Brevard County Public Schools
School Improvement Plan
2012-2013

Name of School:

Central Middle School

Area:

South Area

Principal:

James C. Kirk

Area Superintendent:

Dr. Mark Mullins

SAC Chairperson:

Ashley Riley

Superintendent: Dr. Brian Binggeli

Mission Statement:

Central Middle School will provide a quality education in a culture of dedication, collaboration, and learning to help prepare our students to be college and career ready upon graduation from high school.

Vision Statement:

To design and provide a quality education that serves every student with excellence as the standard.

Brevard County Public Schools
School Improvement Plan
2012-2013

RATIONAL – Continuous Improvement Cycle Process

Data Analysis from multiple data sources: *(Needs assessment that supports the need for improvement)*

One place to start – three year trend history (optional):

Central Middle School has maintained its "A" School Grade for the past decade. It is evident through the three year trend analysis that Central has been "sustaining" its status however there is a need to push for greater results. The data shows that Central has consistently scored higher than the State in Reading, Math, Science and Writing. Central Middle School has not however been in congruence with the overall results of the District. In all categories, for the past three years, Central has fallen below the District average. With that said, it is imperative that Central Middle School review its best practices to overcome that hurdle.

The analysis from the past three years shows that the percent of students meeting high standards (defined as a level 3 or above) in reading ranges from 73% in 2010, 74% in 2011, and 63% in 2012. The percent of students meeting high standards in math in 2010 was 76%, 77% in 2011 and 63% in 2012. The percent of students meeting high standards in writing has always met the requirements to earn AYP, earning an 89% in 2010, 84% in 2011, and 76% in 2012. The percent of students meeting high standards in science remained steady in 2010 from the previous year at 60% and in 2011 dropped to 59%. In 2012, 53% of the students met high standards.

The percent of students making reading gains in 2012 was 66%, a big increase from the prior year when 57% of the students made gains. In 2010, 61% of the students made reading gains. The percent of students making gains in math has consistently dropped in the past three years from 74% in 2010, to 67% in 2011, and then 63% in 2012.

The percent of students in our lowest 25% making gains in reading in 2012 also increased from the past two years, from 63% in both 2010 and 2011 to 65% in 2012. However, the percent of students in the lowest 25% making gains in math has steadily decreased from 2010 to 2012 achieving 73%, 65% and 63% respectively.

The data also shows that the percentage of students defined as our economically disadvantaged students, those receiving free and/or reduced lunch, to be at its highest in 2012 than in the past 6 years. In 2012, the percentage of students tested was 100% and 53% of those students were free and/or reduced lunch. Also, our minority population has continued to increase from the past 6 years, reaching its highest in 2012 at 42%.

Based on the new calculations in 2012, the data demonstrates that Central Middle School's grade of an "A" was a result of the learning gains made from our lowest 25%. The additional points earned from that calculation brought us to earn our "A" status.

When comparing our individual FCAT results, the numbers illustrate that our 7th grade students surpass our 8th grade students in reading. The trend presents a concern. Our 7th grade students scoring at a level 3 or above in Reading in 2012 was 65% while in 8th grade it was merely 58%. Our math students in 8th grade did outperform our 7th grade students, 61% vs. 59% respectively, however it was not as impressive as in 2011 when our 8th graders scoring at level 3 or above was 72% and in 7th grade it was 64%.

Best Practice: *(What does research tell us we should be doing as it relates to data analysis above?)*

Best practice indicates that a variety of research-based instructional techniques should be utilized in the classroom. Robert Marzano's high-yield instructional strategies of summarizing & note-taking, reinforcing effort & recognition, non-linguistic representations, cooperative learning, generating & testing hypothesis, questions, cues & advance organizers, homework practice, identifying similarities & differences have been found to produce results with students. These instructional strategies are useful in all academic areas and can be customized to the individual teacher's taste and preference.

Carol Tomlinson's work in differentiated instruction indicates that classroom instruction should be targeted to the individual student. This is accomplished through differentiation in lesson content for different groups of students, allowing students choices in the product they show for lesson assessment, and the process through which the lesson is taught. Differentiation represents a practical strategy that can be used with students of all ability levels to teach them at their level of preparedness. This strategy tends to be time-intensive for the teacher, as significant planning is sometimes required. It also tends to be a "stretch" area for most teachers since they are often reluctant to try a differentiated lesson.

