3 99 Students	2012 Current Level of Performance: * 4%	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * 8%	2.2. Students may lack motivation to achieve learning gains in math due to the lack of relevance and differentiated instruction	2.2. Use PENDA as a computer assisted remediation tool that will differentiate instruction for state benchmarks. Increased use of inquiry based facilitation in each classroom	2.2. AP over Mathematics Math Teachers,	2.2. Show mastery of benchmarks through mandated statewide math exam and improved student grades	2.2. Benchmark Exams EOC Exams Teacher-made Assessments, Penda reports, EduSoft, Common assessment data
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011	All-70 Asian- 87 AA-57 Hispanic-59 White-77	All-47 Asian- 78 AA-40 Hispanic-38 White-53	All-52 Asian- 81 AA-46 Hispanic-45 White-58	All-57 Asian- 83 AA-52 Hispanic-51 White-63	All-63 Asian- 85 AA-58 Hispanic-57 White-67	All-68 Asian-87 AA-64 Hispanic-63 White-72	
	<u>Algebra 1 Goal #3A:</u> Decrease the achievement gap between ethnic groups by 10% yearly.	ELL-38 SWD-30 ED-63	ELL-30 SWD-38 ED-43	ELL-37 SWD-44 ED-49	ELL-44 SWD-50 ED-55	ELL-51 SWD-56 ED-60	ELL-58 SWD-63 ED-60	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.								
<u>Algebra 1 Goal #3B:</u> All ethnic groups made satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*						
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	
based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3.C.1. Students need remediation not included in current curriculum maps	3. C.1. Develop instructional focus calendar for FCIM that gives extra time to areas where our data shows weaknesses.	3.C.1. AP over Mathematics, Math Department Chair, Math Teachers	3.C.1. Show master of benchmarks through charting student data and teacher/student data chats from weekly mini-assessments.	3.C.1 Instructional Focus Calendars, Mini-assessments, Lake County benchmark assessment progress monitoring midyear, EduSoft	
<u>Algebra 1 Goal #3C:</u>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*						

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

Decrease the number of ELL students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1 by moving 10% of Level 2 students up to Level 3.	62%	54%					
			3C2 Adequate time may not be spent in concept/strand areas of greatest need. Students may lack motivation to achieve learning gains in math due to the lack of relevance and differentiated instruction	3C.2. Use focus lessons through lesson studies that go more in depth and concentrate more time on higher percentage strands (use of item specifications) Utilize common assessments followed by data chats to effectively determine concept/strand areas of greatest need.	3C.2 AP over Mathematics Math Department Chair. Math Teachers	3C.2. Show master of benchmarks through charting student data and teacher/student data chats from weekly mini-assessments as well as common assessments	3C.2. FCIM Mini-assessments, Lake County benchmark assessment progress monitoring midyear, common assessments
			3C3. Use PENDA as a computer assisted remediation tool that will differentiate instruction for state benchmarks.	3C3. Increased use of inquiry based facilitation in each classroom	3C3. AP over Mathematics Math Teachers	3C3. Show mastery of benchmarks through mandated statewide math exam and improved student grades	3C.3. Benchmark Exams EOC Exams Teacher-made Assessments, Penda reports, EduSoft, Common assessment data
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3D.1. Students need remediation not included in current curriculum maps	3D1. Develop instructional focus calendar for FCIM that gives extra time to areas where our data shows weaknesses.	3D.1. AP over Mathematics, Math Department Chair, Math Teachers	3D.1. Show master of benchmarks through charting student data and teacher/student data chats from weekly mini-assessments.	3D. 1 Instructional Focus Calendars, Mini-assessments, Lake County benchmark assessment progress monitoring midyear, EduSoft
Algebra 1 Goal #3D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Decrease the number of Students with Disabilities not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1 by moving 11% of Level 2 students up to Level 3.	70%	62%					
			3D.2. Use focus lessons through lesson studies that go more in depth and concentrate more time on higher percentage strands (use of item specifications)	3D.2 Utilize common assessments followed by data chats to effectively determine concept/strand areas of greatest need.	3D.2. AP over Mathematics Math Department Chair. Math Teachers	3D.2. Show master of benchmarks through charting student data and teacher/student data chats from weekly mini-assessments as well as common assessments	3C.2. FCIM Mini-assessments, Lake County benchmark assessment progress monitoring midyear, common assessments

