Florida Department of Education

DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Broadmoor Elementary	District Name: Miami-Dade
Principal: Linda Klein	Superintendent: Alberto M. Carvalho
SAC Chair: Amparo Quintero	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.

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

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

Principal	Linda Klein	BS Elementary Education, Masters in Educational Leadership, Elementary Education 1-6 Certification, Early Childhood Certification, and a Certified Principal	9	18	School Grade 2012-C, 2011-C, 2010-C, 2009-C, 2008-C High Standards Rdg. 2012-40, 2011-53, 2010-55, 2009-53, 2008-53 High Standards Math 2012-39, 2011-67, 2010-64 , 2009-62, 2008-59 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 2012-70, 2011-54, 2010-57, 2009-64, 2008-61 Lrng Gains-Math 2012-58, 2011-69, 2010-62, 2009-57, 2008-66 Gains-Rdg-25% 2012-86, 2011-46, 2010-72, 2009-59, 2008-61 Gains-Math-25% 2012-67, 2011-69, 2010-74, 2009-63, 2008-NA AMO
Assistant Principal	Maria Rodriguez	BS Elementary Education, Educational Leadership	1	8	School Grade 2012-C, 2011-C, 2010-C, 2009-B, 2008-B High Standards Rdg. 2012-47, 2011-70, 2010-61, 2009-59, 2008-70 High Standards Math 2012-47, 2011-73, 2010-66 , 2009-66, 2008-68 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 2012-76, 2011-66, 2010-59, 2009-34, 2008-73 Lrng Gains-Math 2012-56, 2011-58, 2010-63, 2009-59, 2008-50 Gains-Rdg-25% 2012-79, 2011-55, 2010-67, 2009-70, 2008-75 Gains-Math-25% 2012-49, 2011-70, 2010-67, 2009-65, 2008-61 AMO

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	Amparo Quintero	Elementary Education 1-6, Masters in Reading, ESOL Endorsement, and Reading Certification	9	9	School Grade 2012-C, 2011-C, 2010-C, 2009-C, 2008-C High Standards Rdg. 2012-40, 2011-53, 2010-55, 2009-53, 2008-53 High Standards Math 2012-39, 2011-67, 2010-64 , 2009-62, 2008-59 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 2012-70, 2011-54, 2010-57, 2009-64, 2008-61 Lrng Gains-Math 2012-58, 2011-69, 2010-62, 2009-57, 2008-66 Gains-Rdg-25% 2012-86, 2011-46, 2010-72, 2009-59, 2008-61 Gains-Math-25% 2012-67, 2011-69, 2010-74, 2009-63, 2008-NA AMO

Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

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

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Regular meetings of new teachers with principal	Principal	May 29, 2013
2. Partnering new teachers with veteran teachers	Assistant Principal	August 16, 2012
3.		
4.		

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/or 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
1 (2.94%) Out-of-Field 0 (0%) Less than Effective	Regular meetings with principal and partnering with veteran teacher who is ESOL endorsed

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

| 34 | 5.88% (2) | 17.65% (6) | 44.12% (15) | 32.35% (11) | 38.24% (13) | 100% (34) | 5.88% (2) | 11.76% (4) | 64.71% (22) |

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
Linda B. Hume	Mayleen Baluja	Outstanding knowledge of content, materials, and methods that support high standards in the curriculum areas	Assist the mentee in organizing a rich learning environment in the classroom and developing rigorous lesson plans
Chantea Salley	Jennifer Holcombe	Outstanding knowledge of content, materials, and methods that support high standards in the curriculum areas	Assist the mentee in organizing a rich learning environment in the classroom and developing rigorous lesson plans
Chaneqa Wooten	Janet Pinero	Outstanding knowledge of content, materials, and methods that support high standards in the curriculum areas	Assist the mentee in organizing a rich learning environment in the classroom and developing rigorous lesson plans
Marina Prieto	Jenifer Molinas	Outstanding knowledge of content, materials, and methods that support high standards in the curriculum areas	Assist the mentee in organizing a rich learning environment in the classroom and developing rigorous lesson plans
Ada Ortiz	Jessica Gonzalez	Outstanding knowledge of content, materials, and methods that support high standards in the curriculum areas	Assist the mentee in organizing a rich learning environment in the classroom and developing rigorous lesson plans

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
Broadmoor Elementary School Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through extended learning opportunities (before-school and/or after-school programs, or summer school). The district coordinates with Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided. Support services are provided to students. Curriculum Coaches develop, lead, and evaluate school core content standards/ programs; identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/ behavior assessment and intervention approaches. They identify systematic patterns of student needs while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-

based intervention strategies; assist with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assist in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participate in the design and delivery of professional development; and provide support for assessment and implementation monitoring. Other components that are integrated into the school-wide program include an extensive Parental Program; Supplemental Educational Services; and special support services to special needs populations such as homeless, migrant, neglected and delinquent students.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Broadmoor Elementary School provides services and support to migrant students and parents. The District Migrant liaison coordinates with Title I and other programs and conducts a comprehensive needs assessment of migrant students to ensure that the unique needs of migrant students are met. Students are also provided extended learning opportunities (before school and/or after-school, and summer school) by the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program.

Title I, Part D

District receives funds to support the Educational Alternative Outreach program. Services are coordinated with district Dropout Prevention programs.

Title II

We are a Title II District. The District uses supplemental funds for improving basic education as follows:
• training to certify qualified mentors for the New Teacher (MINT) Program
• training for add-on endorsement programs, such as Reading, Gifted, ESOL training and substitute release time for Professional Development Liaisons (PDL) at each school focusing on Professional Learning Community (PLC) development and facilitation, as well as Lesson Study Group implementation and protocols

Title III

Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners. Broadmoor Elementary participates in a tutorial program for ELL students coupled with parent out-reach activities. Additional professional development on best practices for ESOL and content area teachers is made readily available. Waterford Early Reading Grant and Achieve 3000 are programs which are used to enhance the ELL program.

Title X- Homeless

- Miami-Dade County Public Schools' School Board approved the School Board Policy 5111.01 titled, **Homeless Students.** The board policy defines the McKinney-Vento Law and ensures homeless students receive all the services they are entitled to.
- The Homeless Assistance Program seeks to ensure a successful educational experience for homeless children by collaborating with parents, schools, and the community.
- Project Upstart, Homeless Children & Youth Program assists schools with the identification, enrollment, attendance, and transportation of homeless students. All schools are eligible to receive services and will do so upon identification and classification of a student as homeless.
- The Homeless Liaison provides training for school registrars on the procedures for enrolling homeless students and for school counselors on the McKinney Vento Homeless Assistance Act-ensuring homeless children and youth are not to be stigmatized or separated, segregated, or isolated on their status as homeless-and are provided with all entitlements.
- Project Upstart provides a homeless sensitivity, awareness campaign to all the schools - each school is provided a video and curriculum manual, and a contest is sponsored by the homeless trust-a community organization.
- Project Upstart provides tutoring and counseling to twelve homeless shelters in the community.
- The District Homeless Student Liaison continues to participate in community organization meetings and task forces as it relates to homeless children and youth.
- Each school will identify a school based homeless coordinator to be trained on the McKinney-Vento Law ensuring appropriate services are provided to the homeless students.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Broadmoor Elementary school will receive funding from Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) as part of its Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) allocation.

