FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Pine View Middle School	District Name: Pasco
Principal: Jennifer Matthews Crosby	Superintendent: Heather Fiorentino
SAC Chair: Kristen Fuqua	Date of School Board Approval: November 6, 2012

<u>Student Achievement Data:</u>

The following links will open in a separate browser window.
<u>School Grades Trend Data</u> (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.)
<u>Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data</u> (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)
<u>High School Feedback Report</u>
<u>K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan</u>

<u>Highly Effective Administrators</u>

List your school's highly effective administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment performance (Percentage data for Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) progress.

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Jennifer Matthews Crosby	BA in Elementary Education MA in Varying Exceptionalities MA in Educational Leadership Certification: ESE K-12 and Ed. Leadership	3	13	2012 Grade A 70% Meeting High Standards in Reading 67% Meeting High Standards in Math 87% Meeting High Standards in Writing 73% Meeting High Standards in Science 71% of lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading 58% of lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math 2011 Grade A 81% Meeting High Standards in Reading

					79% Meeting High Standards in Math 64% Making Learning Gains in Reading 82% Making Learning Gains in Math 68% of lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading 77% of lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math AYP Met – No 2010 Grade A % Meeting High Standards in Reading: 79 % Meeting High Standards in Math: 79 % Meeting High Standards in Writing: 89 % Meeting High Standards in Science: 64 % Making Learning Gains in Reading: 67 % Making Learning Gains in Math: 82 % of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading: 62 % of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math: 77 AYP-No 2009 Grade D % Meeting High Standards in Reading: 40 % Meeting High Standards in Math: 73 % Meeting High Standards in Writing: 82 % Meeting High Standards in Science: 34 % Making Learning Gains in Reading: 44 % Making Learning Gains in Math: 69 % of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading: 43 % of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math: 50 AYP-No 2008 Grade C % Meeting High Standards in Reading: 43 % Meeting High Standards in Math: 69 % Meeting High Standards in Writing: 78 % Meeting High Standards in Science: 36 % Making Learning Gains in Reading: 52 % Making Learning Gains in Math: 76 % of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading: 49 % of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math: 71 AYP-No 2007 Grade C % Meeting High Standards in Reading: 41

					% Meeting High Standards in Math: 64 % Meeting High Standards in Writing: 86 % Meeting High Standards in Science: 39 % Making Learning Gains in Reading: 51 % Making Learning Gains in Math: 70 % of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading: 48 % of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math: 62 AYP-No
Assistant Principal	Jennifer Hull	BS in General Communications and MA in Educational Leadership Certifications: Middle Grades English, ESOL Endorsement, and Ed. Leadership	1	2	2012 Grade A 70% Meeting High Standards in Reading 67% Meeting High Standards in Math 87% Meeting High Standards in Writing 73% Meeting High Standards in Science 71% of lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading 58% of lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math From Charles S. Rushe Middle School – 2011 Grade A 80% meeting High Standards in Reading 79% meeting High Standards in Math 64 % Making Learning Gains in Reading 82% Making Learning Gains in Math 68% of lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading 77% of lowest 25% making learning gains in Math AYP met - No From Charles S. Rushe Middle School - 2010 Grade A 79% meeting High Standards in Reading 75% meeting High Standards in Math 69 % Making Learning Gains in Reading 75% Making Learning Gains in Math 63% of lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading 72% of lowest 25% making learning gains in Math AYP met - No From John Long Middle School 2006 – 2009 Grade A As the Language Arts Department Head, I led teachers to produce FCAT Writing Scores each year at or above a 94% passing rate.
Susan Lepisto	Assistant Principal	Bachelor of Arts M.A. Educational Leadership	.1	12	From Gulf Middle School – 2010-2011 Grade C 64% meeting High Standards in Reading 59% meeting High Standards in Math 69% Meeting High Standards in Writing

						40% Meeting High Standards in Science 63% of lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading 69% of lowest 25% making learning gains in Math AYP met - No From Gulf Middle School 2009-2010 Grade B 68% Meeting High Standards in Reading 65% Meeting High Standards in Math 82% Meeting High Standards in Writing 41% Meeting High Standards in Science 60% of lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading 69% of lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math AYP Met – No From Gulf Middle School 2008-2009 Grade A 68% Meeting High Standards in Reading 67% Meeting High Standards in Math 84% Meeting High Standards in Writing 44% Meeting High Standards in Science 73% of lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading 70% of lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math AYP Met – No From Gulf Middle School 2007-2008 Grade A 68% Meeting High Standards in Reading 66% Meeting High Standards in Math 91% Meeting High Standards in Writing 42% Meeting High Standards in Science 60% of lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading 69% of lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math AYP Met – No

<u>Highly Effective Instructional Coaches</u>

List your school's highly effective 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 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.