Rick Dufour's work in professional learning communities shows that having teachers act as sole proprietors with a "silo" mentality is not an effective or efficient use of teacher resources in a school building. In this scenario teachers are denied the opportunity of exposure to the collective wisdom of the faculty. Similarly, students are denied the most effective teaching practices as shared by the teachers on campus who use them. Ideally, teachers would work in a collegial atmosphere that is free from fear or intimidation on the topics of teaching and learning. Teachers would learn from one another in their professional learning community about what is working in their classroom and what is not. They would have the opportunity to share experiences with fellow teachers and gain useful information about how they might teach a lesson or concept more effectively. Additionally, teachers would have the opportunity to design and create common assessments based on an agreement of which concepts are important to teach. This would allow teachers to measure student performance and benchmark it against instructional practice. Over time patterns would emerge demonstrating the efficacy of classroom instruction.

A companion idea to professional learning communities is the reflective practice of teachers. Effective schools provide time for teachers to evaluate their classroom performance and instructional techniques. Jennifer York-Barr's work indicates that the act of reflection allows teachers to better understand their strengths and weakness on an individual level. This practice can be expanded to the team, grade level, department level, or PLC level to allow teachers to share their experiences and learn from one another. Reflective practice, combined with the collaborative atmosphere of PLCs, can be a powerful strategy for teacher improvement.

Analysis of Current Practice: *(How do we currently conduct business?)*

Students scoring Level 1 on FCAT Reading will have Progress Monitoring Plans (PMP's)
developed for them by their language arts teacher. Parents must sign the plan and return it
to the school.

Level 1 and 2 students will be placed in year-long intensive reading classes.
Level 1, tier 2 (non-fluent) students will have 1 language arts class and 1 reading class.
Level 1, tier 3 (non-fluent) students will have 1 language arts class and 2 reading classes.
Level 2, tier 1 (fluent) students will have a language arts class and a reading class.

Students struggling in reading are supported with remediation opportunities during the school day and an
academic support program before and after school. In-school remediation will focus on Language Arts,
Reading, and Math strands each week leading up to the FCAT test. Our academic support program will
focus only on non-proficient students. We will work to increase participation in the program through
phone calls and direct mailings, and work on specific reading goals set by each student.

Students that fail a course first semester are offered the opportunity of a virtual instruction
lab. This allows the student to make up the course so he or she can stay on track for
promotion.

Prior to this year many of our teachers operated like sole proprietors, without a great deal of collaboration
with peers. The result of this was isolated pockets of very effective teaching but decreased collegiality and
sharing. Worse, the faculty denied themselves the opportunity to learn from one another. This negatively
impacted instructional effectiveness and student achievement.

Central Middle School is now committed to improving teacher effectiveness through the use of Professional
Learning Communities (PLC). In this process we focus on common planning—determining what we want
our students to know, understand, and be able to do at the end of each unit. We also focus on creating
common assessments so we can know if our students are meeting proficiency. Finally, we analyze the
results of the assessments to determine the effectiveness of our instruction. These results drive lesson
planning and instructional practice in a culture of continuous improvement.

This year we started the PLC process at the outset of the year and will relentlessly pursue it throughout the
year, with a goal of becoming a National Model PLC School in three to four years. Our PLCs are organized
by academic discipline and are required to meet every week. Time has been built into the master schedule
to allow for these meetings. Department leaders take minutes of each meeting to record their progress.
All PLCs are crafting action plans to drive their work for this year, with a focus on the basics of common
planning and common assessments. Math, Language Arts, Social Studies, and Science teachers are
expected to create and administer one common summative assessment each nine week period and to
analyze the results afterward.

☒Reading	☒Math	☒Writing	☒Science	☐Parental Involvement	☐Drop-out Programs
☒Language Arts	☒Social Studies	☒Arts/PE	☐Other:		

School Based Objective: *(Action statement: What will we do to improve programmatic and/or instructional effectiveness?)*

Central Middle School will use Professional Learning Communities to drive instruction, assessment, and improvements in teacher effectiveness with the result being higher academic achievement for all students.