Violence Prevention Programs

Broadmoor Elementary School offers a non-violence and anti-drug program provided by the counselor to students that incorporates counseling with a focus on anti-drugs and anti-violence themes.

Nutrition Programs 1) Broadmoor Elementary adheres to and implements the nutrition requirements stated in the District Wellness Policy. 2) Nutrition education, as per state statute, is taught through physical education. 3) The School Food Service Program, school breakfast, school lunch, and after care snacks, follows the Healthy Food and Beverage Guidelines as adopted in the District's Wellness Policy.
Housing Programs N/A
Head Start Head Start programs are co-related in several Title I schools and/or communities. Joint activities, including professional development and transition processes are shared. Through affiliating agreements, the Summer VPK program is provided at Head Start sites.
Adult Education N/A
Career and Technical Education By promoting Career Pathways and Programs of Study students will become academy program graduates and have a better understanding and appreciation of the postsecondary opportunities available and a plan for acquiring the skills necessary to take advantage of those opportunities. Articulation agreements allow students to earn college and postsecondary technical credits in high school and provide more opportunities for students to complete 2 and 4 year postsecondary degrees. Students will gain an understanding of business and industry workforce requirements by acquiring Ready to Work and other industry certifications. Readiness for postsecondary opportunities will strengthen with the integration of academic, career and technical education components in conjunction with a coherent sequence of courses.
Job Training N/A

Other

Health Connect in Our Schools

- Health Connect in Our Schools (HCiOS) offers a coordinated level of school-based healthcare which integrates education, medical and/or social and human services on school grounds.
- Teams at designated school sites are staffed by a School Social Worker (shared between schools), a Nurse (shared between schools) and a full-time Health Aide.
- HCiOS services reduces or eliminates barriers to care, connects eligible students with health insurance and a medical home, and provides care for students who are not eligible for other services.
- HCiOS delivers coordinated social work and mental/behavioral health interventions in a timely manner.
- HCiOS enhances the health education activities provided by the schools and by the health department.
- HCiOS offers a trained health team that is qualified to perform the assigned duties related to a quality school health care program.

Broadmoor Elementary will involve parents in the planning and implementation of the Title I program and extend an open invitation to Broadmoor Elementary's Parent Resource Center in order to inform parents regarding available programs, their rights under No Child Left behind and other referral services.

Increase parental engagement/involvement through developing (with on-going parental input) our Title I School-Parent Compact (for each student); our school's Title I parental Involvement Policy; scheduling the Title I orientation meeting (Open House); and other documents/activities necessary in order to comply with dissemination and reporting requirements.

Conduct informal parent surveys to determine specific needs of our parents, and schedule workshops. Parent Academy Courses, etc., with flexible times to accommodate our parents' schedule as part of our goal to empower parents and build their capacity for involvement.

Complete Title I Administration Parental Involvement monthly School Reports (FM-6914 Rev. 06-08) and the Title I parental involvement Monthly Activities Report (FM-6913 03-07), and submit to Title I Administration by the 5th of each month as documentation of compliance with NCLB Section 1118.

Confidential "as-needed services" will be provided to any students in the school in "homeless situations" as applicable.

Additional academic and support services will be provided to students and families of the Migrant population as applicable

Broadmoor Elementary School receives funding under the 21st Century Learning Grant in order to increase the achievement of the lowest performing subgroups through comprehensive, ongoing data analysis, curriculum and instruction alignment, and specific interventions such as extended day remedial tutorial instruction, differentiated instruction/intervention, classroom libraries, and project CRISS. Additionally, Title I School Improvement Grant/Fund support funding and assistance to schools in Differentiated Accountability based on need.

The Voluntary Public School Choice Program (I Choose!) a federally funded grant, is a district wide initiative designed to assist in achieving the Miami-Dade County Public Schools' District Strategic Plan goal to expand the availability of and access to high quality public school choice options for all parents in Miami-Dade County. Voluntary Public School Choice grant funds are used to evaluate programs, inform parents of educational options, and reculture teaching practices to establish qualitative school environments. Broadmoor Elementary provides parent out-reach activities in grades K-5.

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

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

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

MTSS/RtI is an extension of the school's Leadership Team, strategically integrated in order to support the administration through a process of problem solving as issues and concerns arise through an ongoing, systematic examination of available data with the goal of impacting student achievement, school safety, school culture, literacy, attendance, student social/emotional well being, and prevention of student failure through early intervention.

1. MTSS/RtI leadership is vital, therefore, in building our team we have considered the following:

   ● Administrator(s) who will ensure commitment and allocate resources;
   ● Teacher(s) and Coaches will extend and report on meeting the goals of the leadership team at grade level, subject area, and intervention group, problem solving
   ● Team members who will meet to review consensus, infrastructure, and implementation of building level.
2. The school's Leadership Team will include additional personnel as resources to the team, based on specific problems or concerns as warranted, such as:

   ● School reading, math, science, and behavior specialists
   ● Special education personnel
   ● School guidance counselor
   ● School psychologist
   ● School social worker
   ● Member of advisory group
3. Community stakeholders MTSS/RtI is a general education initiative in which the levels of support (resources) are allocated in direct proportion to student needs. MTSS/RtI uses increasingly more intense instruction and interventions.
   ● The first level of support is the **core** instructional and behavioral methodologies, practices, and supports designed for **all** students in the general curriculum.
   ● The second level of support consists of **supplemental** instruction and interventions provided *in addition to and in alignment with effective core instruction and behavioral supports* to groups of targeted students who need additional instructional and/or behavioral support.
   ● The third level of support consists of **intensive** instructional and/or behavioral interventions provided *in addition to and in alignment with effective core instruction and the supplemental instruction and interventions* with the goal of increasing an individual student's rate of progress academically and/or behaviorally.
   ● There will be an ongoing evaluation method established for services at each tier to monitor the effectiveness of meeting school goals and student growth as measured by benchmark and progress monitoring data. The MTSS/RtI four step problem-solving model will be used to plan, monitor, and revise instruction and intervention. The four steps are problem identification, problem analysis, intervention implementation, and response evaluation.

Describe how the school based RtI Leadership Team functions (e.g. meeting processes and roles/functions)

The following steps will be considered by the school's Leadership Team to address how we can utilize the MTSS/RtI process to enhance data collection, data analysis, problem solving, differentiated assistance, and progress monitoring.