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

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	Mary Sawl	BA Elem. Ed. Cert: Elem. Ed., Reading, Reading Endorsement	22	8	2012 Grade A 70% Meeting High Standards in Reading 67% Meeting High Standards in Math 87% Meeting High Standards in Writing 73% Meeting High Standards in Science 71% of lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading 58% of lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math AYP Met – ??? 2011 Grade A 81% Meeting High Standards in Reading 79% Meeting High Standards in Math 64% Making Learning Gains in Reading 82% Making Learning Gains in Math 68% of lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading 77% of lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math AYP Met – No 2010 Grade A % Meeting High Standards in Reading: 79 % Meeting High Standards in Math: 79 % Meeting High Standards in Writing: 89 % Meeting High Standards in Science: 64 % Making Learning Gains in Reading: 67 % Making Learning Gains in Math: 82 % of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading: 62 % of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math: 77 AYP-No 2009 Grade A % Meeting High Standards in Reading: 80 % Meeting High Standards in Math: 79 % Meeting High Standards in Writing: 94 % Meeting High Standards in Science: 69 % Making Learning Gains in Reading: 73 % Making Learning Gains in Math:81 % of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading: 75

					% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math: 77 AYP-Yes 2008 Grade A % Meeting High Standards in Reading: 73 % Meeting High Standards in Math: 73 % Meeting High Standards in Writing: 92 % Meeting High Standards in Science: 52 % Making Learning Gains in Reading: 68 % Making Learning Gains in Math: 78 % of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading:69 % of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math: 73 AYP-No 2007 Grade A % Meeting High Standards in Reading: 72 % Meeting High Standards in Math: 69 % Meeting High Standards in Writing: 91 % Meeting High Standards in Science: 50

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	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1. District guidelines will be followed to retain and recruit Highly Qualified teachers	Principal/Assistant Principals	Ongoing	All teachers at PVMS are Highly Qualified
2.			
3.			
4.			

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

List all instructional staff and paraprofessionals who are teaching out-of-field and/or who are NOT highly effective.

Name	Certification	Teaching Assignment	Professional Development/Support to Become Highly Effective

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
63	.01% (1)	19% (12)	38% (24)	41% (26)	12% (8)	100%	15% (10)	2%	28% (18)

Teacher Mentoring Program

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program 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
Lisa Sans	Sara Saavedra	Science department head	Monthly
Deb Storts	Veronica Steiner	Reading department knowledge	Monthly
Lisa Sans	Michelle Boorse	Science department knowledge	Monthly
Pat Heid	Rita Coppin	CTE knowledge	Monthly
Andy Olson	Brandi Padgett	CTE knowledge	Monthly
Alice Sansonetti	Kristen Fuqua	Social Studies department knowledge	Monthly
Lisa Sans	Robin Lash	Science department head	Monthly
Kristen Shirmohammad	Jamie Fromm	Language Arts department head	Monthly

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 MTSS Leadership Team.   Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach, School Psychologist, Social Worker, 5 basic education teachers, 1 ESE teacher, and Drop Out Prevention Teacher
Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?   The Pine View school-based RtI Leadership Team meets weekly to review school data in regards to interventions that are working for students through the RtI process.   • Review of grade level data will be examined weekly by grade level groups and the Panther Leadership Team will examine data monthly   • Academic (including formative assessments), discipline, and attendance data will be used   • Planning for interventions, including developing and assisting in implementation of Tier 2 and Tier 3 strategies.
Describe the role of the school-based MTSS 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 RtI Framework was used to develop to examine data, look at appropriate interventions, and then set fair goals for improvement. In implementation, the RtI Early Warning System will be using their student success binder to steer the conversation around data and interventions. This will be personalized to each teachers' students to ultimately increase student growth.