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

		3D3. Use PENDA as a computer assisted remediation tool that will differentiate instruction for state benchmarks.	3D3. Increased use of inquiry based facilitation in each classroom	3D3. AP over Mathematics Math Teachers	3D3. Show mastery of benchmarks through mandated statewide math exam and improved student grades	3D3. Benchmark Exams EOC Exams Teacher-made Assessments, Penda reports, EduSoft, Common assessment data
--	--	---	---	--	---	--

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool			
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1. Algebra 1 Goal #3E: Decrease the number of students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1 by moving 10% of Level 2 students up to Level 3	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td> <td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>37%</td> <td>33%</td> </tr> </table>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	37%	33%	3D.1. Students need remediation not included in current curriculum maps	3D.1. Develop instructional focus calendar for FCIM that gives extra time to areas where our data shows weaknesses.	3D.1. AP over Mathematics, Math Department Chair, Math Teachers	3D.1. Show master of benchmarks through charting student data and teacher/student data chats from weekly mini-assessments.	3D.1 Instructional Focus Calendars, Mini-assessments, Lake County benchmark assessment progress monitoring midyear, EduSoft
	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*								
	37%	33%								
	3D.2. Use focus lessons through lesson studies that go more in depth and concentrate more time on higher percentage strands (use of item specifications)	3D.2 Utilize common assessments followed by data chats to effectively determine concept/strand areas of greatest need.	3D.2. AP over Mathematics Math Department Chair. Math Teachers	3D.2. Show master of benchmarks through charting student data and teacher/student data chats from weekly mini-assessments as well as common assessments	3C.2. FCIM Mini-assessments, Lake County benchmark assessment progress monitoring midyear, common assessments					
	3D3. Use PENDA as a computer assisted remediation tool that will differentiate instruction for state benchmarks.	3D3. Increased use of inquiry based facilitation in each classroom	3D3. AP over Mathematics Math Teachers	3D3. Show mastery of benchmarks through mandated statewide math exam and improved student grades	3D.3. Benchmark Exams EOC Exams Teacher-made Assessments, Penda reports, EduSoft, Common assessment data					

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 need remediation not included in current curriculum maps	1.1. Develop instructional focus calendar for FCIM that gives extra time to areas where our data shows weaknesses. Content Area Coach to provide small group remediation for struggling students Homeroom classes arranged by skill level to narrow the focus of Algebra 1 instruction/remediation	1.1. AP over Mathematics, Math Department Chair, Math Teachers	1.1. Show master of benchmarks through charting student data and teacher/student data chats from weekly mini-assessments.	1.1. Instructional Focus Calendars, Mini-assessments, Lake County benchmark assessment progress monitoring midyear, EduSoft
Geometry Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Increase by 10% the number of students scoring level 3 by moving 10% of the Level 2 (19) Students to Level 3.	34%	38%					
545 Students Tested			1.2. Adequate time may not be spent in concept/strand areas of greatest need.	1.2. Use focus lessons through lesson studies that go more in depth and concentrate more time on higher percentage strands (use of item specifications) Utilize common assessments followed by data chats to effectively determine concept/strand areas of greatest need.	1.2. AP over Mathematics Math Department Chair. Math Teachers,	1.2. Show master of benchmarks through charting student data and teacher/student data chats from weekly mini-assessments as well as common assessments	1.2. FCIM Mini-assessments, Lake County benchmark assessment progress monitoring midyear, common assessments.
35% Lower 3rd			1.3. Students may lack motivation to achieve learning gains in math due to the lack of relevance and differentiated instruction	1.3. Use PENDA as a computer assisted remediation tool that will differentiate instruction for state benchmarks. Increased use of inquiry based facilitation in each classroom	1.3. AP over Mathematics Math Teachers	1.3. Show mastery of benchmarks through mandated statewide math exam and improved student grades	1.3. Benchmark Exams EOC Exams Teacher-made Assessments, Penda reports, EduSoft, Common assessment data
185 Students Level 1 and 2			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