Strategies: *(Small number of action oriented staff performance objectives)*

Barrier	Action Steps	Person Responsible	Timetable	Budget	In-Process Measure
1.Time for PLC meetings	1.Create master schedule with time for PLC meetings during the school day	Assistant Principal	August 2012	N/A	Master Schedule
2. Lack of information about the function of PLCs	2. Train faculty on the goals of a PLC and how they conduct business	Principal	August 2012; October 2012; January 2013; March 2013	N/A	Pre-Planning Agenda; Presentation notes
3. Lack of curriculum alignment	3. Require each PLC to complete Know-Understand-Do planning for each nine week unit	Department Chairpersons	October 2012; December 2012; March 2013; May 2013	N/A	K-U-D unit plans for each academic area; PLC meeting notes
4. Lack of common assessment to track student results	4.Develop common assessments in each academic area each nine week period	Department Chairpersons	October 2012; December 2012 March 2013; May 2013	$3000.00	Copy of each common assessment; PLC meeting notes
5. Lack of systemic plan to assist struggling students	5.Create school-wide intervention plan to remediate struggling students	Principal; School Leadership Team	October 2012	ASP Budget $20,790.00	School Wide Intervention Plan
6. Lack of training for faculty on Common Core State Standards	6.Schedule regular monthly training on Common Core State Standards	Principal	October 3, 2012; November7, 2012; December 5, 2012; January 9, 2013; February 6, 2013; March 6, 2013; April 3, 2013	$1000.00	Faculty Meeting Agendas; Presentation notes
7.Inconsistent focus on high impact instructional strategies	7. Train faculty on high impact strategies of using Vocabulary in Context and Summarizing. Monitor implementation through classroom walkthrough	Principal	November 2012	N/A	Faculty meeting agendas; classroom walkthrough notes
8. No student training in developing targeted goals for their own learning in Intensive Reading classes.	8.Assist non-fluent students in developing personal achievement goals for each FAIR assessment period and review progress after each administration	Reading Teachers; Reading Coach	October 2012; January 2012; March 2012	N/A	Student goal sheets
9. No written work plans developed to guide the work of each PLC during the year.	9. Develop a specific action plan in each PLC that addresses the work to be completed during the year.	Department chairpersons; PLC leader	September 2012	N/A	PLC Action Plans

EVALUATION – Outcome Measures and Reflection

Qualitative and Quantitative Professional Practice Outcomes: *(Measures the level of implementation of the professional practices throughout the school)*

Central Middle School will increase achievement for all students through the use of Professional Learning Communities. By May 2013 our teachers will have created a guaranteed curriculum by determining what they want their students to know, understand, and be able to do during each nine week period as evidenced by their KUD unit plans. Further, teachers will have created one common summative assessment each nine week period to determine the proficiency of each student on the standards taught and will analyze the results to drive instruction. Teachers will be effectively utilizing high impact instructional strategies of Summarizing and Using Vocabulary in Context as evidenced by classroom walkthrough data.

Qualitative and Quantitative Student Achievement Expectations: *(Measures of student achievement)*

See Attached Appendices for Qualitative Achievement Expectations.

Central Middle School's focus this year is on establishing Professional Learning Communities, developing Common Assessments, and professional development focusing on Common Core Literacy Standards across all content areas. The quantitative outcome measure of these Best Practices is twofold – the increase in student achievement and the paradigm shift for the teachers through professional development that will drive instruction.

The true success of Professional Learning Communities is in establishing a culture within the school and the school's community that we work as a collaborative team. "PLCs are not the latest innovation, but they are often treated that way. Rather, they are intended to permanently change the culture of the school toward continuous improvement" (Fullan, 2008, p. 18). A PLC is not just a "method", a "pedagogical approach to teaching", a "best practice", or a "document". It is a mindset, a culture, a paradigm shift for all stakeholders that encompasses all of the previously expressed descriptions. It is the breath of the educational institution that remains even after founding members leave.   "Principals who establish collaborative cultures increase the likelihood that there will be this continuity of direction because it is already built into the culture, and culture has powerful persistence. Culture *is* legacy" (Fullan, 2008, p.19). In working with the teachers to develop their skills, and guide their focus to a more collaborative nature, it will ensure increased student achievement. Central Middle School has had the reputation of being one of the schools with the highest retention rate in Brevard County. Also, the data shows that our students' performance on FCAT is stagnate. With a focus on PLCs and the intent of a more data driven curriculum, the retention rate should decrease in the 2012-2013 school year and our FCAT scores should significantly increase.

With continued support and professional development training for our teachers, the implementation of instruction that is consistent with the Literacy Standards of Common Core will enhance our students' ability to think critically and their self-esteem will build. They will feel more confident about their achievements

through the success they will experience when working in collaborative groups. They will take risks to participate in group activities knowing that their peers will support their efforts. Teachers will utilize their newly learned professional development strategies and skills when developing lesson plans and providing students with feedback on a regular basis through not only summative assessments, but also formative assessments. Through ongoing support and encouragement, the school environment will be a more cohesive and positive one. Classrooms will be more productive and have a student- centered focus, helping our students gain the skills they will need to be College and Career Ready.

APPENDIX A

(ALL SCHOOLS)

Reading Goal 1.	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 28%=129 students)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 31%=1134 students)
Anticipated Barrier(s): **1. Teacher buy-in of Literacy across all content areas. Collaboration among all teachers in developing KUDs to support Common Core Literacy Standards will require time.**		
Strategy(s): **1. Provide teachers with a built-in time scheduled during their common planning designated for collaboration for common assessments, KUDs and sharing of strategies.**		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 **Barrier(s):** **Lack of systemic plan to assist struggling students.** **Strategy(s):** **1. Create school-wide intervention plan to remediate struggling readers.**	7th Gr 65% (408) 8th Gr. 58% (351)	7th Gr 70% (435) 8th Gr. 63% (399)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Lack of training materials for teachers.** **Strategy(s):** **1. Schedule students for a period of reading with a reading endorsed teacher.**	7th and 8th 13% (2)	7th and 8th 6% (1)
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Lack of resources for enrichment and acceleration of students.** **Strategy(s):** **1. Develop activities to utilize during the school-wide intervention program specifically for enrichment.**	7th Gr 30% (189) 8th Gr. 31% (188)	7th Gr 35% (217) 8th Gr. 36% (228)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Lack of resources for acceleration of readers.** **Strategy(s):** **1. Collaborate with Reading Coach in determining appropriate reading materials to utilize for enrichment.**	7th and 8th 80% (12)	7th and 8th 88% (14)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Providing support to students outside of the school day.** **Strategy(s):** **1. Provide parents/guardians strategies to utilize at home with students.**	7th and 8th 75% (11)	7th and 8th 80% (13)
FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Providing support to students outside of the school day.** **Strategy(s):** **1. Implement a remediation program offered on Saturdays.**	7th and 8th 65% (189)	7th and 8th 68% (188)

Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Lack of consistency during reading class time due to specific behavioral needs of individual students.** **Strategy(s):** **1. Develop a reward system in which students earn tokens for participating and behaving well in reading class.**	7th and 8th 75% (11)	7th and 8th 80% (13)
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: **Baseline data 2010-11:**		

	Enter numerical data for current level of performance	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance
Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in reading : White; Black; Hispanic; Asian; American Indian;	35% (218) 56% (106) 46% (105) 41% (11) 0% (2)	31% (240) 51% (106) 41% (83) 37% (13) 0% (0)
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Lack of time to remediate students if entering ESOL program in the first year.** **Strategy(s):** **1. Offer additional remediation opportunities through ESOL nights.**	12% (2)	10% (2)
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Lack of consistency at home in practicing reading strategies.** **Strategy(s):** **1. Create school-wide intervention plan to remediate struggling readers.**	44% (76)	37% (80)
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s):** **No opportunity for students to receive tutoring before or after school due to transportation.** **Strategy(s):** **1. Create a school-wide intervention plan to remediate students during the school day and offer students a Saturday program with transportation.**	36% (96)	31% (224)