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.   A File Maker Pro database will be used by teachers and administration that incorporates all of this data into one system.
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.   This database will be rolled out during planning week to provide an overview for the Panther Leadership Team. Within the first month of school, the remainder of the faculty will be fully trained as well.
Describe plan to support MTSS.   Continued training from the technology specialist, administration, and teacher leaders will be offered to support these efforts.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).   This group is headed by the Literacy Coach and one administrator. Teacher members represent the variety of grade levels and content areas.

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

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).
The meetings will continue to be monthly and will focus on school-wide literacy goals.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?
This group will complete a "One Book, One School" reading of <u>Bystander</u>, Vocabulary Bee based on academic vocabulary, and work to promote the infusion of Common Core literacy standards throughout all courses.

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 (b) F.S

For schools with Grades 6-12, describe the plan to ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility of every teacher.

Staff will be trained on Common Core Literacy Standards. This will expand the work that has been done in prior years with just an infusion of reading strategies.

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the <u>High School Feedback Report</u>.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS
<u>Reading Goals</u>

* 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. <u>Reading Goal #1a:</u> ***Increase the number of students reading at a Level 3 to 35%***	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *31% (270 of 850) students are a Level 3*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *35% will be a Level 3*	1a.1. Teachers will continue to use prior vocabulary	1a.1. School-wide academic vocabulary will help students understand increasingly complex	1a.1. Literacy Coach, Department Heads, Team Leaders, and Administration	1a.1. Lesson plans will be reviewed to look for evidence of academic vocabulary being infused into student learning activities.	1a.1. FAIR and FCAT scores improvement
			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 reading. <u>Reading Goal #1b:</u> ***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.*	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.
			1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.

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

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

		1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in reading. Reading Goal #2a: *Increase the number of students reading at a Level 4 and 5 to 40%*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *37% (320 of 850) students scored a Level 4 or 5* / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *40% will be a Level 4 or 5*	2a.1. Teachers having a difficult time finding a variety of text with increase complexity to use with these students	2a.1. Teachers will use increasingly complex text when working with these students	2a.1. Literacy Coach, Department Heads, Team Leaders, and Administration	2a.1. Lesson plans will be reviewed to look for evidence of complex text being infused into student learning activities.	2a.1. FAIR and FCAT scores improvement
		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 reading. Reading Goal #2b: *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.*	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.
		2b.2.	2b2.	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. Teachers focus only on reading the informational text	3a.1. Students will work with vocabulary in the context informational text	3a.1. Literacy Coach, Department Heads, Team Leaders, and Administration	3a.1. Lesson plans will be reviewed to look for evidence of complex text vocabulary being infused into student learning activities.	3a.1. FAIR and FCAT scores improvement
Reading Goal #3a: _Increase the number of students earning a learning gain reading 73%_	2012 Current Level of Performance:* _68% (583 of 850) students earned a Learning Gain_	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* _73% of students will have a learning gain in reading_					
			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 reading.			3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.
Reading Goal #3b: _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._					
			3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.
			3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

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

4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.						
Reading Goal #4a: *75% of the Lowest 25% will make a Learning Gain*	**2012 Current Level of Performance:*** *71% (150 of 212) of the Lowest 25% made a Learning Gain*	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:*** *75% of the Lowest 25% will make a Learning Gain*	4a.1. Teachers will continue to use prior vocabulary	4a.1. School-wide academic vocabulary will help students understand increasingly complex	4a.1. Literacy Coach, Department Heads, Team Leaders, and Administration	4a.1. Lesson plans will be reviewed to look for evidence of academic vocabulary being infused into student learning activities.
			4a.2.	4a.2.	4a.2.	4a.2.
			4a.3	4a.3.	4a.3.	4a.3.

(4a.1 also includes: 4a.1. FAIR and FCAT scores improvement)

4b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.						
Reading Goal #4b: *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.*	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.
			4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.
			4b.3	4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.

(4b.1 also includes: 4b.1.)