The Leadership Team will:

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

1.	Use the Tier 1 Problem Solving process to set Tier 1 goals, monitor academic and behavior data evaluating progress at least three times per year by addressing the following important questions: • What will all students learn? (curriculum based on standards) • What progress is expected in each core area? • How will we determine if students have made expected levels of progress towards proficiency? (common assessments) • How will we respond when grades, subject areas, or class of, or individual students have not learned? (Response to Intervention problem solving process and monitoring progress of interventions) • How will we respond when students have learned or already know? (enrichment opportunities).
2.	Gather and analyze data at all Tiers to determine professional development for faculty as indicated by group or individual student diagnostic and progress monitoring assessment.
3.	Hold regular team meetings. Use the four step problem solving process as the basis for goal setting, planning, and program evaluation during all team meetings that focus on increasing student achievement or behavioral success.
4.	Gather ongoing progress monitoring (OPM) for all interventions and analyze that data using the Tier 2 problem solving process after each OPM.
5.	Maintain communication with staff for input and feedback, as well as updating them on procedures and progress.
6.	Support a process and structure within the school to design, implement, and evaluate both daily instruction and specific interventions.
7.	Provide clear indicators of student need and student progress, assisting in examining the validity and effectiveness of program delivery.
8.	Assist with monitoring and responding to the needs of subgroups within the expectations for meeting Annual Measurable Objectives.

<div align="center">MTSS Implementation</div>

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

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

1. Data will be used to guide instructional decisions and system procedures for all students to:

    - adjust the delivery of curriculum and instruction to meet the specific needs of students
    - adjust the delivery of behavior management system
    - adjust the allocation of school-based resources
    - drive decisions regarding targeted professional development
    - create student growth trajectories in order to identify and develop interventions

2. Managed data will include:

    Academic
    - FAIR assessment (Broad Screening, Progress Monitoring, Targeted Diagnostic Indicators, Broad Diagnostic Indicators, Ongoing Progress Monitoring Tools, Phonics Screening Inventory
    - Oral Reading Fluency Measures
    - Voyager Checkpoints
    - Voyager Benchmark Assessments
    - Baseline Benchmark Assessments
    - Success Maker Utilization and Progress Reports
    - Interim assessments
    - State/Local Math and Science assessments
    - FCAT
    - Student grades
    - School site specific assessments

    Behavior
    - Student Case Management System
    - Detentions
    - Suspensions/expulsions
    - Referrals by student behavior, staff behavior, and administrative context
    - Office referrals per day per month
    - Team climate surveys
    - Attendance

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

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.
The district professional development and support will include:

1. training for all administrators in the MTSS/RtI problem solving at Tiers 1, 2, and 3 (SST), using the Tier 1 Problem Solving Worksheet, Tier 2 Problem Solving Worksheet, and Tier 3 Problem Solving Worksheet and Intervention Plan

2. providing support for school staff to understand basic MTSS/RtI principles and procedures; and

3. providing a network of ongoing support for MTSS/RtI organized through feeder patterns.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.
Based upon the information from http://www.florida-rti.org/educatorResources/MTSS_Book_ImplComp_012612.pdf, but not limited to the following:

1. Effective, actively involved, and resolute leadership that frequently provides visible connections between a MTSS framework with district & school mission statements and organizational improvement efforts.

2. Alignment of policies and procedures across classroom, grade, building, district, and state levels.

3. Ongoing efficient facilitation and accurate use of a problem-solving process to support planning, implementing, and evaluating effectiveness of services.

4. Strong, positive, and ongoing collaborative partnerships with all stakeholders who provide education services or who otherwise would benefit from increases in student outcomes.

5. Comprehensive, efficient, and user-friendly data-systems for supporting decision-making at all levels from the individual student level up to the aggregate district level.

6. Sufficient availability of coaching supports to assist school team and staff problem-solving efforts.

7. Ongoing data-driven professional development activities that align to core student goals and staff needs.

8. Communicating outcomes with stakeholders and celebrating success frequently.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

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

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). The Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) is comprised of the principal, Ms. Linda Klein, assistant principal, Ms. Maria Rodriguez, the reading coach, Ms. Amparo Quintero and the following grade level chairs: Kindergarten, Ms Joann Welch, First Grade, Ms. Crystal Moore, Second Grade, Mr. Roody Estriplet, Third Grade, Dr. Tanesha Sewell, Fourth Grade, Ms. Marina Prieto, and Fifth Grade, Ms. Chantea Salley. Teams support teachers by collecting diagnostic data, conducting progress monitoring and identifying appropriate instructional interventions. As team members chart particular student needs, data is used strategically to shift instructional focus and align professional development with the students' instructional needs. Professional development thus serves as a focal point to promote continuous improvement aimed at remediation and increased student achievement.
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The Literacy Leadership Team will discuss data driven instruction and instructional strategies that will target areas where the students are weak. The administration will ensure appropriate implementation and allocate the resources. Teachers and the reading coach will support the administration in an on-going systematic examination of available data that will positively impact student achievement, school safety, school culture, literacy, attendance, and the prevention of student retention through early intervention. The team will meet monthly to monitor the core curriculum instructional strategies for all general education students. Supplemental instruction and interventions will be provided as appropriate and the Leadership team will monitor the effectiveness of implementation through data analysis. All students will be monitored through their performance and the analysis of progress monitoring data.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? The Literacy Leadership Team will meet with teachers monthly during grade level planning time, or one-on-one to discuss assessment results and student progress. During these meetings, lesson plans, data binders, and student portfolios will be utilized to provide evidence of instruction, assessment, and differentiation to address individual student needs. Progress Monitoring logs will also be utilized to document the process of teaching, assessing, re-teaching, and re-assessing. Special attention will be given to the lowest 25% and NCLB subgroups not making AMO. The LLT will conduct classroom walkthroughs and provide assistance in the delivery of instruction and/or classroom management. The LLT will work with teachers to ensure that research-based reading programs (comprehensive core reading programs, supplemental reading programs and comprehensive intervention reading programs) and strategies are implemented with fidelity and adjusted to meet the needs of all students. Professional development will be provided during teachers' common planning time and small sessions will occur throughout the year by the reading coach, Ms. Quintero in each of the major reading components, as needed, based on an analysis of student performance data; administration and analysis of instructional assessments; and providing differentiated instruction and intensive intervention based on assessments. Ms. Quintero will also model effective instructional strategies for teachers and train teachers in data analysis and using data to differentiate instruction. The Literacy Leadership Team will provide a network of ongoing support for teachers as they implement interventions for students.

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.

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

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

Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

Broadmoor Elementary has developed a partnership with Title I Administration. Title I Administration assists the school by providing supplemental funds beyond the State of Florida funded Voluntary pre-Kindergarten Program (VPK). Funds provided are used to give extended support through a full time highly qualified teacher and paraprofessional. This assists with the goal of providing young children with a variety of meaningful learning experiences in environments that give them opportunities to create knowledge through initiatives shared with supportive adults. In selected school communities, the Title I Program further provides assistance for preschool transition through the Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngster (HIPPY) Program. HIPPY provides in-home training for parents to become more involved in the educational process of their three- and four-year old children with the Early Childhood in Attendance Zone Program in order to ensure a smooth transition for all the students from pre-kindergarten to kindergarten. Broadmoor Elementary currently has three Pre-K Programs. During the spring, Head Start visits the pre-kindergarten classrooms to assess student progress in the program. We use the Early Growth Indicators Benchmark Assessment (EGIBA) and the Phonological Early Literacy Inventory (PELI) to determine students' acquisition of specific skills and knowledge, as well as the ability to form meaningful relationships. Pre-K teachers and their paraprofessionals are responsible for implementing these strategies. At the end of the school year, the pre-kindergarten teachers articulate with the kindergarten teachers in order to establish a smooth transition. Broadmoor Elementary conducts its annual Open House which takes place in the evening during the first weeks of school, to ensure parents and students are properly oriented in their new academic environment. Broadmoor's dedicated funding for Pre-K is Title I.