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.			2.1 Teachers having time to collaborate with each other, implement data chats, and lesson study discussions.	2.1. Post more information on Moodle to free up 75% of department meeting time for more collaborative time between department members (data chats/lesson study) Content Writing PLCs held once a month	2.1. Math Department Chair AP over Mathematics,	2.1. Teachers incorporate new strategies in lesson plans. Student writing activities explain inquiry bases activities. Students writing also explain how math process standards and higher order thinking were used in the lesson. Lesson study groups meet bi-weekly	3.1. Lesson Study Lesson Plans Advanced Math Classes Student writing activities Benchmark Assessment Progress Monitoring FCAT Math
Geometry Goal #2: Increase by 5% the number of students scoring level 4 and 5 (top 3rd) by moving 5% of the Level 3 (9) Students to Level 4.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	31 %	33%					
545 Students Tested 34% Middle 3rd 185 Students Level 3			2.2. Students may lack motivation to achieve learning gains in math due to the lack of relevance and differentiated instruction	2.2. Use PENDA as a computer assisted remediation tool that will differentiate instruction for state benchmarks. Content Area Coach to provide small group remediation for struggling students Homeroom classes arranged by skill level to narrow the focus of Algebra 1 instruction/remediation Increased use of inquiry based facilitation in each classroom	2.2. AP over Mathematics Math Teachers	2.2. Show mastery of benchmarks through mandated statewide math exam and improved student grades	2.2. Benchmark Exams EOC Exams Teacher-made Assessments, Penda reports, EduSoft, Common assessment data
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Geometry Goal #3A: Information Not Available	Baseline data 2011-2012						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3B: Information Not Available	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3C.1. Teachers having time to collaborate with each other, implement data chats, and lesson study discussions.	3C.1. Post more information on Moodle to free up 75% of department meeting time for more collaborative time between department members (data chats/lesson study) Content Writing PLCs held once a month	3C.1. Math Department Chair AP over Mathematics,	3C.1. Teachers incorporate new strategies in lesson plans. Student writing activities explain inquiry bases activities. Students writing also explain how math process standards and higher order thinking were used in the lesson. Lesson study groups meet bi-weekly	3C1 Lesson Study Lesson Plans Advanced Math Classes Student writing activities Benchmark Assessment Progress Monitoring FCAT Math
Geometry Goal #3C:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Information Not Available	<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>					
			3C.2. Students may lack motivation to achieve learning gains in math due to the lack of relevance and differentiated instruction	3C.2. Use PENDA as a computer assisted remediation tool that will differentiate instruction for state benchmarks. Content Area Coach to provide small group remediation for struggling students Homeroom classes arranged by skill level to narrow the focus of Algebra 1 instruction/remediation Increased use of inquiry based facilitation in each classroom	3C.2. AP over Mathematics Math Teachers	3C.2. Show mastery of benchmarks through mandated statewide math exam and improved student grades	3C.2. Benchmark Exams EOC Exams Teacher-made Assessments, Penda reports, EduSoft, Common assessment 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
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3D.1. Teachers having time to collaborate with each other, implement data chats, and lesson study discussions.	3D1. Post more information on Moodle to free up 75% of department meeting time for more collaborative time between department members (data chats/lesson study) Content Writing PLCs held once a month	3D.1. Math Department Chair AP over Mathematics,	3D.1. Teachers incorporate new strategies in lesson plans. Student writing activities explain inquiry bases activities. Students writing also explain how math process standards and higher order thinking were used in the lesson. Lesson study groups meet bi-weekly	3D1 Lesson Study Lesson Plans Advanced Math Classes Student writing activities Benchmark Assessment Progress Monitoring FCAT Math
Geometry Goal #3D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Information Not Available	<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