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011	==70% of students met high standards in reading==	==75% of students will meet high standards in reading==	==80% of students will meet high standards in reading==	==85% of students will meet high standards in reading==	==90% of students will meet high standards in reading==	==95% of students will meet high standards in reading==
Reading Goal #5A: *95% of students will meet high standards in reading*							

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	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**		5B.1. Some students need individual reading coaching.	5B.1. The Literary coach will meet regularly with students who are represented by scoring in the lowest 15th percentile (or red area) on FAIR.	5B.1. Department Head and Literacy Specialist	5B.1. Teacher observation, student performance in class and student engagement.	5B.1. Benchmark assessments, unit exams, FCAT and FAIR testing.	
Reading Goal #5B: *Each subgroup will have a 5% point reduction in students not making sati*	**2012 Current Level of Performance:*** *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* White: 28% (162 of 570) Black: 46% (22 of 47) Hispanic: 40% (67 of 167) Asian: 12% (3 of 25) American Indian:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:*** *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: 23% Black:41% Hispanic: 35% Asian: 7% American Indian:					
		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 reading.			5C.1. Teachers will continue to use prior vocabulary	5C.1. School-wide academic vocabulary will help students understand increasingly complex	5C .1. Literacy Coach, Department Heads, Team Leaders, and Administration	5C.1. Lesson plans will be reviewed to look for evidence of academic vocabulary being infused into student learning activities.	5C.1. FAIR and FCAT scores improvement
Reading Goal #5C: *There will be a 5% reduction of ELL students not making satisfactory progress in reading.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *57% (12 of 21) students are not making Learning Gains*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *52% of ELL students will not make Learning Gains*					
			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.			5D.1. Teachers focus only on reading the informational text	5D.1. Students will work with vocabulary in the context informational text	5D.1. Literacy Coach, Department Heads, Team Leaders, and Administration	5D.1. Lesson plans will be reviewed to look for evidence of complex text vocabulary being infused into student learning activities.	5D.1. FAIR and FCAT scores improvement
Reading Goal #5D: *There will be a 5% reduction of SWD students not making satisfactory progress in reading.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *65% (54 of 82) students are not making Learning Gains*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *60% of SWD will not make satisfactory progress*					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5E.1. Teachers focus only on reading the informational text	5E.1. Students will work with vocabulary in the context informational text	5E1. Literacy Coach, Department Heads, Team Leaders, and Administration	5E.1. Lesson plans will be reviewed to look for evidence of complex text vocabulary being infused into student learning activities.	5E.1. FAIR and FCAT scores improvement
Reading Goal #5E: *There will be a 5% reduction of Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	43% (134 of 308) students are not making Learning Gains	*38% of Economically Disadvantaged students will not satisfactory progress*					
			5E.2.	5E.2	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			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 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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Pathway to the Common Core book study	All	Administration, Department Heads and Literacy Coach	Faculty	Monthly	Grade Level Content meetings and lesson plans	Administration
Becoming a Reflective Teacher book study	All	Administration, Department Heads and Literacy Coach	Faculty	Monthly	Grade Level Content meetings and lesson plans	Administration

Reading 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: $0

End of Reading Goals

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

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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: *85% of ELL students will be proficient in Listening/Speaking*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: *82% (14 of 17) are proficient*	1.1. Teachers will continue to use prior vocabulary	1.1. School-wide academic vocabulary will help students understand increasingly complex	1.1. Literacy Coach, Department Heads, Team Leaders, and Administration	1.1. Lesson plans will be reviewed to look for evidence of academic vocabulary being infused into student learning activities.	1.1. FAIR and FCAT scores improvement
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read in English at grade level text 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: *22% of students will be proficient in Reading*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading : *17% (3 of 17) are proficient*	2.1. Teachers will continue to use prior vocabulary	2.1. School-wide academic vocabulary will help students understand increasingly complex	2.1. Literacy Coach, Department Heads, Team Leaders, and Administration	2.1. Lesson plans will be reviewed to look for evidence of academic vocabulary being infused into student learning activities.	2.1. FAIR and FCAT scores improvement
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
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. CELLA Goal #3: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : *52% (9 of 17) are proficient*	3.1. Teachers will continue to use prior vocabulary	3.1. School-wide academic vocabulary will help students understand increasingly complex	3.1. Literacy Coach, Department Heads, Team Leaders, and Administration	3.1. Lesson plans will be reviewed to look for evidence of academic vocabulary being infused into student learning activities.	3.1. FAIR and FCAT scores improvement

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

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
Revision of PVMS academic vocabulary list to provide updated focus on current vocabulary	This will be created by teachers through departments	No funding needed	$0
			Subtotal: $0
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Pathway to the Common Core book study	All	Administration, Department Heads and Literacy Coach	Faculty
Becoming a Reflective Teacher book study	All	Administration, Department Heads and Literacy Coach	Faculty
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: $0