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?

N/A

High Schools Only

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

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

N/A

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?

N/A

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.

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.	1A.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment was Reporting Category 4, Informational Text/Research Process. Students demonstrate difficulty in interpreting graphical information (text features)	1A.1. Provide a variety of real-world documents such as, how-to articles, brochures, fliers, and websites use text features to locate, interpret, and organize information.	1A.1. MTSS/RtI Team	1A.1. Following the FCIM model, the Literacy Leadership Team will Analyze classroom assessments to determine students' knowledge of text features	1A.1. Formative: Mini-assessments/ Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment		

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

Reading Goal #1A: The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment indicate that 25 % of students achieved proficiency (Level 3). Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency (Level 3) by 4 percentage points to 29%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	25% (51)	29% (59)				
		1A.2. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment was Reporting Category 2, Reading Application. Students demonstrate difficulty in identifying cause and effect relationships, compare/ contrast and chronological order.	1A.2. Provide a variety of strategies that help students be familiar with text structures such as cause/ effect, compare/contrast, and chronological order.	1A.2. MTSS/RtI Team	1A.2. Following the FCIM model, the Literacy Leadership Team will Analyze classroom assessments to determine students' ability to identify cause and effect relationships, compare/contrast and Chronological order.	1A.2. Formative: Mini-assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	

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

1B. **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Reading Goal #1B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

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

| 2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading. | 2A.1. The area which showed minimal growth and would require students to maintain or improve performance as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment was Reporting Category 4, Informational Text/Research Process. These students require the ability to utilize critical thinking strategies needed to locate, interpret and organize information and to determine the validity and reliability of information within and across texts. | 2A.1. Provide a variety of how-to articles, brochures, fliers and other real-world documents to identify text features (subtitles, headings, charts, graphs, diagrams, etc), to locate, interpret and organize information and infuse higher order thinking | 2A.1. MTSS/RtI Team | 2A.1. Following the FCIM model, the Literacy Leadership Team will monthly analyze the assessments and observations of students' ability to complete assignments as teacher becomes facilitator guiding students to become independent learners | 2A.1. Formative: Mini-assessments/ Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment | | |

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

Reading Goal #2A: The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment indicate that 14% of students achieved Levels 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving Levels 4 and 5 by 2 percentage points to 16%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	14% (29)	16% (33)					
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.**	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		

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

Reading Goal #2B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	3A.1. The area which showed minimal growth and would require students to maintain or improve performance as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment was Reporting Category 4, Informational Text/Research Process.	3A.1. Provide a variety of instructional strategies and activities that include building strong arguments to support answers, exploring shades of meaning, using reciprocal teaching and question-answer relationships, questioning the author, and summarizing	3A.1. MTSS/RtI Team	3A.1. Following the FCIM model, the Principal will Analyze bi-weekly formative assessment data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed	3A.1. Formative: FAIR, Computer reports generated from FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep and Edusoft bi-weekly reports Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment		

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

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

Reading Goal #3A: The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment indicate that 70% of students made learning gains Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 75%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	70% (90)	*75% (97)*				
		3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.**	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	
Reading Goal #3B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				

23

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

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4A.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment was Reporting Category 2 Reading Application: Identifying Author's Purpose, Main Idea, Cause and Effect Relationships, Text Structure, and Theme/ Topics	4A.1. Provide students with Voyager or SuccessMaker Intervention and grade-level appropriate texts that include identifiable author's purpose for writing, including informing, telling a story, conveying a particular mood, entertaining or explaining. The author's perspective should be recognizable in text. Students should be able to identify causal relationships imbedded in text and must be familiar with text structures such as cause/ effect, compare/ contrast and provide practice in identifying topics and themes within texts	4A.1. MTSS/RtI Team	4A.1. Following the FCIM model, the Principal bi-weekly will analyze formative assessment data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed	4A.1. Formative: FAIR, Computer reports generated from FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, SuccessMaker, and Edusoft bi-weekly reports Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment		

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

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

Reading Goal #4: The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment indicate that 86% in the Lowest 25% subgroup made learning gains Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 91%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	86% (28)	91% (30)				
		4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.
		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.

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** 34	40	45	51	56	62	67
Reading Goal #5A: **Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.**							

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 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: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment was Reporting Category 1, Vocabulary. Students lack the vocabulary necessary to be successful readers	5B.1. Provide a variety of reading strategies through differentiated instruction that help students determine meanings of words by using context clues. Instruction should allow students to build their general knowledge of words and word relationships, the study of synonyms and antonyms, and the practice of recognizing examples and non-examples of word relationships.	5B.1. MTSS/RtI Team	5B.1. Following the FCIM model, the Literacy Leadership Team will Analyze classroom assessments to determine the students' knowledge of words and word relationships.	5B.1. Formative: Bi-weekly classroom assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment		
Reading Goal #5B: The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment indicate that 37% in the Black Subgroup made learning gains and 41% in the Hispanic Subgroup made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the Black Subgroup making learning gains by 3 percentage points to 40% and increase the percentage of students in the Hispanic Subgroup making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 46%	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	Black: 37% (24) Hispanic: 41% (55)	Black: 40% (26) Hispanic: 46% (62)			
	5B.2. Black: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment was Reporting Category 1, Vocabulary. Students lack the vocabulary necessary to be successful readers	5B.2. Provide a variety of reading strategies through differentiated instruction that help students determine meanings of words by using context clues. Instruction should allow students to build their general knowledge of words and word relationships, the study of synonyms and antonyms, and the practice of recognizing examples and non-examples of word relationships.	5B.2. MTSS/RtI Team	5B.2. Following the FCIM model, the Literacy Leadership Team will Analyze classroom assessments to determine the students' knowledge of words and word relationships.	5B.2. Formative: Bi-weekly classroom assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.

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

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5C.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment was Reporting Category 1: Vocabulary- Identify and understands the meaning of conceptually advanced prefixes, suffixes, and root words	5C.1. Provide students with more practice through differentiated instruction for prefixes, suffixes, root words, synonyms, and antonyms. Teachers should emphasize strategies for deriving word meanings and word relationships from context, as well as provide additional instruction on word meanings	5C.1. MTSS/Rtl Team	5C.1. Following the FCIM model, the MTSS/RtI Team bi-weekly will analyze formative bi-weekly assessment data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed	5C.1. Formative: FAIR, Computer reports generated from FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, SuccessMaker, and Edusoft bi-weekly reports Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment		
Reading Goal #5C: The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment indicate that 31% in the ELL Subgroup made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the ELL Subgroup making learning gains by 7 percentage points to 38%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	31% (22)	38% (27)					
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	

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

		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5D.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment was Reporting Category 1, Vocabulary. Students lack the vocabulary necessary to be successful readers	5D.1. Provide a variety of reading strategies through differentiated instruction that help students determine meanings of words by using context clues. Instruction should allow students to build their general knowledge of words and word relationships, the study of synonyms and antonyms, and the practice of recognizing examples and non-examples of word relationships.	5D.1. MTSS/RtI Team	5D.1. Following the FCIM model, the Literacy Team will analyze bi-weekly classroom assessments to determine the effectiveness of the students' knowledge of words and word relationships	5D.1. Formative: Bi-weekly classroom assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment		

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

Reading Goal #5D: The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment indicate that 6% in the SWD Subgroup made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the SWD Subgroup making learning gains by 15 percentage points to 21%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	6% (1)	21% (4)					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	

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

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5E.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment was Reporting Category 2, Reading Application. Students demonstrate difficulty in main idea/ relevant details, identifying cause and effect relationships, compare/ contrast and chronological order. **Teachers will utilize the Accelerated Reader Program** for students to practice and become successful readers.	5E.1. Provide a variety of instructional strategies and activities through differentiated instruction that include making inferences, drawing conclusions, returning to text as support for answers, analyzing stated vs. implied main ideas, using graphic organizers to analyze text, interacting with text, understanding text structures and summarizing text. Teachers will utilize the Accelerated Reader Program for students to practice and become successful readers.	5E.1. MTSS/RtI Team	5E.1. Following the FCIM model, the Literacy Leadership Team bi-weekly will Analyze classroom assessments in order to determine students' ability to identify cause and effect relationships, compare/ contrast and Chronological order.	5E.1. Formative: Mini- assessments and AR Quizzes Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment, District Assessments		

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

Reading Goal #5E: The results of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment indicate that 40% in the Economically Disadvantaged Subgroup made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup making learning gains by 4 percentage points to 44%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	40% (80)	44% (88)					
		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						

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

PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Voyager Intervention Training	K-5	Reading Coach	K-5	September 19, 2012	Mini-assessments and student work folders	MTSS/Rtl Leadership Team, Assistant Principal and Reading Coach
Success Maker Intervention Training	3-5	Reading Coach	3-5	September 19, 2012	Computer- based assessments and student data folders	MTSS/Rtl Leadership Team, Assistant Principal and Reading Coach
Differentiated Instruction	K-5	Reading Coach	K-5	September 26, 2012	Teacher observation and student work folders	Principle, Assistant Principal and Reading Coach

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/ materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
5E.1.	EESAC funds	SAC funds	$3,800.00
Subtotal: $3,800.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
4A.1.	Materials for Workshops & Printing of Informational Worksheets	School Based Budget	$100.00
Subtotal: $100.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
4A.1.	Voyager Intervention	Title I	$31,000.00
Subtotal: $31,000.00			
Total: $34,900.00			

End of Reading Goals

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	

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

1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.	1.1. The area of deficiency, as noted on the 2012 administration of the CELLA Listening/Speaking Assessment, was paraphrasing and retelling. The students had difficulty in understanding text when asked to read, retell or paraphrase what they read.	1.1. The students will use brief excerpts or passages from text and paraphrase what they have read, accounting for the vocabulary words and concepts that are important to the excerpt.	1.1. MTSS/RtI Team	1.1. Following the FCIM model, the ESOL teacher will analyze bi-weekly student work folders and teacher made assessments.	1.1. Formative: Student work folders and teacher made assessments Summative: 2013 CELLA Listening/ Speaking Assessment	
CELLA Goal #1: The results of the 2012 CELLA Listening/Speaking assessment indicate that 46% of students achieved proficiency.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					
	46% (88)					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

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.	2.1. The area of deficiency, as noted on the 2012 administration of the CELLA Reading Assessment was comprehending text on grade level. The students had difficulty in understanding text when asked to read, grade level text independently.	2.1. The students will use the Reciprocal Teaching steps (predicting, questioning, clarifying and summarizing) to comprehend grade level text.	2.1. MTSS/RtI Team	2.1. Following the FCIM model, the ESOL instructor will analyze bi-weekly student formative reading benchmark assessment and teacher made assessments.	2.1. Formative: Bi-weekly assessments and teacher made assessments Summative: 2013 CELLA Writing Assessment	
CELLA Goal #2: The results of the 2012 CELLA Reading assessment indicate that 27% of students achieved proficiency.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:					
	27% (51).					

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

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

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.	2.1. The area of deficiency, as noted on the 2012 administration of the CELLA Writing Assessment was the writing process The students had difficulty in understanding the necessary steps to respond to a writing prompt.	2.1. The students will write in the following steps: *planning, drafting, revising, editing,* and *publishing* according to their individual writing level; additionally, they will share and respond to other pieces of writing.	2.1. MTSS/RtI Team	2.1. Following the FCIM model, the ESOL instructor will analyze student writing journals and teacher made assessments weekly and adjust instruction to meet the needs of the students.	2.1. Formative: Monthly Writing Prompt Summative: 2013 CELLA Writing Assessment	
<u>CELLA Goal #3:</u> The results of the 2012 CELLA Writing assessment indicate that 19% of students achieved proficiency	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u>					

	19% (37)					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
2.1	Writing Journals	Title One	$400.00
Subtotal: $400.00			
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: $400.00			

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.	1A.1. The area of deficiency in grade 3 as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment was Number: Fractions. This deficiency is due to limited access to manipulatives for each classroom.	1A.1. Provide the instructional support needed for students to develop quick recall of addition facts and related subtraction facts, and multiplication and related division facts and multiplication and division of whole numbers, as well as addition and subtraction of fractions and decimals.	1A.1. MTSS/RtI Team	1A.1. Following the FCIM model, the Leadership Team will analyze and review formative chapter Tests data reports monthly to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed. Administrative walkthroughs/grade level meetings to obtain teacher feedback on effectiveness of manipulative usage with students.	1A.1. Formative: Chapter Tests; District interim data reports; Student work Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.		
Mathematics Goal #1A: The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment indicate that 23% of students achieved proficiency (Level 3). Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency (Level 3) by 5 percentage points to 28%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	23% (46)	28% (57)					
		1A.2. The area of deficiency in grades 4-5 as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment was Number and Operations. This deficiency is due to limited access to manipulatives for each classroom.	1A.2. Provide contexts for mathematical exploration and the development of student understanding of number sense and operations by supporting the use of manipulatives and engaging opportunities for practice.	1A.2. MTSS/RtI Team	1A.2. Following the FCIM model, the Leadership Team will analyze and review formative chapter Tests data reports monthly to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed. Administrative walkthroughs/ grade level meetings to obtain teacher feedback on effectiveness of manipulative usage with students.	1A.2. Formative: Chapter Tests; District interim data reports; Student work Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #1B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	

| | | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | |
| | | | | | | | |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.	2A.1. The area of deficiency in grade 3 as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment was Number: Fractions. This deficiency is due to limited access to manipulatives for each classroom.	2A.1. Provide the instructional support needed for students to develop quick recall of addition facts and related subtraction facts, and multiplication and related division facts and multiplication and division of whole numbers, as well as addition and subtraction of fractions and decimals.	2A.1. MTSS/RtI Team	2A.2. Following the FCIM model, the Leadership Team will analyze and review formative chapter Tests data reports monthly to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed. Administrative walkthroughs/grade level meetings to obtain teacher feedback on effectiveness of manipulative usage with students.	2A.1. Formative: Chapter Tests; District interim data reports; Student work Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.		