Reading Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring

CELLA GOAL	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Listening/ Speaking:** 79%			Sonia Guerao
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Reading:** 40%			Sonia Guerao
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Writing**: 36%			Sonia Guerao

Mathematics Goal(s): 1.	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Anticipated Barrier(s): **1. The overlapping of NGSSS and Common Core Mathematical Practices and lack of prior knowledge of the students.**		
Strategy(s): **1. Form PLCs in math by course taught to develop common assessments based on those particular standards.**		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 **Barrier(s):** **Lack of basic skills of students.** **Strategy(s):** **1. Implement pre- and post- assessments to progress monitor students.**	7th Gr 59% (371) 8th Gr. 61% (368)	7th Gr 64% (397) 8th Gr. 66% (418)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Lack of professional training in Access Math standards for teachers.** **Strategy(s):** **1. Arrange for additional math support from district personnel.**	7th and 8th 53% (8)	7th and 8th 58% (9)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Managing different levels of students within the classroom.** **Strategy(s):** **1. Utilize assistants in creating math learning stations.**	7th and 8th 93% (14)	7th and 8th 96% (15)
FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Providing support to students outside of the school day.** **Strategy(s):** **1. Implement a remediation program offered on Saturdays.**	7th and 8th 63% (180)	7th and 8th 70% (195)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Lack of supplemental resources for teachers.** **Strategy(s):** **1. Coordinate opportunities for the Math Department Chair and VE teachers to develop tasks and activities for remediation of the lowest 25%.**	7th and 8th 93% (14)	7th and 8th 96% (15)
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: **Baseline Data 2010-11:**		

Student subgroups by ethnicity :		
White:	34% (247)	29% (225)
Black:	57% (109)	52% (107)
Hispanic:	44% (101)	39% (70)
Asian:	44% (12)	39% (13)
American Indian:	0% (2)	0% (0)
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	12% (2)	10% (2)
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	47% (38)	44% (95)
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	42% (113)	37% (267)

Mathematics Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring

Writing	**2012 Current Level of Performance** (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	**2013 Expected Level of Performance** (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): **Generating consistency among all content area teachers to provide writing opportunities for all students in all classes.** **Strategy(s):** **1. Initiate days each week where writing is done in each subject on a rotating basis.**		
FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing	76% (453)	81% (513)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing	71% (5)	76% (5)

Science Goal(s) **(Elementary and Middle)** **1.**	**2012 Current Level of Performance** (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	**2013 Expected Level of Performance** (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): **Focus has been on Reading and Math.** **Strategy(s):** **1. Collaborate through Science PLCs to develop common assessments and to develop KUDs for science standards with common core literacy standards in mind.**		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Science:	51% (308)	56% (355)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science	43% (3)	48% (3)
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science:	11% (66)	16% (101)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Science	43% (3)	48% (3)

Science Goal(s) (High School) 1.	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): **Strategy(s):** 1.		
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science		
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Science		
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. **White:** **Black:** **Hispanic:** **Asian:** **American Indian**:		
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		

APPENDIX B

(SECONDARY SCHOOLS **ONLY**)

Algebra 1 EOC Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): **Consistency in placement of students in Algebra 1.** **Strategy(s):** **1. Utilize appropriate screening measures to determine accurate placement of students.**		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Algebra**:**	36% (72)	41% (69)
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra:	63% (124)	68% (115)
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11		
Student subgroups by ethnicity ⬚k, Hispanic, Asian, American India⬚g satisfactory progress in Algebra. **White:** **Black:** **Hispanic:**	7% (9) 7% (1) 13% (4)	2% (3) 2% (1) 8% (1)
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	0 (N/A)	0% (0)
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	0 (N/A)	0% (0)
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	16% (11)	11% (7)

Geometry EOC Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): **Strategy(s):** **1.**		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Geometry**:**		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry:		
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11		
Student subgroups by ethnicity ⬚k, Hispanic, Asian, American India⬚g satisfactory progress in Geometry. **White:** **Black:** **Hispanic:**		

English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		

Biology EOC Goal	**2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Biology**:**		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology**:**		

Civics EOC	**2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Civics**:**		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics**:**		

U.S. History EOC	**2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in U. S. History**:**		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U. S. History**:**		

Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Goal(s)	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Person/Process/Monitoring**
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: **Goal 1:** **Goal 2:**			

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: **Goal 1:** **Goal 2:**			

Additional Goal(s)	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: **Goal 1:** **Goal 2**:			

APPENDIX C

(TITLE 1 SCHOOLS ONLY)

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

Descriptions of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1.		
2.		
3.		