		3D2. Students may lack motivation to achieve learning gains in math due to the lack of relevance and differentiated instruction	3D2. Use PENDA as a computer assisted remediation tool that will differentiate instruction for state benchmarks. Increased use of inquiry based facilitation in each classroom	3D.2. AP over Mathematics Math Teachers	3D.2. Show mastery of benchmarks through mandated statewide math exam and improved student grades	3D.2. Benchmark Exams EOC Exams Teacher-made Assessments, Penda reports, EduSoft, Common assessment data
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3E1. Teachers having time to collaborate with each other, implement data chats, and lesson study discussions.	3E.1 . Post more information on Moodle to free up 75% of department meeting time for more collaborative time between department members (data chats/lesson study) Content Writing PLCs held once a month	3E1. Math Department Chair AP over Mathematics,	3E1 . Teachers incorporate new strategies in lesson plans. Student writing activities explain inquiry bases activities. Students writing also explain how math process standards and higher order thinking were used in the lesson. Lesson study groups meet bi-weekly	3E1 Lesson Study Lesson Plans Advanced Math Classes Student writing activities Benchmark Assessment Progress Monitoring FCAT Math
Geometry Goal #3E:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Information Not Available	<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>					
			3E.2. Students may lack motivation to achieve learning gains in math due to the lack of relevance and differentiated instruction	3E.2. Use PENDA as a computer assisted remediation tool that will differentiate instruction for state benchmarks. Increased use of inquiry based facilitation in each classroom	3E.2. AP over Mathematics Math Teachers,	3E.2. Show mastery of benchmarks through mandated statewide math exam and improved student grades	3E2. Benchmark Exams EOC Exams Teacher-made Assessments, Penda reports, EduSoft, Common assessment data
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Math Instruction Utilizing Task Cards-Increasing rigor and complexity for the Common Core	9-12	District Curriculum Department	2 Math Lead Teachers School-Wide	September 20, 2012-December 20, 2012	Department and Content Meeting updates Administrative CWT's, Evaluations, Teacher Lesson Plans and Content Meeting	All Math Teachers, Department Chairs Administration
School Wide Literacy Plan	9-12	District Curriculum Department and ERHS- Language Arts Department Leads Writing Teachers	School-Wide	August 2012-June 2013	Department and Content Meeting updates Administrative CWT's, Evaluations, Teacher Lesson Plans and Content Meeting	All Instructional Staff Department Chairs Administrators
Connecting to Common Core through Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM)	9-12	District Curriculum Department	All Instructional Staff in Language Arts and Reading Departments	November 15, 2012	Content Meeting Evaluations (Formal/Informal) Classroom Walkthroughs Surveys on implementation and effectiveness	ERHS – TQR Jacob Stein Administration and Department Chairs

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

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.			1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
Science Goal #1A: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Science Goal #1B: Providing the data violates student confidentiality.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.			2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.
Science Goal #2A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Science Goal #2B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

High School Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Science Goal #1: Providing the data violates student confidentiality.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <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.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Science Goal #2: Providing the data violates student confidentiality.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <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.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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]).

Biology 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.			1.1. Not all students are receiving the same material and instruction	1.1. FCIM Bell-work	1.1. Classroom Instructor Administration	1.1. Student Assessment Scores	1.1. Common Assessment FCIM calendar assessment
Biology 1 Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Increase the percentage of students scoring in the 2/3rd percentage by moving 20% of the 1/3 percentage students to the 2/3 level	36	40					
	1.2. Students coming into a science course with a high level of deficiency on some standards 1.3. Students absent from classroom instruction		1.2. After-school Tutoring	1.2. Classroom Instructor Laura Bushwitz (NHS/SNHS)	1.2. Progress monitoring of grades	1.2. Common Assessment Biology EOC	1.2. Teacher assessment data
			1.3. Utilizing technology (internet) to make content and remediation available outside of class.	1.3. Classroom Instructor	1.3. Progress monitoring utilizing school-wires	1.3. Common Assessment	1.3. Student Survey Feedback
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.			2.1. Biology curriculum has been simplified to accommodate low achieving students	2.1. Differentiated Instruction	2.1. Classroom Instructor Administration	2.1. CWT’s and Teacher Evaluations	2.1. Common Assessment Biology EOC
Biology 1 Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Increase the percentages of students scoring level 4 and 5 by 10%.							
	2.2. Lack of real world relevance in the curriculum. 2.3. Students are unable to make		2.2. Integrate more career and real world application in to instructions	2.2. Classroom Instructor Administration	2.2. Administrator/Department Chair	2.2. CWT’s and Teacher Evaluations	2.2. Common Assessment Biology EOC

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

	connection between content.	2.3. Instructors will scaffold their instructions	2.3. Classroom Instructor Administration	2.3. Teacher, Department Chair, Administration	2.3. CWT's and Teacher Evaluations	2.3. Common Assessment Biology EOC
--	-----------------------------	---	--	--	------------------------------------	------------------------------------

End of Biology I EOC Goals

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
School Wide Literacy Plan	9-12	District Curriculum Department and ERHS- Language Arts Department Leads Writing Teachers	School-Wide	August 2012-June 2013	Department and Content Meeting updates Administrative CWT's, Evaluations, Teacher Lesson Plans and Content Meeting	All Instructional Staff Department Chairs Administrators
Connecting to Common Core through Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM)	9-12	District Curriculum Department	All Instructional Staff -Biology	November 15, 2012	Content Meeting Evaluations (Formal/Informal) Classroom Walkthroughs Surveys on implementation and effectiveness	Administration and Department Chairs
Task Cards for Biology 5 E Model	9 and 10	District Learning Zones	All Instructional - Biology	September 19 & 26	Work in Content Meeting to plan and discuss utilization of Task Cards	All Instructional Staff-Biology Administrators

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
			Subtotal:
Technology			
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

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

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]).

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.			1A.1. Teacher implementation of the use of the rubrics for grading.	1A.1. Implementation of a year long, school-wide writing initiative to be conducted across all grade levels as well as all departments.	1A.1. Administration, Language Arts Department Chair, All Instructional Staff	1A.1. Administration will monitor classrooms to ensure all Literacy Posters are visible to students and encourage teachers to refer to the posters during instruction, in addition to using the rubric for grading student work.	1A.1. Student Work will be assessed using the rubric.
Writing Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Student performance will increase by 10% as shown through the percent of students meeting high standards in writing. Anticipating a 4.0 Scale.	83%	91%					
			1A.2. Organization of and testing of all students. Meeting with all students who will write in science, math, social studies, career and technical classes, etc.	1A.2. FCAT/Common Core writing rubric will be created and distributed to all teachers to be utilized when grading student writing.	1A.2. Literacy Coach, Administration, Language Arts Department Chair, Teachers	1A.2. Essays will be graded by select English Teachers as well as Teachers from various departments, and marked for student improvement. Teachers will conference with students individually to support student growth in writing.	1A.2. Departmental writing activities for all grade levels
			1A.3. Teacher implementation of strategies.	1A.3. Content area Data Based Questioning strategies will be implemented in the classroom. American/World History “Teaching American History” Grant will provide school-wide training in August and September. AVID-Cornell notes will be utilized school-wide.	1A.3. Administration, All Teachers	1A.3. Administration will coordinate training and monitor implementation	1A.3. DBQ and Cornell notes reviewed and assessed by teachers
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.			1B.1. Organization of and testing of	1B.1. Writing Activities will occur	1B.1. Various Department teacher	1B.1. FCAT Writing Rubric to be	1B.1. FCAT Writing Rubric

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

Writing Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Increase the percentage of students writing at a 4.0 Level to 85%	29	85	all students throughout the year, to be conducted in individual departments quarterly throughout the school year.	each term by individual departments for students in all grades.	implementations of strategies.	introduced by Language Arts Department teachers and utilized by teachers in all departments.	
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
FCAT 2.0 Writing Plan School Wide	9 th and 10 th	District Curriculum Department Teacher Leader 9/10 Grade: Stalma	All 9 th and 10 th Grade Language Arts Teachers	September 20, 2012 October-19 November- TBA January - TBA February - TBA	Writing PLC – Administrative CWT’s, Monthly Department updates on writing progress	Administration, Department Chairs
Common Core Writing School-Wide	11 th -12 th	District Curriculum Department Teacher Leader: 11 th and 12 th Teron	All Teachers-School Wide	September 20, 2012 October 1, 2012 November- TBA January- TBA February- TBA	Writing PLC- Administrative CWT’s, Monthly Department updates on writing progress	Administration, Department Chairs
Writing Task Cards	9-12	District C2 Cohort	All Teachers-School Wide	September 18, 20, 26	Writing PLC-Administrative CWT’s Content PLC	Administration, Department Chairs

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) FCAT 2.0 Writing Prompts and Common Core Strands for Writing with Supportive Evidence			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Copies, Materials, Supplies and Literacy Charts	Copy of Prompts/Pencils/ Copied and Laminated	Discretionary Budget	\$300.00
Substitute Teachers	Supply Substitute for Teachers at Workshops and District Training on Writing.	School Discretionary Budget	\$1,000.00
			Subtotal:
Technology			
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

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
K-12 Writing Plan	District \$ Funding Lead Teacher Training	District Curriculum Department	Cost to ERHS - \$0.00
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Summer Writing Teams	Create FCIM/Writing Prompts/Writing Plan	SAI Budget	5,000.00
Subtotal:			
Total:			

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]).

Civics EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Civics Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</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>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Civics Goal #2: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</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>					
			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

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

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

End of Civics Goals

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

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]).

U.S. History EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
U.S. History Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	Professional Development opportunities for teachers, as the EOC and curriculum map are new for all US History teachers.	Lesson Study for US History Lake County Schools US History Curriculum Map/Blueprint US History Task Cards (produced by Lake County Schools DA Team)	Assistant Principal: Brent Frazier SS Dept Chairperson: Grant Mollett US History Teachers: Jennifer Butera, Scott McKenzie, Al DeJoseph, Tim Ferrell, Joseph Wright, Rick Everett	Scheduling and implementation of lesson study among US History teachers. Monthly content area meetings for common lesson planning along the US History curriculum map.	Bank of lessons that have been created, executed, observed, and reflected/edited by US History teachers. Updated lesson plans and benchmark focus forms from content area meetings.
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>		The need for mid-year data to re-teach skills, benchmarks, and content prior to the EOC.	The district will develop a mid-year benchmark test. Teachers will use this data to create a plan to review and reteach weak areas.	Assistant Principal: Brent Frazier SS Dept Chairperson: Grant Mollett Testing Dept: B.J. Gamez and Sandy Sunderman	US History EOC results	US History EOC
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
			The ability to group struggling students and readers with high achieving students, as many students with higher reading scores tend to take separate AP US History course.	Purposely group students by reading levels, DBQ writing levels, etc. for peer teaching/learning.	Assistant Principal: Brent Frazier SS Dept Chairperson: Grant Mollett US History Teachers: Jennifer Butera, Scott McKenzie, Al DeJoseph, Tim Ferrell, Joseph Wright, Rick Everett	Continuous implementation of quarterly DBQs in US History courses.	Storage of student work (DBQs) in blue crates provided by the Curriculum Department.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
			The need for proven strategies to	AVID Strategies, specifically	Assistant Principal: Brent	Monitoring of teacher use of	Teacher evaluations.

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

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

U.S. History Goal #2: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>	increase levels for high achieving students in US History.	Cornell Notes and various strategies within the Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Reading, and Organization model (WICR+O). Lake County Schools DBQ Project Initiative for World and US History	Frazier SS Dept Chairperson: Grant Mollett US History Teachers: Jennifer Butera, Scott McKenzie, Al DeJoseph, Tim Ferrell, Joseph Wright, Rick Everett	AVID strategies and the DBQ by Department Chair and Assistant Principal walkthroughs. Continuous implementation of quarterly DBQs in US History courses.	Storage of student work (DBQs) in blue crates provided by the Curriculum Department.
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

U.S. History Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Lesson Study	U.S.History	Grant Mollett	U.S. History Teachers	8-12-6-13	Teacher implementation	Administration, Department head
U.S. History Task Cards	U.S. History	Brent Frazier	U.S. History Teachers	9-26-12	Teacher implementation	Administration, Department head
Edmodo Training	All	District Office	School-wide	9-20-12	Teacher implementation	Administration, Department head

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

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

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

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Summer Writing Teams	Writing Prompts/FCIM/DBQ's		See Writing Dollar Amount and Source
Subtotal:			
Total:			

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]).

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			1.1 Board Approval and student failures due to automatic grade reduction due to non-attendance	1.1. East Ridge High will use an independent attendance policy approved by Lake County School Board.	1.1. Principal Administration Guidance Counselors	1.1. Progress Monitoring Student attendance by grade level administrators, guidance counselors, and teachers	1.1. Student Grades and Student attendance records
Attendance Goal #1:	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					
The average daily attendance rate will increase by 2percent for the 2012-2013 school years .	93.54%	95.54%					
	<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>					
	648	500					
	<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>					
	NA	NA					
			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

Attendance Professional Development

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

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Attendance Goals

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

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)).

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension			1. Funding-Teacher; Allocation, Materials Provided	1.1. Developed an In-School Suspension Program focused on Character Development, Reflection and FCAT Remediation	1.1. Administration, Exceptional Student Education Subject Area Certified instructors.	1.1. Process through administration (discipline referrals)	1.1. Discipline Reports and Positive Behavior support Data
<u>Suspension Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Total Number of In – School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected In- School Suspensions</u>					
East Ridge High will decrease the number of out of school and in-school suspensions by 10%. .	39 (?)	30(?)					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current number of students suspended in-school</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected number of students suspended in- school</i>					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current number of students suspended out- of- school</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected number of students suspended out- of- school</i>					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current number of students suspended out- of- school</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected number of students suspended out- of- school</i>					
			1.2.Full Implementation of Expectations-Staff	1.2.PBS-Teach Behavioral expectations during ADAPT.	1.2. Administration and Instructional Staff.	1.2. Administration	1.2. Discipline Reports and PBS Data
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
ERHS-PBS/1: Knight	9-12 ADaPT	PBS Coordinator	Administration, Teachers and Staff Members	Begin in September Tuesdays(ADaPT)	CWT's during ADaPT and PBS In-Services	Department chairs, PBS Coordinator and Administration

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Dropout Prevention			1.1. Student history of unsuccessful academics	1.1. Use of E2020 during school and after school	1.1. Administration, guidance counselors, E2020 trained teachers	1.1. Completion of required graduation courses for grade forgiveness	1.1. AS400, eSembler
Dropout Prevention Goal #1: Decrease the dropout rate by .3%.	<u>2012 Current Dropout Rate:*</u> ERHS has a single year dropout rate of 2.3%.	<u>2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*</u> The ERHS single year dropout rate is expected to be 2%.					
	<u>2012 Current Graduation Rate:*</u> ERHS has a graduation rate of 85.9%.	<u>2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*</u> The ERHS graduation rate is expected to be 95.9%.					
			1.2. 1.1 Lack of student and parent communication regarding graduation requirements	1.2. Parent Information Meetings and Senior Letters	1.2. Counselors	1.2. Graduation rate	1.2. AS400, FIDO
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement			1.1. Communication-Incorrect Phone Contacts, Lack of Internet Access, Copy Cost	1.1. Attendance Clerk call to make corrections on Parent Contact Numbers Notify parents of lower cost internet connections Print/Mail only no contacts	1.1. Administration and Guidance	1.1. Notate number of no call connects Sign in sheets at events	1.1. Sign In Sheets- Number of Parents participating
Parent Involvement Goal #1: Increase Parent Involvement by 10% from our 2011-12 school year percentage of 38%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</u> 38%	<u>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</u> 42%	1.2. Times of Events	1.2. Schedule later time frames to meet with parents.	1.2. Administration.	1.2. Survey Parents	1.2. Survey Monkey
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Parent Involvement Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
"Meet the Knights"	9-12	Guidance	School -Wide	October 1 st and March	Sign-In Sheet and a Survey to parents	Administrators and Teachers
SAC Training	9-12	SAC Chair	Open to all Parents	September 10, 2012	Meeting noted on website and call outs on School Messenger	AP for SAC/SAC Chair

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
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Contact Parents via call outs	School Messenger System	School Discretionary Budget	\$2,500.00
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: Increase number of students taking high level Math and Science Course (i.e. Physics and Calculus). The need to secure an engineering instructor to create and sustain a successful engineering program.	1.1. The need to reduce student fear and anxiety.	1.1. Student informational meetings.	1.1 Instructor, department chair and administration	1.1. Number of students enrolling in higher level math, science and engineering course.	1.1. Student schedules, student feedback(surveys)
	1.2. Securing a qualified instructor.	1.2. Bring in guest speakers from different backgrounds that may be trained in those fields or hold a degree.	1.2. Instructors and Administration.	1.2 TEAM Evaluation	1.2 TEAM Evaluation
	1.3. Providing extra support for students in higher level courses.	1.3. Peer Mentoring/Tutoring	1.3. Instructors	1.3. Student Surveys	1.3. Surveys/Student Schedules

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
College and Career Preparation	9-12	Administration	Instructor , students and Administration	2012-2013 school years.	Student/teacher college and industry visits	Instructors and Administration