End of CELLA Goals

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: ***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 mathematics.			1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.
Mathematics Goal #1b:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.
			1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2a.1.	2a.1.	2a.1.	2a.1.	2a.1.
Mathematics Goal #2a: *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.*					
			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: *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.*					

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

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

			2b.2.	2b2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.
			2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3
	Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.			3a.1.	3a.1.	3a.1.	3a.1.	3a.1.
Mathematics Goal #3a: *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.*					
			3a.2.	3a.2.	3a.2.	3a.2.	3a.2.
			3a.3.	3a.3.	3a.3.	3a..3.	3a.3.
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.			3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.
Mathematics Goal #3b: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in*					

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

	this box.	*this box.*					
			3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.
			3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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: *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.*					
			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: *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.*					

			4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	
			4b.3	4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target			**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Mathematics Goal #5A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	**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 subgroup:			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: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	

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

	this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:				
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.		5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
Mathematics Goal #5C: *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.*					
		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: *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.*					

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

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

			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.
Mathematics Goal #5E: *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.*					
			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. New teachers who are not familiar with CORE K12 assessments	1a.1. Utilize CORE K12 assessments to adjust instruction to remediate strands as needed.	1a.1. Department Head and teachers	1a.1. PLT discussion and updates on CORE K12 throughout the year	1a.1. CORE K12 and FCAT
Mathematics Goal #1a: *30% of students will score a Level 3*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *26% (221 of 850) students are a Level 3*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *30% of students will score a Level 3*					
			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: *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.*					
			1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.

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

		1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2a.1. New teachers who are not familiar with CORE K12 assessments	2a.1. Utilize CORE K12 assessments to adjust instruction to remediate strands as needed.	2a.1. Department Head and teachers	2a.1. PLT discussion and updates on CORE K12 throughout the year	2a.1. CORE K12 and FCAT
Mathematics Goal #2a: *44% of students will reach an Achievement Level 4 and 5*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *39% (331 of 850) students scored a Level 4 or 5*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *44% of students will reach an Achievement Level 4 and 5*					
		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: *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.*					
		2b.2.	2b2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.

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

		2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.		3a.1. Not all teachers will use their success binders to document RtI improvements for students	3a.1. Teachers will use RtI to identify off track students and communicate individually with those students on a daily basis	3a.1. RtI Committee Chair, Department Head, and teachers	3a.1. Documentation of student conversation and data reflecting student improvement in their Success Binders	3a.1. CORE K12 and FCAT
Mathematics Goal #3a: *76% of students will demonstrate a Learning Gain*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *71% (603 out of 850) students demonstrated a Learning Gain*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *76% of students will demonstrate a Learning Gain*				
		3a.2.	3a.2.	3a.2.	3a.2.	3a.2.
		3a.3.	3a.3.	3a.3.	3a..3.	3a.3.
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.		3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.
Mathematics Goal #3b: *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.*				

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

		3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.
		3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.

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. Not all teachers will use their success binders to document RtI improvements for students	4a.1. Teachers will use RtI to identify off track students and communicate individually with those students on a daily basis	4a.1. RtI Committee Chair, Department Head, and teachers	4a.1. Documentation of student conversation and data reflecting student improvement in their Success Binders	4a.1. CORE K12 and FCAT

Mathematics Goal #4a:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*
63% of the Lowest 25% will achieve a Learning Gain	*58% of the Lowest 25% achieved a Learning Gain*	*63% of the Lowest 25% will achieve a Learning Gain*

		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:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*

		4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	
		4b.3	4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target		**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011	**70% of students met high standards in mathematics**	**75% of students will meet high standards in mathematics**	**80% of students will meet high standards in mathematics**	**85% of students will meet high standards in mathematics**	**90% of students will meet high standards in mathematics**	**95% of students will meet high standards in mathematics**
Mathematics Goal #5A: *95% of students will meet high standards in mathematics*							
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	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**		5a.1. All subgroups: Not all teachers will use their success binders to document RtI improvements for students	5a.1. Teachers will use RtI to identify off track students and communicate individually with those students on a daily basis	5a.1. RtI Committee Chair, Department Head, and teachers	5a.1. Documentation of student conversation and data reflecting student improvement in their Success Binders	5a.1. CORE K12 and FCAT	
Mathematics Goal #5B: *All student subgroups will decrease their unsatisfactory progress by 5%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* / *% equals the amount of students not making a Learning Gain in Mathematics* / White: 27%						
	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* / *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*						

	White: 32% (181 of 568) Black: 53% (24 of 47) Hispanic: 45% (75 of 167) Asian: 7% (1 of 24) American Indian: 33% (1 of 3)	Black: 48% Hispanic: 40% Asian: 2% American Indian: 28%				
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.