Non-Highly Effective Instructors
Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who are not highly effective. *When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

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

For the following areas, please write a brief narrative that includes the data for the year 2011-12 and a description of changes you intend to incorporate to improve the data for the year 2012-13.

MULTI-TIERED SYSTEM OF SUPPORTS (MTSS)/RtI (Identify the MTSS leadership team and it role in development and implementation of the SIP along with data sources, data management and how staff is trained in MTSS)

MTSS Leadership Team:

- Chad Kirk-Principal
- Marina Middleton & Cliff Grindles-Assistant Principals
- Patty Fitzgerald-ESE Contact
- Jennifer Imel, Sonya Guerao, Teresa Huff-Guidance
- Team Leaders (i.e. Teacher Data Team)

Faculty and staff will be trained in MTSS at our October 2012 faculty meeting

Tier I Interventions (All Students):

1. Outstanding, research-based daily instruction.
2. Homeroom/Study Hall -15 minutes/day
    a. All students expected to study or work on class assignments after Central News program.
    b. Extended homeroom on Wednesday for 45 minutes for acceleration and remediation.
3. Meeting daily with faculty advisor during Homeroom
    a. Teacher consults with every student every week to motivate, encourage, and determine problems.
    b. Teacher refers social issues via email to guidance counselor. Disciplinary issues referred to administration.
4. The day after each common assessment is used as a re-teaching & enrichment period based on student performance.
    a. Assessment data are reviewed in next department meeting to determine efficacy of instruction.

ALL TIER 2 AND 3 INTERVENTIONS ARE RECORDED IN THE A3 SOFTWARE DURING TEAM MEETINGS

Tier II Interventions (Some Students): Teachers complete RtI Forms 1, 2, 3A, & Appendix 5

1. Before/after school tutoring
    a. Schedule posted in each team member's classroom and promoted regularly
2. No Zero Zone
    a. Students receive No Zero Zone assignment/intervention from their homeroom teacher.
    b. Students take their make-up assignments to the media center during the period assigned.
    c. Students supervised by media center staff.
    d. Students that fail to report for No Zero Zone will be considered out of area and subject to disciplinary consequences. Teacher reports these students to the Dean's office.
    e. Academic team makes notes in A3 program regarding the intervention prescribed, duration, and results.
3. Meeting with counselor
    a. Counselor meets with students during available period and calls parents
4. Academic Support Program
    a. Letter mailed to parents with program schedule
5. Team conference with parent
    a. Team Leader calls to schedule conference and invites any necessary school personnel

Tier III Interventions (Individual students still failing a course after 6 weeks of a marking period):

1. No Zero Zone **plus:**
2. Failing students pulled from elective by academic team one day per week for three weeks and assigned to intervention room to make up missing assignments and/or work on Classworks and/or re-teaching assignments.
3. Teacher Data Team (TDT) meets to problem solve issue(s) facing the student and create specific, measurable intervention. Team ensures that RtI forms are complete.
4. Students still failing after 9+ weeks of a semester are referred to the Individual Student Problem Solving Team (IPST)
    a. IPST reviews collected data and designs specific intervention for student, including diagnostic assessment.
    b. IPST determines eligibility for ESE services.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT:
In 2011-12 parents contributed 7094 volunteer hours. In the 2012-13 school year our goal is a 5% increase in volunteer hours. We intend to dramatically increase communication to our parents regarding opportunities for volunteerism through our PTO. This will be done through a weekly parent newsletter, Central's website, synervoice calls, and a read-only Facebook page for our PTO.

ATTENDANCE: (Include current and expected attendance rates, excessive absences and tardies)

SUSPENSION:

DROP-OUT (High Schools only):

POSTSECONDARY READINESS: (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? Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report.)