FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Hilliard Middle-Senior High School	District Name: Nassau
Principal: Dr. Brent Tilley	Superintendent: Dr. John Ruis
SAC Chair: Laura Porter	Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.
School Grades Trend Data (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)
High School Feedback Report
K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

Administrators

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

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Brent Tilley	B.A., M.S. Educational Leadership, Ed.D. Educational Leadership. State of Florida Certifications: Level II Principal Certification , Middle Grades Integrated, Middle Grades Math, Educational Leadership	3	7	Principal Hilliard Middle-Senior High in 2011-2012: Grade: Pending. Reading Mastery: 60%, 2011-2012; Reading Gains: 64%, Lowest Quartile: 65%, Writing Mastery: 79% Math Mastery: 55%, Science Mastery: 32%, Writing Mastery: 79% Principal Hilliard Middle Senior High School in 2010-2011: Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 65%, Math mastery: 74%, Science Mastery: 46%, Writing Mastery: 92%. AYP: 79%. The total population did not make AYP in Reading or Math. The white and black populations did not make AYP in Reading or Math. Economically disadvantaged students did not make AYP in Reading or Math. 2009-2010: Grade: B, Reading Mastery: 65%, Math Mastery: 75%, Science Mastery: 31%, Writing Mastery: 88%. AYP: 79%. The total population did not make AYP in Reading or Math. The white and black populations did not make AYP in Reading or Math. Economically disadvantaged students did not make AYP in Reading or Math. Assistant Principal Yulee Elementary school in 2008-2009: Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 82%, Math mastery: 80%, Science Mastery: 48%, Writing mastery 91%. AYP: 95%, Students with disabilities did not make AYP in reading and math. 2007-2008: Grade: A, Reading Mastery 84%, Math Mastery 80%, Science Mastery 45%, Writing Mastery 77%. AYP 92%, SWD did not make AYP in reading and

					math. The total population did not make AYP in Writing. Assistant Principal at Yulee Middle: 2006-2007: Grade A, Reading Mastery: 70%, Math Mastery 68%, Writing Mastery 97%. AYP: 92%, Economically disadvantaged students and SWD did not make AYP in math.
Assistant Principal	Cheryl Copps	B.A.; M.S.; State of Florida Certifications: in Educational Leadership, Elementary Education, Occupational Specialist, Teacher Coordinator of Cooperative Education Endorsement	30	14	Assistant Principal Hilliard Middle-Senior High in 2011-2012: Grade: Pending. Reading Mastery: 60%, Math Mastery: 55%, Science Mastery: 32%, Writing Mastery: 79% Assistant Principal Hilliard Middle Senior High School in 2010-2011: Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 65%, Math mastery: 74%, Science Mastery: 46%, Writing Mastery: 92%. AYP: 79%. The total population did not make AYP in Reading or Math. The white and black populations did not make AYP in Reading or Math. Economically disadvantaged students did not make AYP in Reading or Math. Assistant Principal 2009-2010: Grade: B, Reading Mastery: 65%, Math mastery: 75%, Science Mastery: 31%, Writing Mastery: 88%. AYP: 79%. The total population did not make AYP in Reading or Math. The white and black populations did not make AYP in Reading or Math. Economically disadvantaged students did not make AYP in Reading or Math.

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

Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Julie Smith	M.S.; B.A. Degree. Professional Educator's Certificate with Florida Certification in: Elementary Education(1-6), English 6-12, Educational Media Specialist, Reading Endorsement	9	5	2011-2012; Grade: Pending. Reading Mastery: 60%, Reading Gains: 64%, Lowest Quartile: 65%, Writing Mastery: 79% 2010-2011; Grade: A. Reading Mastery: 65%, , Writing Mastery: 92%. 2009-2010: Grade B. Reading Mastery: 65%, Learning Gains: 56%, Lowest 25% Gains: 54% 2008-2009: Grade A. Reading Mastery: 67%, Learning Gains: 61%, Lowest 25% Gains: 59%. The total population and economically disadvantaged students did not make AYP in reading. 2007-2008: Grade A. Reading Mastery: 66%, Learning Gains: 62%, Lowest 25% Gains: 58%. Economically disadvantaged students did not make AYP in reading.

Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

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

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Regular meetings of new teachers with Principal	Prinicipal	Monthly
2. Partnering new teachers with veteran staff	Principal	Beginning of school year
3. Contacts with local colleges and personnel office	Principal	Continuous

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

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
0% (0)	N/A

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total number of Instructional Staff	% of first-year teachers	% of teachers with 1-5 years of experience	% of teachers with 6-14 years of experience	% of teachers with 15+ years of experience	% of teachers with Advanced Degrees	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
42	1	20	40	40	27%	95%	8	2	15

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Monica Cason	Jamie Terry	Teach same grade level	Peer observations, meetings, planning time.
Kelly Burnette	Kalyn Rayburn	Teach in same department	Peer observations, meetings, planning time.
Melissa Conner	Rob McCannell	Teach in same department	Peer observations, meetings, planning time.

| Kelly Burnette | Thomas Johnson | Teach in same department | Peer observations, meetings, planning time. |

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. The MTSS core team consists of: Administrator, school counselor, reading coach, department heads, and teachers.
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 MTSS leadership team is responsible for ensuring that the school has in place a system that provides increasingly intense and individualized interventions, resources and supports needed to meet the unique needs of its students. In order to identify those needs, the team must analyze data to determine deficits and other areas in need of improvement. The team looks at academic, attendance and behavior related data. As the team disaggregates the data, it is identifying which students are meeting grade level expectations and which are not. It is looking for patterns and trends in the data. Leading questions: Are certain groups of students failing to meet expectations in certain subjects? Or, are there certain groups who have other non-academic barriers to achievement that must be addressed before they will be able to meet academic success? Are there trends in achievement within specific subgroups that need to be addressed? Once those areas of need have been identified, the leadership team disseminates this information to the departments, literacy teams and other school based teams. They will assist in determining appropriate research based interventions to remediate specific deficits and identify other available resources to meet individual student needs. The departments/teams oversee the implementation of the interventions and monitor student progress through regularly scheduled meetings. The progress monitoring information will be shared with the departments/teams together will monitor the effectiveness of interventions through student progress monitoring data and fidelity checks.
Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? The RtI problem solving process provides the framework for developing the SIP. This framework requires schools to identify problems within the general population of students and within subgroups of students, analyze why the problems are occurring and formulate an intervention plan and then measure the effectiveness of the interventions through regular progress monitoring. Their plan to address and remediate areas of deficit becomes the basis for the school improvement plan.

MTSS Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.
    Tier I-Data sources: FCAT 2.0, FAA, EOCs in Algebra I, Geometry, Biology, PERT, ACT, SAT. Data programs: FOCUS, PMRN, FCAT Data Star
    Tier II-Program specific data for Tier II instruction- READ 180 Next Generation, Achieve 3000, Study Island
    Tier III- PMP student individualized progress monitoring plans

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. The District RtI Specialist, district support personnel, and Florida Department of Education online RtI introductory course are available
Describe the plan to support MTSS. District Problem Solving/Response to Intervention Process Implementation Guide

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

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).Administration, Reading Coach, Media Specialist, Department heads and teachers.
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).   The purpose of the Literacy Leadership Team is to create capacity of reading knowledge within the school building, to identify literacy goals and to develop an action plan to achieve those goals. The principal, reading coach, mentor reading teachers, content area teachers, and other principal appointees will serve in this role. Literary Leadership teams meet regularly to address professional development in literacy, content area literacy initiatives, and reading intervention programs. The principal and reading/literacy coach at the school chair or co-chair these meetings.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? The **LLT will support instructional strategies to improve reading comprehension and the Common Core State Standards for College and Career Readiness in reading, writing, speaking, listening, and language. The LLT team will provide professional development throughout the year to ensure that text complexity, along with close reading and rereading of texts, is central to lessons, to provide scaffolding that does not preempt or replace text reading by students, to develop and ask text dependent questions from a range of question types, to emphasize that students support their answers based upon evidence from the text, and to provide extensive research and writing opportunities.**

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.

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

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

The Reading Coach, along with the principal and Literacy Leadership Team employ research-based strategies to support reading/writing instruction across the curriculum. The Reading Coach provides professional development activities to engage all teachers through Professional Learning Communities. Students' mastery of the Common Core State Standards, FCAT 2.0, ACT, SAT, and PERT requires a unified approach by all teachers to meet the particular challenges of reading and writing in each subject area. Teachers' use of high quality complex text will provide a context for building language and vocabulary. By extracting information from more complex informational text, using text evidence to explain and justify an argument in discussion and writing, analyzing and critiquing the effectiveness and quality of an author's writing style, presentation, or argument, students reading skills will become more highly developed. Monitoring the effectiveness of this goal will include: classroom walkthrough data, program data, progress monitoring data, lesson plans, and student artifacts.