			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5c.1. Not all teachers will use their success binders to document RtI improvements for students	5c1. Teachers will use RtI to identify off track students and communicate individually with those students on a daily basis	5c.1. RtI Committee Chair, Department Head, and teachers	5c1. Documentation of student conversation and data reflecting student improvement in their Success Binders	5c1. CORE K12 and FCAT
Mathematics Goal #5C: *The number of ELL students not making a learning gain will be reduced by 5%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *40% (8 of 21) did not show a Learning Gain in Mathematics*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *65% of students will show a learning gain in mathematics.*					
			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. Not all teachers will use their success binders to	5d.1. Teachers will use RtI to identify off track students and	5d.1. RtI Committee Chair, Department Head, and teachers	5d.1. Documentation of student conversation and data reflecting student	5d1. CORE K12 and FCAT

Mathematics Goal #5D: *The number of SWD not making a learning gain will be reduced by 5%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *47% (37 of 79) students did not make a Learning Gain in Mathematics*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *58% of students will show a learning gain in mathematics.*	document RtI improvements for students	communicate individually with those students on a daily basis		improvement in their Success Binders	
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5e.1. Not all teachers will use their success binders to document RtI improvements for students	5e.1. Teachers will use RtI to identify off track students and communicate individually with those students on a daily basis	5e.1. RtI Committee Chair, Department Head, and teachers	5e 1. Documentation of student conversation and data reflecting student improvement in their Success Binders	5e.1. CORE K12 and FCAT
Mathematics Goal #5E: *The number of FRL students not making a learning gain will be reduced by 5%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *33% (101 of 307) students did not make a Learning Gain in Mathematics*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *72% of students will make a learning gain in mathematics.*					
			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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

	this box.	*this box.*				
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.			3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.
Mathematics Goal #3: *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.*					
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.
Mathematics Goal #4: *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.*					

			4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.
			4.3	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Algebra 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. Students will be absent during parts of the review	1.1. The Algebra teacher will conduct a thorough review prior to the end of course exam	1.1. Administration and Mathematics Department Head	1.1. Review of lesson plans	1.1. EOC scores
Algebra Goal #1: *The number of students scoring a Level 3 on the Algebra EOC will be reduced to zero*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *4% (3 of 71)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *No students will earn a Level 3 on the Algebra EOC*					
			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 Algebra.			2.1. Students will be absent during parts of the review	2.1. The Algebra teacher will conduct a thorough review prior to the end of course exam	2.1. Administration and Mathematics Department Head	2.1. Review of lesson plans	2.1. EOC scores
Algebra Goal #2: *All students will score at or above*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

Achievement Levels 4 and 5	*91% (64 of 71)*	*100% of students will score at or above Achievement Levels 4 and*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs),Reading and Math Performance Target		**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**
3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**	**91% scored at Levels 4 and 5**	**100% will score at Levels 4 and 5**	**100% will score at Levels 4 and 5**	**100% will score at Levels 4 and 5**	**100% will score at Levels 4 and 5**	**100% will score at Levels 4 and 5**
Algebra Goal #3A: *All students will perform at Achievement Levels 4 and 5 on the Algebra End of Course Exam*							

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

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

			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	this box. White: .02% (1 of 55) Black: 0% Hispanic: 0% Asian: 0% American Indian:	*this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.			3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.
Algebra Goal #3C: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *0% of students are not making progress in Algebra*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.
			3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.			3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.
Algebra Goal #3D: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

	0% of students are not making progress in Algebra	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.			3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.
Algebra Goal #3E: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *0% of students are not making progress in Algebra .*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			3E.2.	3E.2	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3	3E.3	3E.3	3E.3	3E.3

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course Goals

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

Geometry EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Geometry Goal #1: *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.*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Geometry Goal #2: *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.*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011						
Geometry Goal #3A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*							
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	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.**		3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	
Geometry Goal #3B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.
Geometry Goal #3C: *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.*					
			3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.
			3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.
Geometry Goal #3D: *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.*					
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.
Geometry Goal #3E: *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.*					
			3E.2.	3E.2	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3	3E.3	3E.3	3E.3	3E.3