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<p>CTE Goal #1: To increase the number of students who complete Career and Professional Academies leading to successful industry certification.</p> <p>Additional Goal #1: Students will increase industry certification by 10% (13)</p> <p>2011-12 – 78% (83)</p> <p>2012-13- 88% (90)</p>	1.1. Students will enroll in a Career and Professional Academy but not complete all levels required for certification.	1.1. The CTE instructor will meet with each student individually during each term to discuss student’s interest and encourage him or her to continue in the academy. Students will be taught the benefits of completing the Career and Professional Academy. These include industry certification, postsecondary articulated credit, and scholarship opportunities.	1.1. Melissa Frana, Academy Administrator, Luressie McGriff CTE department chair, Angela Ratter, Career and Professional Academy Guidance Counselor.	1.1. To increase the number of students who complete Career and Professional Academies leading to successful industry certification	1.1. Industry certification exam pass rate.
	1.1. Students will enroll in and complete all coursework within the Career and Professional Academy but will not earn industry certification.	1.1. Increased use of deliberate practice within all Career and Professional Academies. Additional use of Read 180 programs designed to increase reading skills in an effort to assist in the decoding of industry manuals and associated texts.	1.1. Melissa Frana, Academy Administrator, Luressie McGriff CTE department chair, Angela Ratter, Career and Professional Academy Guidance Counselor.	1.1. Monitor use of Read 180 programs within Career and Professional Academies and discuss use during monthly department meetings. Incorporate industry certified individuals within the community to prepare students for transition to postsecondary education and careers.	1.1. Pass rate percentages on industry certification exams.

CTE Professional Development

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

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

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

		PLC Leader	school-wide)	frequency of meetings)		
Reading Instruction, Increasing Rigor and complexity for the Common Core	All content areas 9-12	District Curriculum Department	All Instructional Staff	September 20, 2012-Dec 20, 2012	Content Meeting Evaluations (Formal/Informal) Classroom Walkthroughs Surveys on implementation and effectiveness	ERHS – TQR Jacob Stein Administration and Department Chairs

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Additional Goal			Students not reporting acts bullying.	Post on Website, Announcements, and school messenger student access to hot line.	Administrators and Teachers	Data Collected from the Evaluation Tools	Number of Incidents reported on via hot line, AS400, ERHS Bully Box
Anti-Bullying Goal	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
East Ridge High School would like to reduce the number of Bullying Level III incidents by 50%	2 incidents	1 incident					
			1.2. Students not recognizing what is considered bullying (school and law enforcement)	1.2. Deputies conduct anti-bullying talks in 9 th grade classes, 10 th , 11 th , and 12 th during assemblies.	1.2. SRO Administrator	1.2. 9 th Grade Language Arts Classes Bullying Information Reported	1.2. Number of Incidents reported via hotline, AS400, ERHS Bully Box
			1.3. 9 th graders lack the maturity level to recognize the need to stop bullying	1.3. “Capturing Kids Hearts” Students partner with 9 th grade students to implement anti-bullying message	1.3. Leadership Teacher	1.3. Look at number of Reported Incidents. Conduct a Survey on Anti-bullying	1.3. Number of Incidents reported via hotline, AS400, ERHS Bully Box

Additional Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PD for reading and HOTS	9-12	Missy Frana and Luressie McGriff	All CTE staff	Quarterly	Monthly department meetings	Department Chair and Administrator
SAT/ACT Prep	Upper level courses (10-12)	Missy Frana and Luressie McGriff	All CTE staff	Quarterly	Monthly department meetings	Department Chair and Administrator

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

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

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

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

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	Total:
CELLA Budget	

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

	Total:
Mathematics Budget	
	Total:
Science Budget	
	Total:
Writing Budget	
	Total:
Civics Budget	
	Total:
U.S. History Budget	
	Total:
Attendance Budget	
	Total:
Suspension Budget	
	Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget	
	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	
	Total:
STEM Budget	
	Total:
CTE Budget	
	Total:
Additional Goals	
	Total:
	Grand Total:

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

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

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

Yes No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
Look over and approve School Improvement Plan and Mid Year Update. Approve SAC Funding to support C2 Readiness –Teacher Grants (College and Career Readiness).

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Academic Support	\$7, 042.31

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

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