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

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

Career and technical teachers collaborate to engage students in cognitively complex tasks involving hypothesis generation and testing.

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?

Efforts to support the development of students' academic and career plans include large group presentations, classroom presentations, parent workshops and individual conferences with students throughout their high school careers.   Resources include student handbooks, the Student Progression Plan, Registration Guides, College and Career Fairs, and Financial Aid Workshops. Family involvement in the planning process includes notification of activities through School Reach, school websites, and school newsletters.

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.
Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report.

Schools recognize students who meet Florida's "College Ready Scholar" criteria. To meet that goal and based on analysis of assessment data, students may be provided with additional support through courses such as Intensive Reading, Math for College Readiness, Math for College Success, and English 4 Florida College Prep.

Career technical programs offer certification opportunities for students in Food Service Management (Serve Safe), Certified Nursing Assistant, EMT, ADOBE Flash, National Center for Construction Education and Research: Level 1 Electrical and HVAC Level 1 and 2, Microsoft Office Specialist, and ADOBE Photo Shop. Dual Enrollment and Advanced Placement courses provide opportunities for students to engage in college-level coursework while enrolled in high school.

In addition, the "2012-2013 District Reading Remediation Guidelines" stipulates that students scoring below the college readiness level for writing will be required to receive remediation for college readiness in writing during their senior year through the course option: "English 4 Florida College Prep."

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS
Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1A: The percentage of students achieving a Level 3 or above on the FCAT 2.0 reading assessment will increase.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 60%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 63%	1A.1. Students may fail to see the connection between classroom activities and learning goals.	1A.1. Teachers will develop clearly stated learning goals accompanied by a scale or rubric that describes levels of performance to help students see the connections between classroom activities and learning goals. (Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework)	1A.1.Student, Teacher, and Administrator	1A.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs	1A.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs
			1A.2 Students may not relate what is being addressed in class to their personal interests.	1A.2 Teacher will make connections between students' interests and class content to engage students in the learning process. (Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework)	1A.2. Student, Teacher, and Administrator	1A.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk -throughs	1A.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs
			1A.3 Data analysis is necessary to support targeted instruction to improve student achievement.	1A.3.. Teachers will utilize FAIR , *Study Island, Achieve 3000, and FCAT explorer data to target instruction to improve student achievement	1A.3. Student, Teacher and Administrator	1A.3. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs	1A.3. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs

		1A4 Assessments from instructional software programs and data analysis require the availability and dependability of computer access and technological support. Teachers may need technology support.	1A4 Request district assistance for technology support.	1A4 Student, Teacher, and Administrative feedback	1A4 Request district assistance	1A4 Request district assistance
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.		1B1. Students may struggle with having a clear understanding of what is expected of them and to set goals for their learning.	1B.1. Teachers will provide clear learning goals and scales (PAES Labs and Unique Learning System , Marzano's Art and Science of Teacher Framework), and will utilize district purchased programs and software to track student progress.	1. B1. School administration and classroom teacher	1.B1. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration	1.B1. Florida Alternate Assessment
Reading Goal #1B: The percentage of student scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 on the FAA will maintain.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 100%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 100%				
		1B2. Students may struggle to comprehend new content as it is introduced	1B.2. Teachers will help students identify critical information, organize new knowledge, preview new content, chunk content into digestible bites, and process new information(PAES Labs and Unique Learning System, Marzano's Art and Science of Teacher Framework)	1B.2. School administration and classroom teacher	1B.2. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration.	1.B2. Florida Alternate Assessment
		1B3. Students may struggle to retain content that they have already learned.	1B.3. Teachers will help students review content, practice and deepen knowledge, practice skills, strategies, and processes. (Marzano's Art and Science of Teacher Framework)	1B3. School administration and classroom teacher	1B.3. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration	1.B3. Florida Alternate Assessment

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.			2A.1. Students may not be engaged in cognitively complex tasks.	2A.1. Teachers will incorporate common core state standards for literacy to challenge students to higher levels of achievement.	2A.1. Student, Teacher and Administrator	2A.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs	2A.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs
Reading Goal #2A: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or above on the FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment will increase.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 30%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 33%					
			2A.2. Students may need assistance to interact with new knowledge.	2A.2. Teachers will implement Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework and the associated research-based instructional strategies in every classroom.	2A.2.Student, Teacher and Administrator	2A.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs	2A.2.Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walkthroughs
			2A.3. Assessments from instructional software programs and data analysis require the availability and dependability of computer access and technological support. Teachers may need technology support.	2A.3. Request district assistance for technology support.	2A.3. Student, Teacher and Administrator, District Technology Department	2A.3. Request district assistance	2A.3.Request district assistance
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.			2B1. Students may struggle with having a clear understanding of what is expected of them and to set goals for their learning.	2B1. Teachers will utilize district purchased programs and software to provide clear learning goals and scales, and to track student progress (PAES Labs and Unique Learning System, Marzano's Art and Science of Teacher Framework)	2B1. School administration and classroom teacher	2B1. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration	2B1. Florida Alternate Assessment
Reading Goal #2B: The percent of students scoring at or above level 7 will maintain or increase.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 90%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 93%					
			2B.2. Students may struggle to comprehend new content as it is introduced.	2B.2. Teachers will utilize district purchased programs and software to help students identify critical information, organize students to interact with new	2B.2. School administration and classroom teacher	2.B2. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration.	2.B2. Florida Alternate Assessment

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

| | | | knowledge, preview new content, chunk content into digestible bites, and process new information (PAES Labs and Unique Learning System, Marzano's Art and Science of Teacher Framework,) | | | |

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. Reading Goal #3A: The percentage of students making learning gains in FCAT 2.0 Reading will increase.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 64%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 67%	3A.1. Students may require intensive and differentiated instruction in reading.	3A.1. Teachers will use research based instructional strategies and utilize programs that provide differentiated instruction for all students, including Read 180, Achieve 3000, and Study Island.	3A.1. Student, Teacher, Reading Coach, Media Specialist and Administrator	3A.1. Program reports, assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk- throughs	3A.1. Program reports, assessment data, student interview, administrative walk-throughs
			3A.2. Assessments from instructional software programs and data analysis require the availability and dependability of computer access and technological support. Teachers may require additional support.	3A.2. Request district assistance for technology support.	3A.2. Request district assistance	3A.2 Student, Teacher and Administrator feedback	3A.2.Requrest district assistance
			3A 3 Students may not be organized to practice and deepen knowledge	3A.3. Teachers will implement strategies from Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework and utilize READ 180, Achieve 3000, and Study Island to increase student achievement.	3A.3. Student, Teacher, Reading Coach, Media Specialist and Administrator	3A.3. Program reports, assessment data, student interview, administrative walk-throughs	3A.3. Program reports, assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	3B1. Students may struggle with having a clear understanding of what is expected of them and to set goals for their learning.	3B1. Teachers will utilize district purchased programs and software to provide clear learning goals and scales, and to track student	3B1. School administration and classroom teacher	3B1. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration	3B1. Florida Alternate Assessment

The percentage of students making learning gains on the FAA Reading will increase.	63%	66%			progress (PAES Labs and Unique Learning System, Marzano's Art and Science of Teacher Framework).			
			3B.2. Students may struggle to comprehend new content as it is introduced	3B.2. Teachers will utilize district purchased programs and software to help students identify critical information, organize students to interact with new knowledge, preview new content, chunk content into digestible bites, and process new information (PAES Labs and Unique Learning System, Marzano's Art and Science of Teacher Framework)	3B.2. School administration and classroom teacher	3B2. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration.	3B2. Florida Alternate Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4A.1. Lower quartile students may not be fully engaged in the learning process.	4A.1. Teachers will communicate high expectations for all students, will assist students to interact with new knowledge, and will provide practice of skills,	4A.1. Student, Teacher and Administrator	4A.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-through	4A.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-through
Reading Goal #4: The percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

gains in FCAT 2.0 Reading will increase.	65%	68%		strategies and processes to improve the performance of lower quartile students. (Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework) Nassau County's District Reading Plan will be implemented for students who score at Level 1 or Level 2 on FCAT Reading and who have intervention needs in the areas of decoding and/or text reading.	Reading Coach, Counselor, Administrator	Data Analysis: FCAT 2.0, Read 180, Achieve 3000, Study Island	Data Analysis: FCAT 2.0, Read 180, Achieve 3000, Study Island
			4A.2 Assessment data from instructional software programs and data analysis require the availability and dependability of computer access and technological support. Teachers may need additional technology support.	4A 2. Request district assistance for technology support.	4A.2. Request district assistance	4A.2. Student, Teacher and administrative feedback	4A.2. Request district assistance
			4A.3 Lower quartile students may require additional support to process new information.	4A 3. Teachers will employ strategies to chunk content into digestible bites, elaborate on new information and record and represent new knowledge. (Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework)	4A.3. Student, Teacher, Reading Coach, Administrator	4A.3.Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs	4A.3.Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** 59%	60%	64%	68%	72%	76%	80%
Reading Goal #5A: Current level of performance is 60%.							

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**		5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	1 Data analysis to target instruction. Utilize instructional software (Study Island READ 180 Next Generation Achieve 3000) to meet individual needs.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.
Reading Goal #5B: The percentage of students in each subgroup making satisfactory progress on FCAT Reading will increase.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* White:62% Black:32% Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White:65% Black:35% Hispanic: Asian: 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. ELLs have not had enough time in the ESOL program to become proficient with English to pass the test. Average time for ELLs to be proficient is 3-5 years. However, each ELL is different based on support from home and literacy levels of parents.	5C.1.Teachers and ELL paraprofessional will continue to work with ELLs at their level, making the needed accommodations with the content area material. Involve ELLs in Community in Schools for reinforcement and assistance with assignments and homework. .	5C.1.Principal, assistant principal, counselors, & reading coach.	5C. 1. Data analysis	5C.1.Ongoing progressing monitoring data
Reading Goal #5C: ELL students will increase their FCAT reading level of performance in grades 6-8 and 9-12 for the 2012-2013 school year.	2012 Current Level of Performance :* *6-8 =12% proficient in FCAT reading* *9-12=14% proficient in FCAT reading*	2013 Expected Level of Performance :* *6-8=will increase the proficiency level of performance in FCAT reading* *9-12=will increase the proficiency level of performance in FCAT reading*					
			5C.2. Not enough ESOL endorsed teachers who know strategies when working with ELLs at the different English levels.	5C.2. Provide more ESOL endorsed teachers for ELLs at schools with a large ELL population.	5C.2. Principal, assistant principal, counselors, & reading coach.	5C.2. Staff certifications	5C.2. Staff certifications
			5C.3. Lesson plans will be modified for the English level of each ELL, especially beginning and low intermediate ELLs.	5C.3. Check to make sure teachers are using the ELLs LEP Plan when making lesson plans.	5C.3. Principal, assistant principal, counselors, & reading coach.	5C.3. Review of lesson plans	5C.3. Ongoing progressing monitoring data

		5C.4 ELLs who have been in the program five years or longer. The gap between their grade level and performance is not closing is indicative of an ongoing need for increased intervention with MTSS.	5C: 4 MTSS team to address concerns	5C:4 MTSS personnel	5C:4 Review individual progress monitoring plans.	5C:4 Ongoing progressing monitoring data
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D: The percentage of students with disabilities making satisfactory progress in Reading will increase.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 28% / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 31%	5D.1. The SWD population may have a broad range of needs and accommodations.	5D.1.Teachers will identify needs of SWD and provide accommodations and modifications specific to each student.	5D.1. Classroom teachers and school administration	5D.1. In class assessments and progress monitoring	5D.1. In class assessments and FCAT
		5D.2. SWD may learn at a slower rate.	5D.2. Teachers will provide SWD with repetition and reinforcement for skill development.	5D.2. Classroom teachers	5D.2. In class assessments and progress monitoring.	5D.2. In class assessments and FCAT
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E: The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students will making satisfactory progress in Reading will increase.			5E.1. Teachers may be unaware of the situations faced by ED students.	5E.1. Teachers will identify and consider needs of ED students and provide interventions as needed.	5E.1. Classroom teachers	5E.1. In class assessments and progress monitoring	5E.1. FCAT
	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 49%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 52%					
			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 Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Read 180	9, 10	Scholastic Consultant	English/Reading Block Teachers	Summer, 2012 Winter, 2012	Leadership Dashboard	CRT, Building Administrator, Reading Coach, Teacher
Achieve 3000	9, 10	Achieve 3000 Consultant	Grade 9, 10, English Teachers	Summer, 2012 Winter, 2012	System Data Analysis	CRT, Building Administrator, Reading Coach, Teacher
Study Island	9 - 12	Study Island Consultant	Teachers in core subject areas	Summer, 2012 Fall, 2012	System Data Analysis	Building Administrator, Reading Coach, Media Specialist, Teacher
Marzano Art & Science of Teacher Evaluation Model	9-12	Staff and Program Development Office	Teachers and Building Administrators	Ongoing	Teacher assessments	Administrators
Common Core Standards: An Overview	6-12	Beacon Educator	Secondary Teachers	Fall/Winter 2012	Review of Professional Activity Implementation report.	Staff Development Administration

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

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

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials. ***All resources funded by District			
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 Reading Goals

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

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1: The percentage of students proficient in CELLA listening/speaking will increase in grades 6-8 and 9-12 for the 2012-2013 school year	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: 6-8=47% 9-12=77%.	1.1. ELLs have not had enough time in the ESOL program to become proficient with English to pass the test. Average time for ELLs to be proficient is 3-5 years. However, each ELL is different based on support from home and literacy levels of parents.	1.1. Teachers and ELL paraprofessional will continue to work with ELLs at their level, making the needed accommodations with the content area material. Involve ELLs in Community in Schools for reinforcement and assistance with assignments and homework.	1.1. Principal, assistant principal, counselors, & reading coach.	1.1.Data analysis	1.1.CELLA
		1.2. Not enough ESOL endorsed teachers who know strategies when working with ELLs at the different English levels.	1.2. Provide more ESOL endorsed teachers for ELLs at schools with a large ELL population.	1.2. Principal, assistant principal, counselors, & reading coach.	1.2. Review teacher certifications, ESOL certifications, and teachers working towards endorsement.	1.2.Teacher Certification
		1.3. Lesson plans modified for the English level of each ELL, especially beginning and low intermediate ELLs.	1.3. Check to make sure teachers are using the ELLs LEP Plan when making lesson plans.	1.3. Principal, assistant principal, counselors, & reading coach.	1.3.Administrative walk throughs, teacher assessments	1.3.IObservation.
		1.4 ELLs who have been in the program five years or longer.The gap between their grade level and performance is not closing is indicative of an ongoing need for increased intervention with MTSS.	1.4 MTSS team to address concerns.	1.4 MTSS personnel	1.4 Data Analysis	1.4 CELLA

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

Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2: The percentage of students proficient in CELLA reading will increase in grades 6-8 and 9-12 for the 2012-2013 school year	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: 6-8=35% 9-12=38%	2.1. ELLs have not had enough time in the ESOL program to become proficient with English to pass the test. Average time for ELLs to be proficient is 3-5 years. However, each ELL is different based on support from home and literacy levels of parents.	2.1. Teachers and ELL paraprofessional will continue to work with ELLs at their level, making the needed accommodations with the content area material. Involve ELLs in Community in Schools for reinforcement and assistance with assignments and homework.	2.1. Principal, assistant principal, counselors, & reading coach.	2.1. Data analysis	2.1.CELLA
		2.2. Not enough ESOL endorsed teachers who know strategies when working with ELLs at the different English levels.	2.2. Provide more ESOL endorsed teachers for ELLs at schools with a large ELL population	2.2. Principal, assistant principal, counselors, & reading coach.	2.2. Review teacher certifications, ESOL certifications, and teachers working towards endorsement.	2.2. Teacher Certification
		2.3. Lesson plans modified for the English level of each ELL, especially beginning and low intermediate ELLs.	2.3. Check to make sure teachers are using the ELLs LEP Plan when making lesson plans.	2.3. Principal, assistant principal, counselors & reading coach.	2.3. Administrative walk throughs, teacher assessments	2.3. IObservation
		2.4 ELLs who have been in the program five years or longer. The gap between their grade level and performance is not closing is indicative of an ongoing need for increased intervention with MTSS.	2.4 MTSS team to address concerns	2.4 MTSS personnel	2.4 Data analysis	2.4 CELLA

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

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3: The percentage of students proficient in CELLA writing will increase in grades 6-8 and 9-12 for the 2012-2013 school year	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : 6-8=29% 9-12=62%	3..1. ELLs have not had enough time in the ESOL program to become proficient with English to pass the test. Average time for ELLs to be proficient is 3-5 years. However, each ELL is different based on support from home and literacy levels of parents.	3..1.Teachers and ELL paraprofessionals will continue to work with ELLs at their level, making the needed accommodations with the content area material. Involve ELLs in Community in Schools for reinforcement and assistance with assignments and homework.	3..1.Administration, counselors & reading coach.	**3.1 Data analysis**	3.1 CELLA
		3.2. Not enough ESOL endorsed teachers who know strategies when working with ELLs at the different English levels.	3.2. Provide more ESOL endorsed teachers for ELLs at schools with a large ELL population.	3.2. Administration	3.2. Review teacher certifications, ESOL certifications, and teachers working towards endorsement.	3.2. Teacher certifications
		3.3. Lesson plans modified for the English level of each ELL, especially beginning and low intermediate ELLs.	3.3. Check to make sure teachers are using the ELLs LEP Plan when making lesson plans.	3.3. Principal, assistant principal, counselors, & reading coach.	3.3. Administrative walk throughs, teacher assessments	3..3. IObervation
		3.4 ELLs who have been in the program five years or longer. The gap between their grade level and performance is not closing is indicative of an ongoing need for increased intervention with MTSS.	3.4 MTSS team to address concerns.	3.4 MTSS personnel	3.4Data analysis	3.4 CELLA Writing

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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. Mathematics Goal #1A: The percentage of students achieving a Level 3 or above on the FCAT 2.0 Math assessment will increase.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 55%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 58%	1A.1. Students may fail to see the connection between classroom activities and learning goals.	1A.1. Teachers will clearly state learning goals accompanied by a scale or rubric that describes levels of performance and help students see the connections between classroom activities and learning goals. (Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework)	1A.1. School Administration and classroom teacher	1A.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs	1A.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs
			1A.2 Students may not relate what is being addressed in class to their personal interests.	1A2. Teacher will make connections between students' interests and class content to engage students in the learning process. (Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework)	1A 2. School Administration and classroom teacher	1A2. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration.	1A.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs
			1A3. Effective use of instructional software programs and data analysis required the available and dependability of computer access and technological support. Teachers may need support provided by the	1A3Teachers will utilize district purchased programs and software to provide clear learning goals and scales, (Accelerated Math, Discovery Ed, etc.)	1A3. School Administration and classroom teacher	1A.3. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration	1.A.3 Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs

			Technology Department.				
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B1. Students may struggle with having a clear under-standing of what is expected of them and to set goals for their learning.	1B1. Teachers will utilize district purchased programs and software to provide clear learning goals and scales, and to track student progress (Unique Learning System, IXL, and/or Accelerated Mathematics)	1B1. School Administration and classroom teacher	1B1. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration	1.B1. Florida Alternate Assessment
Mathematics Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The percentage of student scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 on the FAA will maintain.	100%	100%					
			1B2 Effective use of instructional software programs and data analysis required the available and dependability of computer access and technological support. Teachers may need provided by the Technology Department.	1B2. Teachers will utilize district purchased programs and software to help students identify critical information, organize students to interact with new knowledge, preview new content, chunk content into digestible bites, and process new information (Unique Learning System, IXL, and/or Accelerated Mathematic, Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework s)	1B2. School Administration and classroom teacher	1B2. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration	1B.2 Florida Alternate Assessment.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1. Students may not be engaged in cognitively complex tasks.	2A.1. Teachers will identify, teach and assess common terminology / vocabulary used in mathematics (CCSS) and word problems to challenge students to higher levels of achievement.	2A.1. School Administration and classroom teacher	2A.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs	2A.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs
Mathematics Goal #2A: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or above on the FCAT 2.0 Math assessment will increase. .	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 22%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 25%					
			2A.2. Students may need assistance to interact with new knowledge.	2A.2. Teachers will implement Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework and the associated research-based instructional strategies in every classroom.	2A.2. School Administration and classroom teacher	2A.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs	2A.2.Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walkthroughs.
			2A.3. Effective use of instructional software programs and data analysis required the available and dependability of computer access and technological support. Teachers may need support provided by the Technology Department.	2A.3. Teachers will utilize district purchased programs and software (Kudo Software) to help students review content, organize students to practice and deepen knowledge, and practice skills, strategies, and processes. (Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework)	2A.3. School Administration, classroom teacher, and District Technology Department	2A.3. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs	2A.3. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1. Students may struggle with having a clear under-standing of what is expected of them and to set goals for their learning.	2B.1. Teachers will utilize district purchased programs and software to provide clear learning goals and scales, and to track student progress (Unique Learning System, IXL, and/or Accelerated Mathematics, Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework)	2B.1. School Administration and classroom teacher	2B.1. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration	2B.1. Florida Alternate Assessment
Mathematics Goal #2B: The percentage of student scoring at a Level 7 or above on the FAA will increase.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 70%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 73%					

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

		2B.2. Effective use of instructional software programs and data analysis required the available and dependability of computer access and technological support. Teachers may need support provided by the Technology Department.	2B.2. Teachers will utilize district purchased programs and software to help students identify critical information, organize students to interact with new knowledge, preview new content, chunk content into digestible bites, and process new information (Unique Learning System, IXL, and/or Accelerated Mathematics)	2B.1. School Administration and classroom teacher	2B.1. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration	2B.1. Florida Alternate Assessment
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3A.1. Students may fail to see the connection between classroom activities and learning goals.	3A.1. Teachers will clearly state learning goals accompanied by a scale or rubric that describes levels of performance to help students see the connections between classroom activities and learning goals. (Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework)	3A.1. School Administration and classroom teacher	3A.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs	3A.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs
Mathematics Goal #3A: The percentage of students making learning gains in FCAT 2.0 Math will increase.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 57%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 60%					
			3A.2 Students may not relate what is being addressed in class to their personal interests.	3A.2Teacher will make connections between students' interests and class content to engage students in the learning process. (Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework)	3A.2. School Administration and classroom teacher	3A.2. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration.	3A.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs
			3A.3. Effective use of instructional software programs and data analysis required the available and dependability of computer access and technological support. Teachers may need support provided by the Technology Department.	3A.3 Teachers will utilize district purchased programs and software to provide clear learning goals and scales, (Accelerated Math, Discovery Ed, etc.)	3A.3. School Administration and classroom teacher	3A.3. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration	3A.3. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1. Students may struggle with having a clear under-standing of what is expected of them and to set goals for their learning.	3B.1. Teachers will utilize district purchased programs and software to provide clear learning goals and scales, and to track student	3B.1. School administration and classroom teacher	3B.1. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration	3B.1. Florida Alternate Assessment
Mathematics Goal #3B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	43%	46%		progress (Unique Learning System, IXL, and/or Accelerated Mathematics)			
Percentage of students making learning gains on the FAA Math will increase.			3B.2. Effective use of instructional software programs and data analysis required the available and dependability of computer access and technological support. Teachers may need support for the technology department.	3B.2. Teachers will utilize district purchased programs and software to help students identify critical information, organize students to interact with new knowledge, preview new content, chunk content into digestible bites, and process new information (Unique Learning System, IXL, and/or Accelerated Mathematics)	3B.2. School administration and classroom teacher	3B.2. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration	3B.2. Florida Alternate Assessment
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4: The percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in FCAT 2.0 Math will increase.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 52%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 55%	4A.1. Lower quartile students may not be fully engaged in the learning process.	4A.1. Teachers will communicate high expectations for all students, will assist students to interact with new knowledge, and will provide practice of skills, strategies and processes to improve the performance of lower quartile students. (Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework)	4A.1. School Administration and classroom teacher	4A.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-through	4A.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-through
			4A.2 Assessment data from instructional software programs and data analysis require the availability and dependability of computer access and technological support. Teachers may need additional support from the technology department.	4.2.4 Request district assistance when needed	4A.2. School Administration and classroom teachers and other school staff.	4A.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-through, teacher and administrative feedback	4A.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-through
			4A.3 Lower quartile students may require additional support to process new information.	4A.3 Teachers will employ strategies to chunk content into digestible bites, elaborate on new information and record and represent new knowledge. (Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework)	4A.3. School Administration and classroom teachers and other school staff.	4A.3.Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs	4A.3.Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** 58%	55%	59%	64%	69%	73%	78%

Mathematics Goal #5A:

Current level of performance is 55%

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**		5B.1 Students may not relate what is being addressed in class to their personal interests.	5B.1. Teacher will make connections between students' interests and class content to engage students in the learning process. (Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework)	5B.1. School Administration and classroom teacher	5B.1. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration.	5B.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs	
Mathematics Goal #5B: The percentage of "subgroup" students making satisfactory progress in Math will increase	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* White:57% Black:33% Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White:60% Black:36% Hispanic: Asian: 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 mathematics.			5C.1. ELLs have not had enough time in the ESOL program to become proficient with English/Math to pass the test. Average time for ELLs to be proficient is 3-5 years. However, each ELL is different based on support from home and literacy levels of parents.	5C.1. Teachers and ELL paraprofessional will continue to work with ELLs at their level, making the needed accommodations with the content area material. Involve ELLs in Community in Schools for reinforcement and assistance with assignments and homework. .	5C.1. Principal, assistant principal, counselors, & reading coach.	5C. 1. Data analysis	5C.1. Ongoing progressing monitoring data
Mathematics Goal #5C: The percentage of ELL students making satisfactory progress in Math will increase	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 1 ELL student	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* The ELL student will make satisfactory progress in math					
			5C.2. Not enough ESOL endorsed teachers who know strategies when working with ELLs at the different English levels.	5C.2. Provide more ESOL endorsed teachers for ELLs at schools with a large ELL population.	5C.2. Principal, assistant principal, counselors, & reading coach.	5C.2. Staff certifications	5C.2. Staff certifications
			5C.3. Lesson plans will be modified for the English level of each ELL, especially beginning and low intermediate ELLs.	5C.3. Check to make sure teachers are using the ELLs LEP Plan when making lesson plans.	5C.3. Principal, assistant principal, counselors, & reading coach.	5C.3. Review of lesson plans	5C.3. Ongoing progressing monitoring data
			5C.4 ELLs who have been in the program five years or longer. The gap between their grade level and performance is not closing is indicative of an ongoing need for increased intervention with MTSS.	5C: 4 MTSS team to address concerns	5C:4 MTSS personnel	5C:4 Review individual progress monitoring plans.	5C:4 Ongoing progressing monitoring data

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
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1. The SWD population may have a broad range of needs and accommodations.	5D.1.Teachers will identify needs of SWD and provide accommodations and modifications specific to each student.	5D.1. Classroom teachers and school administration	5D.1. In class assessments and progress monitoring	5D.1. In class assessments and FCAT
Mathematics Goal #5D: The percentage of SWD students making satisfactory progress in Math will increase.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 32%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 35%					
			5D.2. SWD may learn at a slower rate.	5D.2. Teachers will provide SWD with repetition and reinforcement for skill development.	5D.2. Classroom teachers	5D.2. In class assessments and progress monitoring.	5D.2. In class assessments and FCAT
			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. Teachers may be unaware of the situations faced by ED students.	5E.1. Teachers will identify and consider needs of ED students and provide interventions as needed.	5E.1. Classroom teachers	5E.1. In class assessments and progress monitoring	5E.1. FCAT
Mathematics Goal #5E: The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged (ED) students making satisfactory progress in Math will increase	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 46%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 49%					
			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

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

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

High School Mathematics Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1: . The percentage of student scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 on the FAA will maintain.	Mathematics Goal #1: 2012 Current Level of Performance:* — 100% 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* — 100%	1.1. Students may struggle with having a clear understanding of what is expected of them and to set goals for their learning.	1.1. Teachers will utilize district purchased programs and software to provide clear learning goals and scales, and to track student progress (PAES Labs and Unique Learning System)	1.1. School administration and classroom teacher	1.1. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration	1.1. Florida Alternate Assessment
		1.2. Students may struggle to comprehend new content as it is introduced	1.2. Teachers will utilize district purchased programs and software to help students identify critical information, organize students to interact with new knowledge, preview new content, chunk content into digestible bites, and process new information (PAES Labs and Unique Learning System)	1.2. School administration and classroom teacher	1.2. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration.	1.2. Florida Alternate Assessment
		1.3. Students may struggle to retain content that they have already learned.	1.3. Teachers will utilize district purchased programs and software to help students review content, organize students to practice and deepen knowledge, and practice skills, strategies, and processes.	1.3. School administration and classroom teacher	1.3. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration	1.3. Florida Alternate Assessment
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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

			2.1. Students may struggle with having a clear understanding of what is expected of them and to set goals for their learning.	2.1. Teachers will utilize district purchased programs and software to provide clear learning goals and scales, and to track student progress (PAES Labs and Unique Learning System, Marzano's Art and Science of Teacher Framework)	2.1. School administration and classroom teacher	2.1. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration	2.1. Florida Alternate Assessment
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring Level 7 or higher on the FAA will increase.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 70%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 73%					
			2.2. Students may struggle to comprehend new content as it is introduced.	2.2. Teachers will utilize district purchased programs and software to help students identify critical information, organize students to interact with new knowledge, preview new content, chunk content into digestible bites, and process new information (PAES Labs and Unique Learning System, Marzano's Art and Science of Teacher Framework,)	2.2. School administration and classroom teacher	2.2. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration.	2.2. Florida Alternate Assessment
			2.3. Students may struggle to retain content that they have already learned.	2.3. Teachers will help students review content, organize students to practice and deepen knowledge, and practice skills, strategies, and processes. (Marzano's Art and Science of Teacher Framework,)	2.3. School administration and classroom teacher	2.3. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration	2.3. Florida Alternate Assessment

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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. Students may struggle with having a clear understanding of what is expected of them and to set goals for their learning.	3.1. Teachers will utilize district purchased programs and software to provide clear learning goals and scales, and to track student progress (PAES Labs and Unique Learning System, Marzano's Art and Science of Teacher Framework).	3.1. School administration and classroom teacher	3.1. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration	3.1. Florida Alternate Assessment
Mathematics Goal #3: The percentage of students making learning gains on the FAA will increase.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 42%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 45%					
			3.2. Students may struggle to comprehend new content as it is introduced	3.2. Teachers will utilize district purchased programs and software to help students identify critical information, organize students to interact with new knowledge, preview new content, chunk content into digestible bites, and process new information (PAES Labs and Unique Learning System, Marzano's Art and Science of Teacher Framework)	3.2. School administration and classroom teacher	3B. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration.	32. Florida Alternate Assessment
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1. Algebra 1 Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring at Level 3 on the Algebra EOC will increase.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance :*</u> 52%	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance :*</u> 55%	1.1. Students may fail to see the connection between classroom activities and learning goals.	1.1. Teachers will develop clearly stated learning goals accompanied by a scale or rubric that describes levels of performance to help students see the connections between classroom activities and learning goals. (Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework)	1.1.Student, Teacher, and Administrator	1.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs	1.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs, Algebra 1 EOC
			1.2 Students may not relate what is being addressed in class to their personal interests.	1.2 Teacher will make connections between students' interests and class content to engage students in the learning process. (Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework)	1.2. Student, Teacher, and Administrator	1.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk - throughs	1.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs
			1.3 Data analysis is necessary to support targeted instruction to improve student achievement.	1.3.. Teachers will utilize *Study Island, Achieve 3000, and FCAT explorer data to target instruction to improve student achievement	1.3. Student, Teacher and Administrator	1.3. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs	1.3. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

improvement for the following group:						
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.			2.1. Students may not be engaged in cognitively complex tasks.	2.1. Teachers will incorporate common core state standards for literacy to challenge students to higher levels of achievement.	2.1. Student, Teacher and Administrator	2.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs	2.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs. Algebra 1 EOC
Algebra Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance.*					
The percentage of students scoring 4 or above on the Algebra 1 EOC will increase.	23%	26%					
			2.2. Students may need assistance to interact with new knowledge.	2.2. Teachers will implement Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework and the associated research-based instructional strategies in every classroom.	2.2.Student, Teacher and Administrator	2.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs	2.2.Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walkthroughs
			2.3. Assessments from instructional software programs and data analysis require the availability and dependability of computer access and technological support. Teachers may need technology support.	2.3. Request district assistance for technology support.	2.3. Student, Teacher and Administrator, District Technology Department	2.3. Request district assistance	2.3.Request district assistance

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** <u>N/A</u>	52%	56%	61%	66%	71%	76%

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

Algebra 1 Goal #3A: Current level of performance is 52%						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.**		3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: All sub groups struggle due to inadequate progress monitoring and remediation of deficient skills.	3B.1. Teacher will utilize district purchased software programs to provide baseline and midyear assessment, to monitor student progress, to remediate skills, and to provide test preparation.	3B.1. Classroom teacher and school administration	3B.1. Evaluation of in class assessment data and classroom walkthroughs	3B.1. Algebra EOC Exam
Algebra 1 Goal #3B: Percentage of students in all subgroups making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1 will increase.	2012 Current Level of Performance :* White:55% Black:42% Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance :* White:58% Black:45% Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:				
			3B.2. Sub groups struggle to set learning goals and to comprehend new content.	3B.2. Teachers communicate learning goals and scales and track student progress. Work with students to interact with new knowledge by identifying critical information, organizing students to interact with new knowledge, previewing new content, chunking content into digestible bites, and processing new information.	3B.2. Classroom teacher and school administration	3B.2. Evaluation of in class assessment data and classroom walkthroughs	3B.2. Algebra EOC Exam

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

		3B.3. Sub groups struggle to retain content that they have previously learned.	3B.3. Help students practice and deepen knowledge by reviewing content, organizing students to practice and deepen knowledge, and practicing skills, strategies, and processes.	3B.3. Classroom teacher and school administration	3B.3. Evaluation of in class assessment data and classroom walkthroughs	3B.3. Algebra EOC Exam
		3B.4. Teachers need greater number of teaching tools and strategies to address deficiencies in subgroups.	3B.4 Teachers will continue training in Marzano strategies for increased student achievement.	3B.4 Classroom teacher and school administration	3B.4 Evaluation of in class assessment data and classroom walkthroughs	3B.4 Algebra EOC Exam

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3C.1. ELLs have not had enough time in the ESOL program to become proficient with English to pass the test. Average time for ELLs to be proficient is 3-5 years. However, each ELL is different based on support from home and literacy levels of parents.	3C.1.Teachers and ELL paraprofessional will continue to work with ELLs at their level, making the needed accommodations with the content area material. Involve ELLs in Community in Schools for reinforcement and assistance with assignments and homework.	3C.1.Principal, assistant principal, counselors, & reading coach.	3C. 1. Data analysis	3C.1.Ongoing progressing monitoring data
Algebra 1 Goal #3C: The percentage of ELL students passing the Algebra 1 EOC will increase.	2012 Current Level of Performance :* No ELLs took the Algebra EOC	2013 Expected Level of Performance :* N/A					
			3C2. Not enough ESOL endorsed teachers who know strategies when working with ELLs at the different English levels.	3C.2. Provide more ESOL endorsed teachers for ELLs at schools with a large ELL population.	3C.2. Principal, assistant principal, counselors, & reading coach.	3C.2. Staff certifications	3C.2. Staff certifications
			3C.3. Lesson plans will be modified for the English level of each ELL, especially beginning and low intermediate ELLs.	3C.3. Check to make sure teachers are using the ELLs LEP Plan when making lesson plans.	3C.3. Principal, assistant principal, counselors, & reading coach.	3C.3. Review of lesson plans	3C.3. Ongoing progressing monitoring data

			3C.4 ELLs who have been in the program five years or longer. The gap between their grade level and performance is not closing is indicative of an ongoing need for increased intervention with MTSS.	3C: 4 MTSS team to address concerns	3C:4 MTSS personnel	3C:4 Review individual progress monitoring plans.	3C:4 Ongoing progressing monitoring data
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3D.1. The SWD population may have a broad range of needs and accommodations.	3D.1.Teachers will identify needs of SWD and provide accommodations and modifications specific to each student.	3D.1. Classroom teachers and school administration	3D.1. In class assessments and progress monitoring	3D.1. In class assessments and Algebra 1 EOC
Algebra 1 Goal #3D: The percentage of students with disabilities making satisfactory progress in Algebra I will increase.	2012 Current Level of Performance :* 31%	2013 Expected Level of Performance :* 34%					
			3D.2. Teachers will provide SWD with repetition and reinforcement for skill development.	3D.2. Classroom teachers	3D.2. In class assessments and progress monitoring.	3D.2. In class assessments and FCAT	3D.2. In class assessments and Algebra 1 EOC
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3E.1. Teachers may be unaware of the situations faced by ED students.	3E.1. Identify and consider needs of ED students and provide accommodations as needed.	3E.1. Classroom teachers	3E.1. In class assessments and progress monitoring	3E.1. Algebra EOC
Algebra 1 Goal #3E: The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students making satisfactory progress on the Algebra I EOC will increase.	2012 Current Level of Performance :* 48%	2013 Expected Level of Performance :* 51%					
			3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

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

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

Geometry EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.			1.1. Students may fail to see the connection between classroom activities and learning goals.	1.1. Teachers will develop clearly stated learning goals accompanied by a scale or rubric that describes levels of performance to help students see the connections between classroom activities and learning goals. (Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework)	1.1.Student, Teacher, and Administrator	1.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs	1.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs, Geometry EOC
Geometry Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring at Level 3 on the Geometry EOC will increase	2012 Current Level of Performance:* N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 60%					
			1.2 Students may not relate what is being addressed in class to their personal interests.	1.2 Teacher will make connections between students' interests and class content to engage students in the learning process. (Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework)	1.2. Student, Teacher, and Administrator	1.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk - throughs	1.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs, Geometry EOC
			1.3 Data analysis is necessary to support targeted instruction to improve student achievement.	1.3.. Teachers will utilize *Study Island, Achieve 3000, and FCAT explorer data to target instruction to improve student achievement	1.3. Student, Teacher and Administrator	1.3. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs	1.3. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs, Geometry EOC
			1.4 Insufficient teacher knowledge of research based, highly effective	1.4. Teachers will continue training in Marzano strategies for increased	1.4. Classroom teacher and school administration	1.4. Evaluation of in class assessment data and classroom walkthroughs	1.4. Geometry EOC Exam

			instructional strategies.	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
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry will increase.			2.1. Students may not be engaged in cognitively complex tasks.	2.1. Teachers will incorporate common core state standards for literacy to challenge students to higher levels of achievement.	2.1. Student, Teacher and Administrator	2.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs	2.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs Geometry EOC
	2012 Current Level of Performance :*	2013 Expected Level of Performance :*					
	N/A	25%					
			2.2. Students may need assistance to interact with new knowledge.	2.2. Teachers will implement Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework and the associated research-based instructional strategies in every classroom.	2.2.Student, Teacher and Administrator	2.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs	2.2.Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walkthroughs
			2.3. Assessments from instructional software programs and data analysis require the availability and dependability of computer access and technological support. Teachers may need technology support.	2.3. Request district assistance for technology support.	2.3. Student, Teacher and Administrator, District Technology Department	2.3. Request district assistance	2.3.Request district assistance
			2.4. Insufficient teacher knowledge of research based, highly effective instructional strategies.	2.4. Teacher will continue training in Marzano strategies for increased student achievement.	2.4. Classroom teacher and school administration	2.4. Evaluation of in class assessment data and classroom walkthroughs	2.4. Geometry EOC Exam

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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

	Indian:	Indian:					

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3C.1. ELLs have not had enough time in the ESOL program to become proficient with English to pass the test. Average time for ELLs to be proficient is 3-5 years. However, each ELL is different based on support from home and literacy levels of parents.	3C.1. Teachers and ELL paraprofessional will continue to work with ELLs at their level, making the needed accommodations with the content area material. Involve ELLs in Community in Schools for reinforcement and assistance with assignments and homework. .	3C.1. Principal, assistant principal, counselors, & reading coach.	3C. 1. Data analysis	3C.1. Ongoing progressing monitoring data
Geometry Goal #3C: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance :* No ELLs took the Geometry EOC in 2011-2012	2013 Expected Level of Performance :* N/A					

			.			
		3C2. Not enough ESOL endorsed teachers who know strategies when working with ELLs at the different English levels.	3C.2. Provide more ESOL endorsed teachers for ELLs at schools with a large ELL population.	3C.2. Principal, assistant principal, counselors, & reading coach.	3C.2. Staff certifications	3C.2. Staff certifications
		3C.3. Lesson plans will be modified for the English level of each ELL, especially beginning and low intermediate ELLs.	3C.3. Check to make sure teachers are using the ELLs LEP Plan when making lesson plans.	3C.3. Principal, assistant principal, counselors, & reading coach.	3C.3. Review of lesson plans	3C.3. Ongoing progressing monitoring data
		3C.4 ELLs who have been in the program five years or longer. The gap between their grade level and performance is not closing is indicative of an ongoing need for increased intervention with MTSS.	3C: 4 MTSS team to address concerns	3C:4 MTSS personnel	3C:4 Review individual progress monitoring plans.	3C:4 Ongoing progressing monitoring data

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3D.1. The SWD population may have a broad range of needs and accommodations.	3D.1.Teachers will identify needs of SWD and provide accommodations and modifications specific to each student.	3D.1. Classroom teachers and school administration	3D.1. In class assessments and progress monitoring	3D.1. In class assessments and Geometry EOC

Geometry Goal #3D: The percentage of students with disabilities (SWD) making satisfactory progress in Geometry	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*
	N/A	40%

will increase.		5D.2. SWD may learn at a slower rate.	5D.2. Teachers will provide SWD with repetition and reinforcement for skill development.	5D.2. Classroom teachers	5D.2. In class assessments and progress monitoring.	5D.2. In class assessments and Geometry EOC
.		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.		3E.1. Teachers may be unaware of the situations faced by ED students.	3E.1. Teachers will identify and consider needs of ED students and provide interventions as needed.	3E.1. Classroom teachers	3E.1. In class assessments and progress monitoring	3E.1. Geometry EOC
Geometry Goal #3E: The percentage of economically disadvantaged (ED) students making satisfactory progress in Geometry will increase.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 60%				

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Ongoing professional development utilizing	All	School administration,	School wide	Monthly at staff and department meetings	Classroom walkthroughs by school administration	School administration and classroom teacher

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

iObservation resource library		department chairs				
District provided training on Marzano design questions and elements for Domain 1	All	Staff Development Office	District wide	Professional development day and summer workshops	Classroom walkthroughs by school administration	School administration and classroom teacher
Common Core Standards: An Overview	6-12	Beacon Educator	Secondary Teachers	Fall/Winter 2012	Review of Professional Activity Implementation report.	Staff Development Administration

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

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.			1A.1. Lack of standards based instruction	1A.1. Science lesson plans aligned with NGSSS, FCAT test item specification, and use of supplemental materials	1A.1. Teachers, Principal	1A.1. Classroom walkthroughs and monitor lesson plans	1A.1. Lesson Science FCAT and baseline assessments
Science Goal #1A: Percentage of students scoring at Level 3 on FCAT Science will increase.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 32%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 40%					
			1A.2. Additional support needed for students with disabilities	1A.2. ESE co-teachers in classes with SWD.	1A.2. Principal, ESE co-teachers	1A.2. Classroom walkthroughs, data analysis	1A.2. FCAT Science test
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1B1. Students may struggle with having a clear understanding of what is expected of them and to set goals for their learning.	1B.1. Teachers will provide clear learning goals and scales (PAES Labs and Unique Learning System , Marzano's Art and Science of Teacher Framework), and will utilize district purchased programs and software to track student progress.	1. B1. School administration and classroom teacher	1.B1. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration	1.B1. Florida Alternate Assessment
Science Goal #1B: Only 1 student took FAA Science test (Level 5)	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 100%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 100%					
			1.2. Students may struggle to comprehend new content as it is introduced	1.B2. Teachers will help students identify critical information, organize new knowledge, preview new content, chunk content into digestible bites, and process new information(PAES Labs and Unique Learning System, Marzano's Art and	1.B.. School administration and classroom teacher	1.B.2. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration.	1.B.2. Florida Alternate Assessment

		Science of Teacher Framework)			
		13. Students may struggle to retain content that they have already learned.	1.B.3. Teachers will help students review content, practice and deepen knowledge, practice skills, strategies, and processes. (Marzano's Art and Science of Teacher Framework)	1.B.3. School administration and classroom teacher	1.B.3. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration	1.B.3. Florida Alternate Assessment

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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.Science teachers unable to share strategies, techniques, and interventions	2A.1. Monthly science department meetings and peer observations	2A.1. Science department chair and principal	2A.1. Data analysis and classroom walkthroughs	2A.1. FCAT Science test
Science Goal #2A: Percentage of students scoring at or above Level 4 in Science will increase.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 5%	2013Expected Level of Performance:* 10%					
			2A.2. Improvement needed in higher order thinking skills	2A.2. Provide teachers with graphic organizers and content area teaching strategies	2A.2. Science department chair and principal.	2A.2. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	2A.2. FCAT Science test
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2.B.1. Students may struggle with having a clear understanding of what is expected of them and to set goals for their learning.	2.B.1. Teachers will provide clear learning goals and scales (PAES Labs and Unique Learning System , Marzano's Art and Science of Teacher Framework), and will utilize district purchased programs and software to track student progress.	2.B. 1. School administration and classroom teacher	2.B.1. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration	2.B.1. Florida Alternate Assessment
Science Goal #2B: Only 1 student took FAA Science test (Level 5)	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 0%	2013Expected Level of Performance:* 50%					
			2.B.2 Students may not relate what is being addressed in class to their personal interests.	2.B.2. Teachers will help students identify critical information, organize new knowledge, preview new content, chunk content into digestible bites, and process new information(PAES Labs and Unique Learning System, Marzano's Art and Science of Teacher Framework)	2.B..2. School administration and classroom teacher	2.B.2. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration.	2.B.2. Florida Alternate Assessment
			2.B.3 Data analysis is necessary to support targeted instruction to improve student	2.B.3. Teachers will help students review content, practice and deepen knowledge, practice skills,	2.B.3. School administration and classroom teacher	2.B.3. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration	2.B.3. Florida Alternate Assessment

		achievement.	strategies, and processes. (Marzano's Art and Science of Teacher Framework)			

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

High School Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			11. Students may struggle with having a clear understanding of what is expected of them and to set goals for their learning.	1.1. Teachers will provide clear learning goals and scales (PAES Labs and Unique Learning System , Marzano's Art and Science of Teacher Framework), and will utilize district purchased programs and software to track student progress.	1. 1. School administration and classroom teacher	1.1. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration	1.1. Florida Alternate Assessment
Science Goal #1: Only 1 student took FAA Science test (Level 5)	2012 Current Level of Performance :*	2013 Expected Level of Performance :*					
	1 Student tested, scored level 5	100%					
			1.2. Students may struggle to comprehend new content as it is introduced	1.2. Teachers will help students identify critical information, organize new knowledge, preview new content, chunk content into digestible bites, and process new information(PAES Labs and Unique Learning System, Marzano's Art and Science of Teacher Framework)	1.2. School administration and classroom teacher	1.2. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration.	1.2. Florida Alternate Assessment
			13. Students may struggle to retain content that they have already learned.	1.3. Teachers will help students review content, practice and deepen knowledge, practice skills, strategies, and processes. (Marzano's Art and Science of Teacher Framework)	1.3. School administration and classroom teacher	1.3. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration	1.3. Florida Alternate Assessment

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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. Science Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring Level 7 or higher on FAA Science will increase.	2.1. Students may struggle with having a clear understanding of what is expected of them and to set goals for their learning.	2.1. Teachers will utilize district purchased programs and software to provide clear learning goals and scales, and to track student progress (PAES Labs and Unique Learning System, Marzano's Art and Science of Teacher Framework)	2.1. School administration and classroom teacher	2.1. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration	2.1. Florida Alternate Assessment
Science Goal #2 table: 2012 Current Level of Performance :* = 0%; 2013 Expected Level of Performance :* = 50%	2.2. Students may struggle to comprehend new content as it is introduced.	2.2. Teachers will utilize district purchased programs and software to help students identify critical information, organize students to interact with new knowledge, preview new content, chunk content into digestible bites, and process new information (PAES Labs and Unique Learning System, Marzano's Art and Science of Teacher Framework,)	. 2.2. School administration and classroom teacher	2.2. In class progress monitoring by teacher, classroom walkthroughs by school administration	2.2. Florida Alternate Assessment
	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

Biology 1 EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.			1.1. Students may fail to see the connection between classroom activities and learning goals.	1.1. Teachers will develop clearly stated learning goals accompanied by a scale or rubric that describes levels of performance to help students see the connections between classroom activities and learning goals. (Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework)	1.1.Student, Teacher, and Administrator	1.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs	1.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs, Biology 1 EOC
Biology 1 Goal #1: 50% of students taking Biology EOC will score Level 3.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 50%					
	.		1.2 Students may not relate what is being addressed in class to their personal interests.	1.2 Teacher will make connections between students' interests and class content to engage students in the learning process. (Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework)	1.2. Student, Teacher, and Administrator	1.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk - throughs	1.2. 1.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs
			1.3 Data analysis is necessary to support targeted instruction to improve student achievement.	1.3.. Teachers will utilize *Study Island, Achieve 3000, and FCAT explorer data to target instruction to improve student achievement	1.3. Student, Teacher and Administrator	1.3. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs	1.3. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.			2.1. Students may not be engaged in cognitively complex tasks.	2.1. Teachers will incorporate common core state standards for literacy to challenge students to higher levels of achievement.	2.1. Student, Teacher and Administrator	2.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs	2.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs Geometry EOC
Biology 1 Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 25%					

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

25% of students taking Biology EOC will score level 4 or higher.		2.2. Students may need assistance to interact with new knowledge.	2.2. Teachers will implement Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework and the associated research-based instructional strategies in every classroom.	2.2.Student, Teacher and Administrator	2.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walk-throughs	2.2.Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walkthroughs 2.2.
		2.3. Assessments from instructional software programs and data analysis require the availability and dependability of computer access and technological support. Teachers may need technology support.	2.3. Request district assistance for technology support.	2.3. Student, Teacher and Administrator, District Technology Department	2.3. Request district assistance	2.3.Request district assistance

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Marzano's High Yield Strategies	All grade levels.	Principal	All teachers.	Periodically throughout the school year during Faculty or PLC meetings.	iObservation	Principal, Assistant Principal, and Teacher.
Study Island	All grade levels.	Laura Graham	All teachers.	Pre-planning.	Data analysis	Principal, Assistant Principal, and Teacher.

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			

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

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

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

End of Science Goals

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

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.			1A.1. Training needed in the new writing requirements with an emphasis on conventions, and quality of support with specific and relevant supporting details.	1A.1. Teachers will use writing across the curriculum with common writing rubrics. Implement CCSS writing standards. Use 2012 FCAT Writing Anchor Sets for staff development.	1A.1. Students, Teachers, and Administrator	1A.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walkthroughs	1A.1 Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walkthroughs
Writing Goal #1A: The percentage of students scoring at Achievement Level 3. on FCAT Writing will increase.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 79%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 82%					
			1A.2. All teachers need instructional strategies on giving quality feedback on student writing.	1A.2. Teachers will focus on learning targets with clear and specific feedback. And use common writing rubrics.	1A.2. Students, Teachers, and Administrator	1A.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walkthroughs	1A.2. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walkthroughs
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.			1B.1. Training needed in the writing with an emphasis on conventions, and quality of support with specific and relevant supporting details.	1B.1. Teachers will use writing across the curriculum. Use common writing rubrics.	1B.1. Students, Teachers, and Administrator	1B.1. Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walkthroughs	1B.1 Assessment data, student interviews, administrative walkthroughs
Writing Goal #1B: The percentage of students scoring at Achievement Level 4 or higher on FAA Writing will maintain.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 100%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 100%					
			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.

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
FCAT 2.0 Writing	4, 8, 10	District Staff	ELA teachers	Fall 2012	Student Data	Administration
Common Core Standards: An Overview	6-12	Beacon Educator	Secondary Teachers	Fall/Winter 2012	Review of Professional Activity Implementation report.	Staff Development Administration

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

Civics EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Civics Goal #1: *N/A*	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 Civics.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Civics Goal #2: *N/A*	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.

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

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

Civics Professional Development

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

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

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

U.S. History EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
U.S. History Goal #1: *N/A*	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: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

U.S. History Professional Development

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

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

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

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			1.1. Lack of parental/community support for education	1.1. Increase parental and community involvement and exposure to the importance of education in current job-field (for their children) through programs such as 9th grade orientation, college and career fair, and updates on school website	1.1. Guidance department and attendance secretary	1.1. Evaluation of absentee rates	1.1. Attendance data
Attendance Goal #1: Average daily attendance will increase.	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
	95%	96%					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	65	55					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	7	5					
			1.2. high rate of absenteeism in middle school	1.2. positive attendance program in middle school	1.2. Attendance secretary/Dean of Students	1.2. . Evaluation of middle school absentee rates	1.2. Attendance data
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Attendance Professional Development

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

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Attendance Goals

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

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1: The total number of suspensions from school will decrease.	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions 140 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School *N/A* 2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions 158 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School *N/A*	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions 126 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School *N/A* 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions 142 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School *N/A*	1.1. Repeat offenders Higher incidents of discipline with middle school students. Parental support	1.1. Implement behavior contracts. Positive behavior plan with middle school students. Parent orientation on middle school student behavior.	1.1. Dean of Students	1.1. Behavior contracts Track discipline data Parent Surveys	1.1. Discipline rate
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

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

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

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:

End of Suspension Goals

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)
Note: Required for High School- F.S., Sec. 1003.53

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

<table>
<tr>
<th colspan="3">Dropout Prevention Goal(s)</th>
<th colspan="5">Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention</th>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="3">Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:</td>
<td>Anticipated Barrier</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td>
<td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td>
<td>Evaluation Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="3">1. Dropout Prevention

Dropout Prevention Goal #1:

The percentage of drop outs will decrease.</td>
<td>1.1. Students have been retained two or more grade levels behind their kindergarten cohort.</td>
<td>1.1 Monitor "at risk" cohort and implement interventions as needed.</td>
<td>1.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Dean, Guidance Counselors, and MTSS team</td>
<td>1.1 Review dropout rates.</td>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 Current Dropout Rate:*

8%</td>
<td>2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*

6%</td>
<td rowspan="2">1.2. Lack of motivation to complete course of study.</td>
<td rowspan="2">1.2. Credit recovery programs: EdOptions, NCAH, virtual educational programs.</td>
<td rowspan="2">1.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Dean, Guidance Counselors, and MTSS team</td>
<td rowspan="2">1.2.Review transcripts.</td>
<td rowspan="2">1.2. Graduation Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 Current Graduation Rate:*
92%</td>
<td>2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*
94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="3"></td>
<td>1.3.</td>
<td>1.3.</td>
<td>1.3.</td>
<td>1.3.</td>
<td>1.3.</td>
</tr>
</table>

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

<table>
<tr>
<th colspan="6">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.</th>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus</td>
<td>Grade Level/Subject</td>
<td>PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader</td>
<td>PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)</td>
<td>Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)</td>
<td>Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring</td>
<td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</table>

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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Upload Option-For schools completing the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) please include a copy for this section.
Online Template- For schools completing the PIP a link will be provided that will direct you to this plan.

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: Increase the number of parents involved, and/or participating in school related activities	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:* *32%*	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:* *35%*	1.1. Effective communication hampered by conflicting schedules.	1. Parent Newsletters,School Reach, FOCUS, Edline , school website, Study Island, School Advisory Council, Booster Clubs, Open House, SIP meetings, new student orientation, climate surveys and volunteer training.	1.1.Administrators	1.1.Results of climate surveys, informal feedback from stakeholders, sign in sheets,	1.1. Analyze data
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.* Increase professional development opportunities for teachers that change instructional practice as it relates to effective integration of STEM across the curriculum.	1.1 Additional professional development opportunities are necessary for program development and implementation.	1.1. Provide professional development for interdisciplinary units with a focus on STEM.	1.1. Administration and Leadership team.	1.1. Review of professional development implementation activities completed by participants.	1.1. Professional Development Implementation Report
	1.2	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
				1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

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

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

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

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
CTE Goal #1: Increase the number of students successfully completing industry certification in career technical programs.	1.1 The inability for students to meet program eligibility requirements.	1.1. Provide students with additional support with courses such as Intensive Reading, Math for College Success, Math for College Readiness, and English 4 Florida College Prep.	1.1. Administration, Guidance Department,	1.1. Analyzing the percentage of CTE students earning Industry Certification	1.1 Industry Certification Exams.
	1.2.	1.2.			
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

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

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

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Additional Goal			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 (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

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

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

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

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

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance
Please choose the school's DA Status. (To activate the checkbox: 1. Double click the desired box; 2.When the menu pops up, select *Checked* under "Default value" header; 3. Select *OK,* this will place an "x" in the box.)

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
☐Priority	☐Focus	☐Prevent

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

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

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

☒ Yes   ☐ No

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

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
Regular meetings.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Teacher training and staff development.	$800.00
Instructional resources	$1,200.00