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD 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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Pathway to the Common Core book study	All	Administration, Department Heads and Literacy Coach	Faculty	Pathway to the Common Core book study	All	Administration, Department Heads and Literacy Coach
Becoming a Reflective Teacher book study	All	Administration, Department Heads and Literacy Coach	Faculty	Becoming a Reflective Teacher book study	All	Administration, Department Heads and Literacy Coach

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: $0
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Departments and GLC will work to infuse Common Core literacy standards in lessons	Common Core standards and updated curriculum maps	No funding needed	$0
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: $0

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (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. A significant number of students are unable to synthesize information and answer high complexity questions	1a.1. Utilize the 5 E's of science, higher order questioning, project based learning.	1a.1. Department Head and Science teachers	1a.1. Teacher observation, student performance in class, student feedback, and student engagement	1a.1. CORE K12, Unit exams, Study Island, and FCAT
Science Goal #1a: *There will be a 10% increase in Achievement Level 3.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *45% (120 of 268) students scored a Level 3 or higher*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *50% of students will reach an Achievement Level 3*					
			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 Level 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.
Science Goal #1b: *Enter narrative for the goal in this*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

box.	*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.
			1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.			2a.1. There could be a lack of classroom engagement	2a.1. The 8th grade students will be offered Advanced Science curriculum/introduction to STEM this year.	2a.1. Department Head and 8th grade Science teachers	2a.1. Teacher observation, student performance in class, student feedback, and student engagement	2a.1. CORE K12, Unit exams, Study Island, and FCAT
Science Goal #2a: *29% of 8th grade students will reach an Achievement Level 4 or 5*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *26% (70 of 268) scored a Level 4 or 5*	2013Expected Level of Performance:* *29% will reach an Achievement Level of 4 or 5.*					
			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.	2.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.
Science Goal #2b: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					

			2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.
			2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

High School Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Level 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Science Goal #1: *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.*					
			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: *Enter narrative for the goal in this*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					

box.	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

box.	*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

End of Biology 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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

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
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			

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

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (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. Teachers will continue to use former writing prompts	1a.1. Writing across the curriculum, incorporating google docs, will be used with an infusion of Data Based Questions	1a.1. Department Heads and Language Arts teachers	1a.1. Lesson plans will be reviewed to look for evidence of academic writing across the curriculum with data based questions infused into student learning activities.	1a.1. Writing portfolios and FCAT
Writing Goal #1a: *95% of students will score a 3.0 or higher in writing.*	**2012 Current Level of Performance:*** **2013 Expected Level of Performance:*** *87% (231 of 266) students are at Level 3 or higher* *95% of students will score a 3.0 or higher*					
		1a.2. Teachers will not infuse grammar instruction into Language Arts lessons	1a.2. Common grammar instruction	1a.2. Language Arts Department Head and Language Arts teachers	1a.2. Lesson plans will be reviewed to look for evidence of a common program of grammar instruction being infused into student learning activities.	1a.2. Writing portfolios and FCAT
		1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.		1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1	1b.1.	1b.1.

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

Writing Goal #1b:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	1a.2. Teachers will not infuse grammar instruction into Language Arts lessons	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.
		1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Pathway to the Common Core book study	All	Administration, Department Heads and Literacy Coach	Faculty	Pathway to the Common Core book study	All	Administration, Department Heads and Literacy Coach
Becoming a Reflective Teacher book study	All	Administration, Department Heads and Literacy Coach	Faculty	Becoming a Reflective Teacher book study	All	Administration, Department Heads and Literacy Coach

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: $0

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

* 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: *Enter narrative for the goal in*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

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

Civics Professional Development

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

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

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

U.S. History End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

* 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.