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

Mathematics Goal #2A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment indicate that17% of students achieved Levels 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving Levels 4 and 5 by 3 percentage points to 20%.						
	17% (35)	*20% (41)*				
		2A.2. The area of deficiency in grade 4 as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment was Number and Operations. This deficiency is due to limited access to manipulatives for each classroom.	2A.2. Provide contexts for mathematical exploration and the development of student understanding of number sense and operations by supporting the use of manipulatives and engaging opportunities for practice	2A.2. MTSS/RtI Team	2A.2. Following the FCIM model, the Leadership Team will analyze and review formative chapter Tests data reports monthly to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed. Administrative walkthroughs/ grade level meetings to obtain teacher feedback on effectiveness of manipulative usage with students.	2A.2. Formative: Chapter Tests; District interim data reports; Student work Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.

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

		2A.3. The area of deficiency in grade 5 as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment was in the Reporting Category of Geometry and Measurement	2A.3. Conduct vertical planning to reinforce attributes of shapes, size and position, dimensional geometric shapes, and transitive properties in the primary grade to prepare and support applications of 2 and 3 dimensional shapes in the intermediate grades	2A.3. MTSS/RtI Team	2A.3. Following the FCIM model, the MTSS/RtI will analyze chapter tests and review data monthly to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus based on data reports. Provide time during grade level meetings to share best practices and reflect on additional needs.	2A.3. Formative: Chapter Tests; District interim data reports; student authentic work Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.**	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #2B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

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

in need of improvement for the following group:							
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3A.1. The area of deficiency in grade 3 as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment was Number: Fractions. This deficiency is due to limited access to manipulatives for each classroom.	3A.1. Provide the instructional support needed for students to develop quick recall of addition facts and related subtraction facts, and multiplication and related division facts and multiplication and division of whole numbers, as well as addition and subtraction of fractions and decimals.	3A.1. MTSS/RtI Team	3A.2. Following the FCIM model, the Leadership Team will analyze and review formative chapter Tests data reports monthly to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed. Administrative walkthroughs/grade level meetings to obtain teacher feedback on effectiveness of manipulative usage with students.	3A.1. Formative: Chapter Tests; District interim data reports; Student work Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.		

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

Mathematics Goal #3A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment indicate that 58% of students made learning gains Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 10 percentage points to 68%.						
	58% (75)	68% (88)				
		3A.2. The area of deficiency in grades 4-5 as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment was in the Reporting Category of Geometry and Measurement The deficiency is due to limited classroom opportunities to develop exploration and inquiry activities.	3A.2. Provide grade-level appropriate activities that promote the composing and decomposing of; describing, analyzing, comparing, and classifying; and building, drawing, and analyzing models that develop measurement concepts and skills through experiences in analyzing attributes and properties of two-and three- dimensional shapes/objects	3A.2. MTSS/RtI Team	3A.2. Following the FCIM model, the Leadership Team will analyze and Review monthly ongoing classroom assignments and assessments that target application of the skills taught	3A.2. Formative: Student work; Monthly assessments, Interim Assessments Summative: 2013FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.**	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #3B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

4. FCAT 2.0: **Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.**	4A.1. The area of deficiency in grade 3 as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment was in Reporting Category – Number: Fractions. Lack of performance of targeted students is due to minimal appropriate interventions.	4A.1. Identify lowest performing students in grades 3 based on instructional needs; in addition, provide tutoring sessions after school 2 times per week. Specifically, targeting struggling students and correlating instruction to their deficiencies.	4A.1. MTSS/RtI Team	4A.1. Following the FCIM model, the Leadership Team will analyze formative chapter test monthly data reports as well as intervention assessments to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.	4A.1. Formative: Chapter Tests data reports; Intervention assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment		

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

Mathematics Goal #4: The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment indicate that67% in the Lowest 25% subgroup made learning gains Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 72%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	67% (25)	72% (27)				

		4A.2. The area of deficiency in grades 4 and 5 as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment was in the Reporting Category of Number: Operations & Problems Lack of performance of targeted students is due to minimal appropriate interventions.	4A.2. Provide differentiated instruction that utilizes the Go Math series Reteach Lessons to those students not demonstrating mastery on weekly tests.	4A.2. MTSS/RtI Team	4A.2. Following the FCIM model, the Leadership Team will analyze formative chapter test monthly data reports as well as intervention assessments to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.	4A.2. Formative: Chapter Tests data reports; Intervention assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment	
		4A3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A3.	4A.3.	

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	

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

5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011 39	44	49	54	59	64	70
Mathematics Goal #5A: **Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.**							
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. Black & Hispanic: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment was Number and Operations for both the Hispanic and Black Subgroups.	5B.1. Implement a rotation schedule for small group instruction during the mathematics 60-minute instructional block and provide tailored instruction based on mini-assessments and hands-on practice for students utilizing manipulatives to develop an understanding of number sense concepts.	5B.1. MTSS/RtI Team	5B.1. Following the FCIM model the Leadership Team will analyze monthly mini-assessments and adjust academic goals utilizing teacher feedback on student skill attainment.	5B.1. Formative: mini-assessments and Tutorial assessments Summative: 2013FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment		

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

| Mathematics Goal #5B:

The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0Mathematics Assessment indicate that 40% in the Black Subgroup made learning gains and 37% in the Hispanic Subgroup made learning gains.

Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the Black Subgroup making learning gains by 6 percentage points to 46% and increase the percentage of students in the Hispanic Subgroup making learning gains by 13 percentage points to 50%	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Black: 40% (26) Hispanic: 37% (50)	Black: 46% (30) Hispanic: 50% (67)					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5C.1. According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students was Reporting Category 1 – Number and Operations.	5C.1. Engage students in activities to use technology (such as Brainchild/ Web-Achiever, Gizmos, and Riverdeep®) that include visual stimulus to develop conceptual understanding of numbers.	5C.1. MTSS/RtI Team	5C.1. Review Gizmos and Riverdeep® reports to ensure students are making adequate progress.	5C.1. Formative: Gizmos and Riverdeep® reports Summative: 2013FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment, District Assessments		
Mathematics Goal #5C: The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment indicate that 32% in the ELL Subgroup made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the ELL Subgroup making learning gains by 13 percentage points to 45%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	32% (22)	45% (32)					
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	

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

		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5D.1. According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students was Reporting Category 1 – Number and Operations	5D.1. Provide the instructional support needed for students to develop quick recall of addition facts and related subtraction facts, and multiplication and related division facts. Engage students in activities to use technology (such as Brainchild/ Web-Achiever, Gizmos, and Riverdeep®) that include visual stimulus to develop conceptual understanding of numbers.	5D.1. MTSS/RtI Team	5D.1. Following the FCIM model, the Leadership Team will review Gizmos and Riverdeep® reports to ensure students are making adequate progress and make recommendations and adjust instruction as needed.	5D.1. Formative: Gizmos and Riverdeep® reports Summative: 2013FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment, District Assessments		

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

Mathematics Goal #5D: The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment indicate that 19% in the SWD Subgroup made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the SWD Subgroup making learning gains by 9 percentage points to 28%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	19% (3)	28% (5)				
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5E.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment was Number and Operations. This can be attributed to the Inconsistent implementation of small group instruction during the mathematics instructional block	5E.1. Implement a rotation schedule for small differentiated group instruction during the mathematics 60-minute instructional block and provide tailored instruction based on mini-assessments and hands-on practice for students utilizing manipulatives to develop an understanding of number sense concepts	5E.1. MTSS/RtI Team	5E.1. Following the FCIM model, the Leadership team and teachers will review assessment data bi-weekly and adjust instruction as needed and adjust academic goals utilizing teacher feedback on student skill attainment and mini-assessments from informal and tutorial assessments.	5E.1. Formative: Mini assessments and tutorial assessments Summative: 2013FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment		

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

Mathematics Goal #5E: The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment indicate that 39% in the Economically Disadvantaged Subgroup made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the Economically Disadvantaged Subgroup making learning gains by 9 percentage points to 48%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	39% (78)	*48% (96)*				
		5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

ddle School Mathema	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem					

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

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

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

Mathematics Goal #1B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.		
Mathematics Goal #2A: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.**	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #2B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

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		

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

61

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

3A. FCAT 2.0: **Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.**	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.		
Mathematics Goal #3A: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.**	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #3B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					

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

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

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	

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

5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011						
Mathematics Goal #5A: 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		
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					

		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

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.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5D: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	

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

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5E: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	
		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

gh School Mathemat	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					

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

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

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

Mathematics Goal #2: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.**	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	
Mathematics Goal #3: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.

		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Algebra 1 Goal #1: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Algebra Goal #2: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

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**						

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

Algebra 1 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 Algebra 1.**	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
Algebra 1 Goal #3B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

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

Algebra 1 Goal #3D: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.

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

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

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Geometry Goal #1: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Geometry Goal #2: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017		
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2011-2012**						

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

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.**	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
Geometry Goal #3B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.		
Geometry Goal #3C: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	
		3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.		
Geometry Goal #3D: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	

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

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

	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	
		3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD 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
Number Sense and Operations (New Generation Standards)	K-5 Mathematics	Leadership Team	K-5 Teachers	Start September 10, 2012-Ongoing	Grade level planning sessions/ classroom walkthroughs	Administrator
Differentiated Instruction during the Mathematics Instructional Block	K-5 Mathematics	Leadership Team	K-5 Teachers	Start September 10, 2012-Ongoing	Mathematics small group schedule	Administrator

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
5B.1	Materials for Workshops & Printing of Informational Worksheets	EESAC	$100.00
Subtotal: $100.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
5C.1	Web-based	School based	1,100.00
Subtotal: $1,100.00			

Total: $1,200.00							

End of Mathematics Goals

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		

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

1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.	1A.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Science is in Physical Science. Students lack higher order thinking skills. Students need more opportunities to investigate Physical Science and students were not consistently engaged in independent inquiry labs that fostered a deeper conceptual understanding.	1A.1. Provide students the opportunity to work cooperatively in a small group setting to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase scientific thinking, and the development and implementation of inquiry-based activities that allow for testing of hypotheses, data analysis, explanation of variables, and experimental design in Physical Science.	1A.1. MTSS/RtI Team	1A.1. Data from school-based assessments and District Interims will be analyzed monthly by administration and shared with teachers to determine if students are making adequate progress toward the goal. Adjustments to instructional focus will be made as appropriate	1A.1. Formative: School- based assessment and District Baseline and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment		

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

Science Goal #1A: The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment indicate that 25% of 5th Grade students achieved proficiency (FCAT Level 3) The goal for the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science assessment is to increase 5th Grade students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) by 3 percentage points to 21%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	25% (18)	30% (21)				
		1A.2. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Science is in Nature of Science. Students lack higher order thinking skills. Students need more opportunities to practice observation skills and forming hypothesis.	1A.2. Provide a variety of hands-on inquiry-based learning opportunities for students to analyze, draw appropriate conclusions, and apply key instructional concepts.	1A.2. MTSS/RtI Team	1A.2. Data from school-based assessments and District Interims will be analyzed monthly by administration and shared with teachers to determine if students are making adequate progress toward the goal. Adjustments to instructional focus will be made as appropriate	1A.2. Formative: School- based assessment and District Baseline and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment

		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.**	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Science Goal #1B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

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

| 2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science. | 2A.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Science is in Physical Science. Students lack higher order thinking skills.

Students need more opportunities to investigate Physical Science and students were not consistently engaged in independent inquiry labs that fostered a deeper conceptual understanding. | 2A.1. Provide students the opportunity to work cooperatively in a small group setting to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase scientific thinking, and the development and implementation of inquiry-based activities that allow for testing of hypotheses, data analysis, explanation of variables, and experimental design in Physical Science. | 2A.1. MTSS/RtI Team | 2A.1. Data from school-based assessments and District Interims will be analyzed monthly by administration and shared with teachers to determine if students are making adequate progress toward the goal. Adjustments to instructional focus will be made as appropriate | 2A.1. Formative: School- based assessment and District Baseline and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment | | |

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

Science Goal #2A: The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment indicate that 7% of 5th Grade students achieved proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 & 5) The goal for the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science assessment is to increase 5th Grade students achieving proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 & 5) by 2 percentage points to 9% .	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*				
	7% (5)	9% (6)				
		2A.2. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Science is in Nature of Science. Students lack higher order thinking skills. Students need more opportunities to practice observation skills and forming hypothesis.	2A.2. Provide a variety of hands-on inquiry-based learning opportunities for students to analyze, draw appropriate conclusions, and apply key instructional concepts.	2A.2. MTSS/RtI Team	2A.2. Data from school-based assessments and District Interims will be analyzed monthly by administration and shared with teachers to determine if students are making adequate progress toward the goal. Adjustments to instructional focus will be made as appropriate	2A.2. Formative: School- based assessment and District Baseline and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.

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

2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Science Goal #2B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

High School Science Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					

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

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

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

Science Goal #2: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

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

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

Biology 1 Goal #1: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	
Biology 1 Goal #2: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

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

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

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
PD focus on Scientific Thinking Strategies	Grades 3-5 Science	Leadership Team	3rd, 4th and 5th grade Science Teachers	September 10, 2012 – May 17, 2013 (Monthly)	Classroom Walkthroughs	Administrator

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:			

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

Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
1A.1.	Materials for Workshops & Printing of Informational Reference Worksheets	School Based Budget	300.00
Subtotal: $300.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total: $300.00			

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		

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

1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.	1A.1. During the 2012 FCAT Writing Test, fourth graders demonstrated difficulty in narrative writing. Students' lack practice following the writing process and experience in editing and revisiting their work.	1A.1. Students will be exposed to the writing process from the time they enter the school. Students will be exposed to mentor text, explicit instruction and independent practice Students will confer in pairs and provide Feedback on word choice, specificity, depth, relevance and thoroughness. After which students will have a conference with the teacher to address additional changes that need to be made.	1A.1. MTSS/RtI Team	1A.1. Monthly the reading coach will assist classroom teachers in analyzing students' monthly writing prompts in order to monitor students' progress and determine their needs and adjust the instruction.	1A.1. Formative: Students' scores on monthly writing assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Writing Test.		

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

Writing Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
The results of the 2012 FCAT Writing Test indicate that 61% of students scored level 3 or higher. The goal for the 2013 FCAT Writing Test is to increase 4th Grade students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3 or higher) by 4 percentage points to 65%.						
	61% (37)	*65% (39)*				
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.**	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	
Writing Goal #1B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.

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

		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
Teaching the use of drafting organizational skills and support.	4th Grade/ Writing	Reading Coach	4th Grade Level	September 12, 2012 - Ongoing (Monthly)	Monitor student writing notebooks. The students will use red pens to make revisions and edit so that their self-correcting behavior can be easily monitored.	Grade Level Chair & Reading Coach

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:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
1A.1.	Journals for student writing	Title I	450.00
Subtotal: $450.00			
Total: $450.00			

End of Writing Goals

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					

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

	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:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		

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

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

Civics Goal #2: N/A.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

Civics Professional Development

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

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Civics Goals

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]).

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

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:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

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

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:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

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.						

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

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

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. Illnesses-excused absences have increased from the previous year due to lack of accessibility to medical resources.	1.1. Identify and refer students who may be developing a pattern of nonattendance to the Truancy Child Study Team (TCST) for intervention services. Provide parents with information to assist them in improving student attendance. Provide health information through Health Connect in our school.	1.1. Assistant Principal & Guidance Counselor	1.1. Monitoring of weekly updates to Administration by the TCST	1.1. TCST logs, Connect Ed Reports, and Attendance rosters		

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

| Attendance Goal #1:

Our goal for this year is to increase attendance to 95.79% by minimizing absences due to illnesses and truancy, and to create a climate in our school where parents, students and faculty feel welcomed and appreciated.

Our second goal is to decrease the number of students with excessive absences (10 or more) and excessive tardiness (10 or more) by 5%	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*				
	95.29% (438)	*95.79% (441)*				
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)				
	155	*147*				
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)				
	107	*102*				

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

		1.2. Tardiness increased from the previous year due to lack of parents and students not aware of the district's attendance and tardiness policies.	1.2. Identify and refer students who may be developing a pattern of tardiness to MTSS/RTI team for intervention services and a tardy conduct.	1.2. Assistant Principal & Guidance Counselor	1.2. Bi-weekly updates to the Principal and faculty from the MTSS/RTI Team	1.2. Attendance rosters	
		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
Truancy Prevention	Grades K-5 Parents	Guidance Counselor, Community Involvement Specialist, & Assistant Principal	Parents and Family Members	September 28, 2012 – Ongoing (monthly)	TCST meeting sign in sheets	Guidance Counselor, Community Involvement Specialist, & Assistant Principal

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

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

Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
1.2	News letters and District Policies	EESAC	50.00
Subtotal: $50.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total: $50.00			

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

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

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

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

1. Suspension	1.1. Lack of student motivation leading to misbehavior.	1.1. Utilizing the Student Code of Conduct provide a parent informational meeting about truancy	1.1. Administrative Team	1.1. The Administrative Team will participate monthly in analyzing the data in order to determine the effectiveness of the strategy and using the FCIM Model will monitor COGNOS reports on student outdoor suspension rate	1.1. Participation Log for students who are recognized for complying with the Student Code of Conduct along with the monthly COGNOS suspension reports		
Suspension Goal #1: Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain the percentage of student suspension.	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions					
	0	0					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					
	0	0					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	0	0					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	0	0					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Suspension Professional Development

Professional						

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

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
The Student Code of Conduct	Grades K-5 Teachers	Guidance Counselor	School wide	August 20, 2012 – September 28, 2012	Walk-throughs to monitor teachers' enforcement of the Student Code of Conduct.	Leadership Team
The Student Code of Conduct	Grades K-5 Parents	Guidance Counselor & Community Involvement Specialist	Parents and Family Members	August 29, 2012	Effectiveness will be determined by the completion of parent surveys	Guidance Counselor & Community Involvement Specialist

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			

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
1.1	Materials for Workshop & Printing of Informational Reference Worksheets	PTA	300.00
Subtotal: $300.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total: $300.00			

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

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

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

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

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

Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Parent Involvement	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Parent Involvement Goal #1: N/A *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*					

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

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

	Enter numerical data for current level of parent involvement in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of parent involvement in this box.*				
		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

Parent Involvement Budget

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

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

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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: 100% of students will participate in the Science Fair.	1.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Science is in Nature of Science. Teachers lack time to prepare mini-lessons to conduct science projects testing the scientific thinking process.	1.1. Provide opportunities for students to experience the scientific method by participating in the school's Science Fair.	1.1. Administrators	1.1. Data from school-based assessments and District Interims will be analyzed monthly by administration and shared with teachers to determine if students are making adequate progress toward the goal. Adjustments to instructional focus will be made as appropriate	1.1. Formative: School- based assessment and District Baseline and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional					

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

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

Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PD focus on Scientific Thinking Strategies	Grades 3-5 Science	Leadership Team	3rd, 4th and 5th grade Science Teachers	September 10, 2012 – May 17, 2013 (Monthly)	Science Lab and Classroom Walkthroughs	Administrator

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
1.1	Materials for Workshops & Printing of Informational Reference Worksheets	School Based Budget	300.00

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

	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:$300.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total: $300.00			

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: During articulation 100% of 5th grade students will be informed of courses offered at the secondary level.	1.1. Setting up with the middle school and limited availability of the courses.	1.1. Articulation Meeting	1.1. Student Services and Administration	1.1. All students must complete course selection	1.1. Subject Selection Paper
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

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

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

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

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: N/A	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.	*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

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

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: $34,900.00
CELLA Budget	
	Total: $400.00
Mathematics Budget	
	Total: $1,200.00
Science Budget	
	Total: $300.00
Writing Budget	
	Total: $450.00
Civics Budget	
	Total:
U.S. History Budget	
	Total:
Attendance Budget	
	Total: $50.00
Suspension Budget	
	Total: $300.00
Dropout Prevention Budget	
	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	
	Total:
STEM Budget	
	Total: $300.00
CTE Budget	
	Total:
Additional Goals	
	Total:

	Grand Total: $37,900.00

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.
The EESAC will meet monthly to assist and support the total school program. The EESAC will develop and monitor the implementation and progress of the School Improvement Plan.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount

● EESAC funds will be utilized to purchase Accelerated Reader books and quizzes to further enhance the Media Center and students' reading performance	$3,800.00
● Printing of informational worksheets on differentiated instruction professional development	$100.00
● News letters/District Policies	$50.00
	$3,950.00