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

U.S. History Goal #1: *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.*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
U.S. History Goal #2: *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.*					
			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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

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

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

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

End of U.S. History Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (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. There could be family circumstances that do not encourage students to attend school regularly	1.1. Implementation of Positive Behavior Support through the use of the RtI on-track and off-track system	1.1. RtI Committee Head and teachers	1.1. Monitor attendance data	1.1. TERMS report at the end of the year
Attendance Goal #1:	2012 Current Attendance Rate:* 2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					

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

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

There will be a 10% improvement in attendance data	*76% (639 of 850) students were absent nine days or less*	*78% of students will be absent 9 days or less*					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	24% (211 of 850) students were absent 10 or more days	*10% reduction in the amount of students with 10 or more absences*					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	Zero students had excessive tardies	*Maintain a zero amount of students who have excessive tardies*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
MTSS/PS RtI Committee Meetings to focus on-track/off-track system using the SDS	All	Ingrid Tone	All	Monthly	Panther Leadership Team meetings	Administration and Tone

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

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: $0

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension	1.1. Teachers who do not consistently use the school-	1.1. The use of a school-wide discipline system with steps for	1.1. RtI Committee Head and teachers	1.1. Monitoring the SDS database to monitor student discipline and	1.1. SDS and TERMS data

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

Suspension Goal #1: *Suspensions will be reduced by 10%*	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions *There were a total of 262 in-school suspensions* 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School *81 students had in-school suspension* 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions *There were a total of 44 out-of-school suspensions* 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School *35 students suspended out- of- school*	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions *There will be 236 in-school suspensions expected* 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School *73 or less students will have in-school suspension* 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions *There will be 44 out- of- school expected* 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School *32 students will be out-of-school suspended*	wide discipline plan	the students will help reduce the number of referrals		interventions	
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
MTSS/PS RtI Committee Meetings to focus on-track/off-track system using the SDS	All	Ingrid Tone	All	Monthly	Panther Leadership Team meetings	Administration and Tone

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: $0

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Dropout Rate:* ***Enter numerical data for dropout rate in this box.***	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:* ***Enter numerical data for expected dropout rate in this box.***					
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:* ***Enter numerical data for graduation rate in this box.***	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:* ***Enter numerical data for expected graduation rate in this box.***					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

Professional Development (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 and Schedules (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

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

			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)

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**

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*			1.1. Challenges to keeping the website updated	1.1. The school website will be kept up to date so parents can be kept abreast of current events	1.1. Technology Specialist	1.1. Parent involvement survey at the year	1.1. Online survey results
There will be a 5% increase in parent involvement.	2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:* *25% of parents are involved in a school activity.*	2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:* *30% of parents will be involved in a school activity.*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

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

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

			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 Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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: *STEM will be introduced as a club marrying Science and CTE curriculums to engage learners in increasingly complex applications required to build a group based robotics project.*	1.1. There will be limited start up funds	1.1. A club will be created for students to make a robotics project	1.1. Terry O'Brien, Andy Olson, Hal Dana	1.1. Participation in the club throughout the year	1.1. A finished and working student product

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

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

	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity					
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.					
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Pathway to the Common Core book study	All	Administration, Department Heads and Literacy Coach	Faculty	Pathway to the Common Core book study	All	Administration, Department Heads and Literacy Coach
Becoming a Reflective Teacher book study	All	Administration, Department Heads and Literacy Coach	Faculty	Becoming a Reflective Teacher book study	All	Administration, Department Heads and Literacy Coach

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: $0

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
CTE Goal #1: *STEM will be introduced as a club marrying Science and CTE curriculums to engage learners in increasingly complex applications required to build a group based robotics project.*	1.1. There will be limited start up funds	1.1. A club will be created for students to make a robotics project	1.1. Terry O'Brien, Andy Olson, Hal Dana	1.1. Participation in the club throughout the year	1.1. A finished and working student product
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Pathway to the Common Core book study	All	Administration, Department Heads and Literacy Coach	Faculty	Pathway to the Common Core book study	All	Administration, Department Heads and Literacy Coach
Becoming a Reflective Teacher book study	All	Administration, Department Heads and Literacy Coach	Faculty	Becoming a Reflective Teacher book study	All	Administration, Department Heads and Literacy Coach

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: $0

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

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

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

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

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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

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

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

			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:
Mathematics Budget
Total:
Science Budget

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

	Total:
Writing Budget	
	Total:
Attendance Budget	
	Total:
Suspension Budget	
	Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget	
	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	
	Total:
Additional Goals	
	Total:
	Grand Total: $0

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		
☐ Priority	☐ Focus	X ☐ 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.

X ☐ Yes   ☐ No

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

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

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
The SAC will continue to monitor the implementation of all SIP strategies and meet monthly to be kept up to date on a variety of school related processes.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount