

# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



## 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: <a href="#">Deerlake Middle School</a>	District Name: <a href="#">Leon County</a>
Principal: <a href="#">Shane Syfrett</a>	Superintendent: <a href="#">Jackie Pons</a>
SAC Chair: <a href="#">Lisa Thompson</a>	Date of School Board Approval:

#### Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

[School Grades Trend Data](#) (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)

[Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test \(FCAT\)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data](#) (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)

[High School Feedback Report](#)

[K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan](#)

#### Administrators

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

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Shane Syfrett	<p><b>Degree(s)</b> BA – Mathematics Education, Florida State University; MS – Educational Leadership, Florida State University</p> <p><b>Certification(s)</b> Educational Leadership &amp; Mathematics (6-12)</p>	18	8	<p><b>2011-2012:</b> Grade A, Reading Mastery: 84%, Math Mastery: 85%, Writing Mastery: 93%, Science Mastery: 75%.</p> <p><b>2010-2011:</b> Grade A, Reading Mastery 89%, Math Mastery 92%, Writing Mastery 97%, Science Mastery 76%.</p> <p><b>2009-2010:</b> Grade A, Reading Mastery: 89%, Math Mastery: 90%, Writing Mastery 91%, Science Mastery 72%, AYP 100%.</p> <p><b>2008-2009:</b> Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 87%, Math Mastery: 88%, Writing Mastery: 97%; Science Mastery: 69%, AYP: 90%, Black &amp; Students with Disabilities subgroups did not make AYP in Math or Reading.</p> <p><b>2007-2008:</b> Grade A, Students with Disabilities did not make AYP in Math or Reading, Black students did not make AYP in Math.</p>
Assistant Principal	Zelena O’Banner	<p><b>Degree</b> BA- Elementary Education 1-6, Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University MS- Educational Leadership; Nova Southeastern University(NOVA) EdS. Curriculum and Instruction, NOVA</p> <p><b>Certifications:</b> Elementary Education (1-6), Middle Grades Math (5-9), &amp; Educational</p>	6	6	<p><b>2011-2012:</b> Grade A, Reading Mastery: 84%, Math Mastery: 85%, Writing Mastery: 93%, Science Mastery: 75%.</p> <p><b>2010-2011:</b> Grade A, Reading Mastery 89%, Math Mastery 92%, Writing Mastery 97%, Science Mastery 76%.</p> <p><b>2009-2010:</b> Grade A, Reading Mastery: 89%, Math Mastery: 90%, Writing Mastery 91%, Science Mastery 72%, AYP 100%.</p> <p><b>2008-2009:</b> Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 87%, Math Mastery: 88%, Writing Mastery: 97%; Science Mastery: 69%, AYP: 90%, Black &amp; Students with Disabilities subgroups did not make AYP in Math or Reading.</p> <p><b>2007-2008:</b> Grade A, Students with Disabilities did not make AYP in Math or Reading, Black students did not make AYP in Math.</p>

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

Assistant Principal	Steve Mill	<p><b>Degree</b> BA- Mathematics, Piedmont College MS- Educational Leadership; Stetson</p> <p><b>Certifications:</b> Mathematics 6-12 &amp; Educational Leadership</p>	3	1	<p><b>2011-2012:</b> Grade A, Reading Mastery: 84%, Math Mastery: 85%, Writing Mastery: 93%, Science Mastery: 75%.</p> <p><b>2010-2011:</b> Grade A, Reading Mastery 89%, Math Mastery 92%, Writing Mastery 97%, Science Mastery 76%.</p> <p><b>2009-2010:</b> Grade A, Reading Mastery: 89%, Math Mastery: 90%, Writing Mastery 91%, Science Mastery 72%, AYP 100%.</p> <p><b>2008-2009:</b> Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 87%, Math Mastery: 88%, Writing Mastery: 97%; Science Mastery: 69%, AYP: 90%, Black &amp; Students with Disabilities subgroups did not make AYP in Math or Reading.</p> <p><b>2007-2008:</b> Grade A, Students with Disabilities did not make AYP in Math or Reading, Black students did not make AYP in Math.</p>
---------------------	------------	--	---	---	---

**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	Sherry Whiddon	<p>BS- English Education</p> <p>English Ed. (5-9) Reading Endorsed</p>	8	1	<p><b>2011-2012:</b> Grade A, Reading Mastery: 84%, Math Mastery: 85%, Writing Mastery: 93%, Science Mastery: 75%.</p> <p><b>2010-2011:</b> Grade A, Reading Mastery 89%, Math Mastery 92%, Writing Mastery 97%, Science Mastery 76%.</p> <p><b>2009-2010:</b> Grade A, Reading Mastery: 89%, Math Mastery: 90%, Writing Mastery 91%, Science Mastery 72%, AYP 100%.</p> <p><b>2008-2009:</b></p>

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

					Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 87%, Math Mastery: 88%, Writing Mastery: 97%; Science Mastery: 69%, AYP: 90%, Black & Students with Disabilities subgroups did not make AYP in Math or Reading. <b>2007-2008:</b> Grade A, Students with Disabilities did not make AYP in Math or Reading, Black students did not make AYP in Math.

**Effective and Highly Effective Teachers**

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Teaming new teachers with veteran teachers	Principal	On Going
2. Meetings regularly with new teachers	Principal	On Going
3. Soliciting referral from current teachers and other administrators	Principal	On Going
4. Create professional learning communities	Administrators	On Going
5. Create a Positive Learning Environment by building strong relationships. (A family atmosphere)	All Faculty & Staff	On Going

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

***Non-Highly Effective Instructors***

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).

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

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/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
3	Teachers are taking classes and working towards certification.

***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
52	5	6	15	26	16	52	4	6	6

***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
Marla Blair	Abby Fishburn	Mrs. Blair is an experienced science teacher who has mentored beginning teachers through the Beginning Teacher Program previously. Her expertise in curriculum and effective teaching strategies make her an excellent choice.	*Support and training in record keeping, lesson planning, instructional strategies, curriculum pacing, and classroom management.  *Monthly meetings with

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

			administrators.  *Shadowing and observation with feedback
Marla Blair	Derek Jones	Mrs. Blair is an experienced science teacher who has mentored beginning teachers through the Beginning Teacher Program previously. Her expertise in curriculum and effective teaching strategies make her an excellent choice.	*Support and training in record keeping, lesson planning, instructional strategies, curriculum pacing, and classroom management.  *Monthly meetings with administrators.  *Shadowing and observation with feedback
Linda Johnson	Erika Grant	Ms. Johnson is an experienced teacher who has mentored beginning teachers through the Beginning Teacher Program previously. Her expertise in curriculum and effective teaching strategies make her an excellent choice.	*Support and training in record keeping, lesson planning, instructional strategies, curriculum pacing, and classroom management.  *Monthly meetings with administrators.  *Shadowing and observation with feedback
Linda Johnson	Gia Maxwell	Ms. Johnson is an experienced teacher who has mentored beginning teachers through the Beginning Teacher Program previously. Her expertise in curriculum and effective teaching strategies make her an excellent choice.	*Support and training in record keeping, lesson planning, instructional strategies, curriculum pacing, and classroom management.  *Monthly meetings with administrators.  *Shadowing and observation with feedback

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

Jackie Parramore	Eden Rodgers	Mrs. Parramore is an experienced guidance counselor who has mentored beginning counselors through the Beginning Guidance Program previously. Her expertise in guidance and effective communication skills make her an excellent choice.	<p>*Support and training in record keeping, communication, and effective parent conferences.</p> <p>*Weekly meetings with administrators.</p> <p>*Shadowing and monitoring with feedback</p>
------------------	--------------	---	--

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
<p>Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.</p> <p><b>Principal or Assistant Principal:</b> Provides an outlook of the “big picture” of Deerlake Middle School, assuring that the MTSS/RtI process is implemented with fidelity while upholding the vision of the school, ensures adequate professional development for faculty and staff, and communicates with parents.</p> <p><b>Guidance Counselor:</b> Leads the team when the student is not ESE, communicates with academic teachers to collect student data, contacts school social workers as needed, provides links to child services and community agencies for school and families to support the student’s academic, behavioral, and social success.</p> <p><b>Select Core Academic Teachers:</b> Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.</p> <p><b>Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teacher:</b> Leads the team when dealing with ESE students. Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teacher to ensure accommodations are being met to assist in student achievement.</p> <p><b>School Psychologist:</b> Participates in collection, interpretation and analysis of data; develops intervention plans; provides support for documentation of the fidelity of interventions; provides professional development for faculty; assessment and evaluation of students, and conferencing with parents to disseminate data and information.</p> <p><b>Speech Language Pathologist:</b> Assist in the selection of screening measures and helps identify systemic patters of student need with respect to language skills.</p> <p><b>District Exceptional Student Education Personnel:</b> Provides expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. In addition to providing interventions, school social workers continue to link child serving and community agencies to our school and families to support the student’s academic, behavioral, and social success.</p>
<p>Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?</p> <p>The team meets once a week to engage in the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review screening data and link to classroom instruction</li> <li>• Review progress monitoring data at the classroom level</li> <li>• Identify if the student is meeting subject area benchmarks</li> <li>• Problem solve to develop an intervention plan</li> <li>• Document the intervention process</li> <li>• Communicate with students, parents, and teachers to implement interventions</li> </ul>



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

- Evaluate the implementation of interventions  
Develop and present professional development to increase knowledge of the MTSS process

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

The MTSS Team meets with the administration and School Leadership Team to help develop the SIP. The team provides data on: Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets and strategies to assist students failing in these areas. These strategies are reviewed and implemented when making school improvement goals.

### MTSS Implementation

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

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), FAIR

Midyear: Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR), Pearson Success Maker, report card grades, and discipline data.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development training will be provided in the form of articulation meetings by grade level during pre-planning for faculty. The director of guidance will review the MTSS process in the October faculty meeting.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

MTSS will be supported through continuous review of student progress and teacher collaboration.

### *Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)*

#### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).

The Reading Coach, Assistant Principal of Curriculum and faculty members representing all departments.

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).

The LLT meets on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Monday of every month at 8:15. The function of the team is give department feedback for all new or ongoing school-wide reading initiatives.

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?

The major initiative of the LLT this year will be to support content area reading strategies in the implementation of Common Core State Standards. By increasing the complexity of text and questioning techniques in content area reading all subjects will assist Deerlake in achieving our Reading Goals.

### *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**

**\*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?

Every teacher is required to document at least one Common Core Lesson implementing reading strategies per nine weeks starting in Jan. 2013. Teachers also perform read-a-louds with students or require students to read every day for 15 minutes during "C" period class. These books were selected based on student interest and social topics to build character for middle school students.

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

**PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS**

**Reading Goals**

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

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.</b>			1A.1.Scores are high already and it will be difficult to increase.	1A.1.Teachers will use a progress monitoring test correlated to the FCAT tested standards to monitor growth and prepare lessons based on needs.	1A.1. Reading Coach, Principal, Assistant Principal.	1A.1. Teachers will review reports based on standards and compare to past performance on the FCAT reading test. At monthly department meetings, teachers will discuss results and share strategies and research based materials to target instruction for weak areas.	1A.1. Language Arts department developed Progress Monitoring Tool and FCAT data.
<u>Reading Goal #1A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<b>28% (266) of students in grades 6-8 will score a Level 3 on the 2013 administration of FCAT Reading</b>	26% (239)	28% (266)					
			1A.2.Scores are high already and it will be difficult to increase	1A.2.Teachers will provide clear learning goals and rubrics	1A.2. Assistant Principal and Principal	1A.2. Monitoring or progress towards goals.	1A.2. Classroom observation.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.</b>			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
<u>Reading Goal #1B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<b>N/A</b>							
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.</b>			2A.1. Scores are high already and it will be difficult to increase	2A.1. Teachers will use a progress monitoring test correlated to the FCAT tested standards to monitor growth and prepare lessons based on needs.	2A.1. Reading Coach, Principal, Assistant Principal.	2A.1. Teachers will review reports based on standards and compare to past performance on the FCAT reading test. At monthly department meetings, teachers will discuss results and share strategies and research based materials to target instruction for weak areas.	2A.1. Language Arts department developed Progress Monitoring Tool and FCAT data.
<u>Reading Goal #2A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>59% (560) of our students in grades 6-8 will score at Level 4 or 5 on the 2012 administration of FCAT Reading.</i>	57% (525)	59% (560)					
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.</b>			2B.1. Only one student is in this category.	2B.1. Teacher will monitor progress throughout school year and prepare academics lessons based on grade level appropriate activities.	2B.1. ESE- Lightfoot	2B.1. Student performance and assessments.	2B.1. Florida Alternate Assessment
<u>Reading Goal #2B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Student will continue to master and generalize specific academic skills in the area of reading to maintain a level of 7 on the Florida Alternate Assessment.</i>	100% (1)	100% (1)					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</b>			3A.1.Scores are high already and it will be difficult to increase	3A.1. Teachers will use a progress monitoring test correlated to the FCAT tested standards to monitor growth and prepare lessons based on needs.	3A.1. Reading Coach, Principal, Assistant Principal.	3A.1. Teachers will review reports based on standards and compare to past performance on the FCAT reading test. At monthly department meetings, teachers will discuss results and share strategies and research based materials to target instruction for weak areas.	3A.1. Language Arts department developed Progress Monitoring Tool and FCAT data.
<u>Reading Goal #3A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>73% (693) of our students in grades 6-8 will make learning gains on the 2012 administration of FCAT Reading.</i>	72% (663)	73% (693)					
			3A.2.	3A.2. Teachers will provide clear learning goals and rubrics	3A.2. Assistant Principal and Principal	3A.2. Monitoring or progress towards goals.	3A.2. Classroom observation.
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
<b>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</b>			3B.1. Only one student is in this category.	3B.1. Teacher will monitor progress throughout school year and prepare academics lessons based on grade level appropriate activities.	3B.1. ESE- Lightfoot	3B.1. Student performance and assessments.	3B.1. Florida Alternate Assessment
<u>Reading Goal #3B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>The student taking the Reading portion of the Florida Alternative Assessment will make learning gains. 100 % (1)</i>	100% (1)	100% (1)					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b>			4A.1. The state is only looking at level 1 and 2 student s this year. We have (126) students scoring at these levels. 6 <sup>th</sup> - 35 7 <sup>th</sup> - 40 8 <sup>th</sup> - 51	4A.1. Students scoring Level 1 or 2 are scheduled into an Intensive Reading class in the place of one of their elective classes.	4A.1. Reading Coach, Principal and Assistant Principal	4A.1. Review of FAIR data to assure that students are making progress	4A.1. Printout of FAIR data reports and 2013 FCAT Data.
<u>Reading Goal #4:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<b>68% (156) of our students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains according to the 2012 administration of FCAT Reading.</b>	65% (156)	68% (85)					
			4A.2.	4A.2. Students will be identified and charted in teacher planning rooms.	4A.2. Reading Coach, Principal and Assistant Principal	4A.2. Review of FAIR data to assure that students are making progress	4A.2. Printout of FAIR data reports and 2013 FCAT Data
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<b>5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b> <b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>			<b>26%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>12%</b>
	<b>Reading Goal #5A:</b>  <i>The current reading gap between white students and black students is 24%. The school will work to reduce the gap to 23% in reading.</i>							
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	
<b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b> <b>Reading Goal #5B:</b>  <i>85% (778) of the students (6-8) will proficient on FCAT Reading.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White:14% Black:36% Hispanic:12% Asian:12% American Indian: N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White: 13% Black: 34% Hispanic:11% Asian: 11% American Indian: N/A	5B.1 Some subgroup have a small number of students in them.	5B.1. Students scoring Level 1 or 2 are scheduled into an Intensive Reading class in the place of one of their elective classes.	5B.1. Reading Coach, Principal and Assistant Principal	5B.1. Review of FAIR data to assure that students are making progress	5B.1. Printout of FAIR data reports and 2013 FCAT Data.	
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5C.1. There are only 2 students in this category. Both students are limited English speakers.	5C.1. Monitor students throughout the year through report cards and assessments.	5C.1.ELL Teachers & Guidance	5C.1. Check report card Grades and WUR scores.	5C.1. 2013 Reading FCAT data
Reading Goal #5C:  <i>100% (2) of the ELL students will be proficient in reading as determined by 2013 Reading FCAT.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	0% (0)	100% (2)					
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5D.1. Students have a diagnosed Learning Disability and are not reading on grade level.	5D.1. Struggling students are enrolled in a Learning Strategies class, and all students have accommodations on their IEP.  Students scoring Level 1 or 2 are scheduled into a Reading class in the place of their elective.	5D.1.ESE Teacher / Classroom Teacher	5D.1.Student grades and FAIR data.	5D.1. 2013 Reading FCAT data
Reading Goal #5D:  <i>50% (44) of students with disabilities will be proficient in reading as determined by the 2013 Reading FCAT.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	53% (36)	50% (44)					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.



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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5E.1. Students not reading on grade level.	5E.1. Teachers will identify students who need academic support.	5E.1. Director of Guidance	5E.1. Guidance counselors and teachers will mentor and conference with each other and students.	5E.1. Grades and progress monitoring results.
<b>Reading Goal #5E:</b>  <i>50% (51) of economically disadvantaged students will score proficient on the 2013 Reading FCAT.</i>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>					
	49% (42)	50% (51)					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

### Reading Professional Development

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities</b>						
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
Data Director	6-8	Lisa Thompson Sherry Whiddon	Language Arts Department	Monthly meeting	Reports printed from Data Director	Assistant Principal
Text Complexity	6-8	Kathy Corder	Language Arts Department	Monthly meeting	Rubrics and results of test	Principal
Common Core Transition	6-8	Kathy Corder Sherry Whiddon	Language Arts Department	Monthly meeting	Create units and lessons plans through study of benchmarks	Assistant Principal

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

**Reading Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Book Study "Becoming a Reflective Teacher"	Marzano Book	Title II	\$1337
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
CCSS Transition Training	District Trainer (Corder)	School Recognition Dollars / Title II	\$1440
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total: \$2777.00</b>

*End of Reading Goals*

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

**Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals**

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

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.</b>  <b>CELLA Goal #1:</b> <i>By the end the 2012-2013 school year, 100% of ELL students who took the CELLA in 2012 will make progress on the CELLA listening and speaking assessment.</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: 100 % (1)	1.1. Only 1 of our 2 current ELL students took the 2011-2012 CELLA. The student scored in the proficient level.	1.1. Analyze CELLA test items and provide student with oral practice opportunities in the classroom.	1.1 ESOL Coordinator/APC	1.1. Student assessment over time using a rubric.	1.1 2013 CELLA listening/speaking test..
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2. Students scoring proficient in reading.</b>  <b>CELLA Goal #2:</b> <i>By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, 100% of ELL students who took the CELLA in 2012 will make progress on the CELLA reading assessment.</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: 100% (1)	2.1. Only 1 of our 2 current ELL students took the 2011-2012 CELLA. The student scored in the very High Intermediate level.	2.1. Explicit instruction in academic and high utility vocabulary.	Language Arts Teacher/APC	2.1 Regular Unit Assessments	2.1. Pre-test/post-test data. 2013 CELLA Reading Test
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

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

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>3. Students scoring proficient in writing.</b>		2.1.	2.1	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
<b>CELLA Goal #3:</b>  <i>By the end the 2012-2013 school year, 100% of ELL students who took the CELLA in 2012 will make progress on the CELLA writing assessment.</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :	Only 1 of our 2 current ELL students took the 2011-2012 CELLA. The student scored in the proficient level.	Teachers will monitor writing scores quarterly and share strategies at monthly department meetings.	Language Arts Teacher/APC	Students and teachers will examine writing over time to determine improvement based on the rubric criteria of focus, elaboration, organization, integration, and conventions as measured by data collected by the teachers that shows adequate growth collected three times during the year – fall, winter and spring.	Scoring anchor papers with rubric and comparing state score to individual scores and 2013 CELLA writing scores.
	100% (1)					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

**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
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*End of CELLA Goals*

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

**Middle School Mathematics Goals**

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

<b>Middle School Mathematics Goals</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
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
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.</b>			1A.1. We have approx. 350 students taking the EOC in Alg.1 or Geometry, therefore we have fewer students taking FCAT Math.	1A.1. Progress Monitor all students (6-8) that are enrolled in non-high school credit classes.	1A.1. Principal, Department Head/ classroom Teachers	1A.1. Data talks during Department PLC to discuss progression of students. (Data Director)	1A.1. 2013 Math FCAT scores and Data Director
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
28% (174) of students in grades 6-8 will score a level 3 on the 2013 administration of FCAT Math	29% (267)	28% (174)					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</b>			1B.1. Only one student is in this category.	1B.1. Teacher will monitor progress throughout school year and prepare academics lessons based on grade level appropriate activities.	1B.1. ESE- Talley	1B.1. Student performance and assessments.	1B.1. Florida Alternate Assessment
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Student will continue to master and generalize specific academic skills in the area of mathematics to achieve a level 4-6 on the Florida Alternate Assessment.	100% (1)	100% (1)					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.</b>			2A.1. We have approx. 350 students taking the EOC in Alg.1 or Geometry, therefore we have fewer students taking FCAT Math.	2A.1. Progress Monitor all students (6-8) that are enrolled in non-high school credit classes.	2A.1. Principal, Department Head/ classroom Teachers	2A.1. Data talks during Department PLC to discuss progression of students. (Data Director)	2A.1. 2013 Math FCAT scores and Data Director
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #2A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>56%(336) of students in grades 6-8 will score at Level 4 or 5 on the 2013 administration of FCAT Math</i>	55% (494)	56% (336)					
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.</b>			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #2B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A							
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.



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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			3A.1. We have approx. 350 students taking the EOC in Alg.1 or Geometry, therefore we have fewer students taking FCAT Math.	3A.1. Progress Monitor all students (6-8) that are enrolled in non-high school credit classes.	3A.1. Principal, Department Head/ classroom Teachers	3A.1. Data talks during Department PLC to discuss progression of students. (Data Director)	3A.1. 2013 Math FCAT scores and Data Director
<u>Mathematics Goal #3A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
76% (456) of students in grades 6-8 will make learning gains according to the 2013 administration of FCAT math	75% (647)	76% (456)					
			3A.2.	3A.2. Teachers will provide clear learning goals and rubrics.	3A.2. Assistant principal and principal	3A.2. Classroom observation	3A.2. Report Card Grades & Teacher Assessments
			3A.3.	3A.3. Struggling students (level 1 & 2) are enrolled in an Intensive Math Lab class. Utilizing Pearson Success Maker.	3A.3. Math Lab Teacher	3A.3. Pearson Success Maker Student Gain Reports bi-weekly.	3A.3. 2013 Math FCAT and Finale Pearson Success Maker Growth Summary
<b>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			3B.1. Only one student is in this category.	3B.1. Teacher will monitor progress throughout school year and prepare academics lessons based on grade level appropriate activities.	3B.1. ESE- Talley	3B.1. Student performance and assessments.	3B.1.2013 Math Florida Alternate Assessment
<u>Mathematics Goal #3B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
The student (1) taking the 2013 Math Florida Alternative Assessment will make learning gains.	N/A	100% (1)					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			4A.1. The state is only looking at level 1 and 2 student s this year. We have (126) students scoring at these levels. 6 <sup>th</sup> - 42 7 <sup>th</sup> - 34 8 <sup>th</sup> - 49	4A.1. Students scoring Level 1 or 2 are scheduled into an Intensive Math Lab class in the place of one of their elective classes.	4A.1. Math Lab Teacher, Principal and Assistant Principal	4A.1. Review of Success Maker data to assure that students are making progress  Student Gain Reports bi-weekly	4A.1. Printout of Student Success Maker Growth Summary data reports and 2013 FCAT Data.
Mathematics Goal #4:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<b>58% (78) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on the 2013 administration of FCAT math.</b>	57% (130)	58% (78)					
			4A.2. ESE students that are eligible for the Math Lab class cannot be assigned the extra math class due to their Learning Strategies Class.	4A.2. Have student work on Pearson Success Maker during their assigned Learning Strategies class.	4A.2. ESE Teacher	4A.2. Review of Success Maker data to assure that students are making progress  Student Gain Reports bi-weekly	4A.2. Printout of Student Success Maker Growth Summary data reports and 2013 FCAT Data.
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<b>5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>	31%	27%	23%	19%	15%	
<b>Mathematics Goal #5A:</b>  <i>Currently, the math gap between white students and black students is 31%. The school will work to reduce the gap to 30% in mathematics.</i>							
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	
<b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>		5B.1. We have a smaller number of students in the Black, Hispanic, and Asian subgroups.	5B.1. Students scoring Level 1 or 2 are scheduled into an Intensive Math Lab class in the place of one of their elective classes.	5B.1. Math Lab Teacher, Principal and Assistant Principal	5B.1. Review of Pearson Success Maker data to assure that students are making progress	5B.1. Printout of Pearson Success Maker Student Growth Summary data reports and 2013 FCAT Data.	
<b>Mathematics Goal #5B:</b>  <i>85% (510) of the students (6-8) will be proficient on FCAT Math, only 15% (90) will not.</i>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>					
	White: 13% Black:44% Hispanic:17% Asian:5% American Indian: 0	White: 12% Black:43% Hispanic:16% Asian:4% American Indian: 0	5B.2. Students within these subgroups that are also ESE students that cannot be assigned the extra math lab class due to their Learning Strategies Class.	5B.2. Have student work on Pearson Success Maker during their assigned Learning Strategies class.	5B.2. ESE Teacher	5B.2. Review of Success Maker data to assure that students are making progress  Student Gain Reports bi-weekly	5B.2. Printout of Student Success Maker Growth Summary data reports and 2013 FCAT Data.
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

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

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

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
<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			5C.1. There are only 2 students in this category. Both students are limited English speakers.	5C.1. Monitor students throughout the year through report cards and assessments.	5C.1.ELL Teachers & Guidance	5C.1. Check report card Grades and Progress Monitoring Assessment scores.	5C.1. 2013 Math FCAT data
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5C:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>100% (2) of the ELL students will be proficient in reading as determined by 2013 Math FCAT.</i>	N/A	100 % (2)					
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			5D.1. Students have a diagnosed Learning Disability and are not performing at grade level.	5D.1. Struggling students are enrolled in a Learning Strategies class, and all students have accommodations on their IEP.  Students scoring Level 1 or 2 are scheduled into a Math Lab class in the place of their elective.	5D.1.ESE Teacher / Classroom Teacher	5D.1.Student grades and Pearson Success Maker data.	5D.1. 2013 Math FCAT data
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5D:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>50% (44) of students with disabilities will be proficient in math as determined by the 2013 Math FCAT.</i>	53%(36)	50% (44)					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			5E.1. Sometimes economically disadvantaged students do not have the support at home needed to be successful.	5E.1. Parent conferences to communicate strategies to parents that will assist students to become successful.	5E.1. Principal, Department Head, Guidance counselor	5E.1. Report Card Grades and Classroom assessments	5E.1. 2013 FCAT mathematics scores
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <b>#5E:</b>  <i>54% (55) of economically disadvantaged students will be proficient in math as determined by the 2013 Math FCAT.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 47% (40)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 46% (47)					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

*End of Middle School Mathematics Goals*

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

**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
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.</b>			1.1. Every student that scores a Level 3 on the 7 <sup>th</sup> Grade FCAT math is expected to be enrolled into Algebra 1 in 8 <sup>th</sup> Grade.	1.1. Progress Monitor all students enrolled in Algebra 1 classes.	1.1. Principal, Department Head/ Alg. Teachers	1.1. Data talks during Department PLC to discuss progression of students. (Data Director)	1.1. 2013 Algebra 1 EOC scores and Data Director
Algebra 1 Goal #1: <i>28% (72) of students enrolled in Algebra will score a level 3 on the 2013 administration of Algebra I End of Course Exam.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	29% (68)	28% (72)					
			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
<b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.</b>			2.1. Every student that scores a Level 3 on the 7 <sup>th</sup> Grade FCAT math is expected to be enrolled into Algebra 1 in 8 <sup>th</sup> Grade.	2.1. Progress Monitor all students enrolled in Algebra 1 classes.	2.1. Principal, Department Head/ Alg. Teachers	2.1. Data talks during Department PLC to discuss progression of students. (Data Director)	2.1. 2013 Algebra 1 EOC scores and Data Director
Algebra Goal #2: <i>70% (175) of students in grades 7-8 will score a level 4 or 5 on the 2013 administration of Algebra I End of Course Exam</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	69% (160)	70% (175)					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

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
<b>3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>  Algebra 1 Goal #3A:  <i>There is no achievement gap in our Algebra EOC scores.</i>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>							
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	
<b>3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.</b>  Algebra 1 Goal #3B:  <i>Students not making satisfactory progress on FCAT math are not eligible for Algebra 1 in middle school.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White:1% Black: 0% Hispanic: 0% Asian: 0% American Indian: 0%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White: 0% Black: 0% Hispanic: 0% Asian: 0% American Indian: 0%	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	



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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.</b>			3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3C:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>Students not making satisfactory progress on FCAT math are not eligible for Algebra 1 in middle school.</i>							
			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
<b>3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.</b>			3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>No SWD students enrolled in Algebra 1 for the 2012-13 school year.</i>							
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.</b>			3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3E:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>Students not making satisfactory progress on FCAT math are not eligible for Algebra 1 in middle school.</i>							
			3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

*End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals*

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

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

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

Geometry EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.</b>			1.1. Not enough information; 2012 was the first year for Geometry EOC and students were not divided into Levels.	1.1. Progress Monitor all students enrolled in Geometry classes.	1.1. Principal, Department Head, Geometry teacher	1.1. Data talk during department learning communities	1.1. Geometry End of Course Exam
Geometry Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<b>25% (23) of students enrolled in Geometry will score a Level 3 on the 2013 administration of Geometry End of Course Exam</b>	N/A	25% (23)					
			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
<b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.</b>			2.1. Not enough information; 2012 was the first year for Geometry EOC and students were not divided into Levels.	2.1. Progress Monitor all students enrolled in Geometry classes.	2.1. Principal, Department Head, Geometry teacher	2.1. Data talk during department learning communities	2.1. Geometry End of Course Exam
Geometry Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<b>75% (71) of students enrolled in Geometry will score a Level 4 or 5 on the 2013 administration of Geometry End of Course Exam</b>	N/A	75% (71)					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

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
<b>3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>  Geometry Goal #3A:  <i>We have no achievement gap in Geometry at this time.</i>	<b>Baseline data 2011-2012</b>  <u>none</u>						
	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
<b>3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.</b>  Geometry Goal #3B:  <i>Students not making satisfactory progress on FCAT math are not eligible for accelerated high school credit math classes in middle school.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	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
<b>3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.</b>			3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.
<b>Geometry Goal #3C:</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>					
<i>Students not making satisfactory progress on FCAT math are not eligible for accelerated high school credit math classes in middle school.</i>							
			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
<b>3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.</b>			3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.
<b>Geometry Goal #3D:</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>					
<i>Students not making satisfactory progress on FCAT math are not eligible for accelerated high school credit math classes in middle school.</i>							
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.</b>			3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.
<b>Geometry Goal #3E:</b>  <i>Students not making satisfactory progress on FCAT math are not eligible for accelerated high school credit math classes in middle school.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
			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

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities</b>						
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
Writing word problems from expressions, equations, and real life scenarios	All	Dept. Head	All of the math department	Once per month	Inclusion of writing word problems on assessments in math classes	Dept. Head / Math Teacher
Providing explanations of how students find solutions	All	Dept. Head	All of the Math department	Once per month	Written responses on assessments throughout the year.	Dept. Head / Math Teacher
CCSS training	All	Vicki Register	All of the Math department	Nov. 2012; Feb. 2013	Implementation of Common Core strategies on chapter assessments.	Dept. Head / Math Teacher

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

**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
Training of teachers in the instructional use of Active Inspire software.	Active Inspire software for every teacher, teacher trainers	PTO/Title II/A+ Money	
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Writing word problems from expressions, equations, and real life scenarios	Workbooks and shared materials from other teachers	PTO/Title II/A+ Money	
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
CCSS training	Substitute Teachers for the math department (2 days each)	Title II School Recognition Dollars	\$1280.00
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*End of Mathematics Goals*

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

**Elementary and Middle School Science Goals**

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.</b>			1A.1. Students taking High School Biology will not take the Science FCAT in 2013.	1A.1. Use CARPD/Common Core Benchmarks/ADI to teach Science concepts and skills.	1A.1. Science Teachers	1A.1. Progress Monitoring	1A.1. Science FCAT
<b>Science Goal #1A:</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>					
<b>45% (110) of the 8<sup>th</sup> grade students taking the 2013 administration of the Science FCAT will score a Level 3.</b>	44% (129)	45% (136)					
			1A.2. The Science portion of the FCAT is only administered to 8 <sup>th</sup> graders and we do not have Science scores for our current 8 <sup>th</sup> grade students.	1A.2. Teachers will provide clear learning goals and rubrics for all lessons.	1A.2. Assistant Principals and Principal	1A.2. Classroom Assessments	1A.2. Classroom Observation
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.</b>			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
<b>Science Goal #1B:</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>					
<b>No students will be taking the alternative assessment.</b>	N/A	N/A					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.



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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.</b>			2A.1. Students taking High School Biology will not take the Science FCAT in 2013.	2A.1. Use CARPD/Common Core Benchmarks/ADI to teach Science concepts and skills.	2A.1. Science Teachers	2A.1. Progress Monitoring	2A.1. Science FCAT
Science Goal #2A:  <i>16% (40) of the 8<sup>th</sup> grade students taking the 2013 administration of the Science FCAT will score a Level 4 or 5.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	30% (88)	16% (40)					
			2A.2. The Science portion of the FCAT is only administered to 8 <sup>th</sup> graders and we do not have Science scores for our current 8 <sup>th</sup> grade students.	2A.2. Teachers will provide clear learning goals and rubrics for all lessons.	2A.2. Assistant Principals and Principal	2A.2. Classroom Assessments	2A.2. Classroom Observation
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.</b>			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Science Goal #2B:  <i>No students will be taking the alternative assessment</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

*End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals*

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

**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]).

<b>Biology 1 EOC Goals</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
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
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.</b>			1.1. Scores were not broken down by levels in 2011-2012.	1.1. Use district progress monitoring instruments to ensure that students are mastering at a 70% level on each unit and benchmark.	1.1. Missy Atkinson, Biology teacher	1.1. Use data from Data Director to monitor student progress and provide information for re-teaching or supplementation of curriculum.	1.1. District-developed progress monitoring instruments and baseline tests.
Biology 1 Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<b>45% of all 8<sup>th</sup> graders (31) taking the Biology EOC will score a Level 3.</b>	N/A – Scores were reported only in thirds.	45% or 31 students will score a level 3.					
			1.2. Need to increase complexity of material to incorporate common core standards.	1.2. Use laboratory activities (Argument Driven Inquiry) to increase common core literacy skills in science and CIS instruction for reading passages.	1.2. Missy Atkinson, Biology teacher	1.2. Student and teacher rubrics for understanding more complex tasks and portfolio/lab presentations of ADI activities.	1.2. District developed activities and assessments that go with ADI and CIS activities.
			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
<b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.</b>			2.1. Scores were not broken down by levels in 2011-2012.	2.1. Use district progress monitoring instruments to ensure that students are mastering at a 70% level on each unit and benchmark.	2.1. Missy Atkinson, Biology teacher	2.1. Use data from Data Director to monitor student progress and provide information for re-teaching or supplementation of curriculum.	2.1. District-developed progress monitoring instruments and baseline tests.
Biology 1 Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<b>50% of all 8<sup>th</sup> graders (35) taking the Biology EOC will score a level 4 or 5.</b>	N/A – Scores were reported only in thirds.	50% or 35 students will score a level 4 or 5.					
			2.2. Need to increase complexity of material to incorporate common core standards.	2.2. Use laboratory activities (Argument Driven Inquiry) to increase common core literacy skills in science and CIS instruction for reading passages.	2.2. Missy Atkinson, Biology teacher	2.2. Student and teacher rubrics for understanding more complex tasks and portfolio/lab presentations of ADI activities.	2.2. District developed activities and assessments that go with ADI and CIS activities.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

*End of Biology 1 EOC Goals*

**Science Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
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

**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
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

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

*End of Science Goals*

**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
<b>1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.</b>			1A.1. With the changes made by DOE to the scoring of the state assessment, and the delay in schools and teachers receiving information about the changes, it will be difficult to increase scores or to prevent a dip in scores.	1A.1. Teachers will monitor writing scores quarterly and share strategies at monthly department meetings. A school wide remediation workshop will be offered during the third quarter for students who are not making adequate progress.	1A.1. Language arts teachers and Zelena O'Banner, APC	1A.1. Data chats at monthly department meetings and final review of Florida Writes scores.	1A.1. WUR/ 2013 FCAT Florida Writes
<u>Writing Goal #1A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
58% (179) of Deerlake students will score a 4.0 or higher on the 2013 administration of FCAT Writing.  90% (279) of Deerlake students will score a 3.0 or higher on the 2013 administration of FCAT Writing.  77% (238) of Deerlake students will score a 3.5 or higher on the 2013 administration of FCAT Writing.	57% (167) of students scored 4.0 or higher.	58% (179) of students scored 4.0 or higher.					
			1A.2. With the changes made by DOE to the scoring of the state assessment, and the delay in schools and teachers receiving information about the changes, it will be difficult to increase scores or to prevent a dip in scores.	1A.2. Teachers and students will examine the state rubrics for effective writing instruction and apply these criteria to their writing. Teachers and students will use the district anchor papers as examples of effective writing. Teachers will also increase the focus on elaboration of supporting details as well as the conventions of standard English to reflect the new grading policy per DOE.	1A.2. Language arts teachers and Zelena O'Banner, APC	1A.2. Students and teachers will examine writing over time to determine improvement based on the rubric criteria of focus, elaboration, organization, integration, and conventions as measured by data collected by the teachers that shows adequate growth collected three times during the year – fall, winter and spring	1A.2. Scoring anchor papers with rubric and comparing state score to individual scores.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.</b>			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
<u>Writing Goal #1B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
No student taking Alternative Assessment for	N/A	N/A					

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

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

<i>Writing</i>		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

**Writing Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
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

**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
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Writes Upon Request Grading	Substitute Teachers	Title II	\$2400.00
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:</b>			\$2400.00

*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 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
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.</b>			1.1. If we are not selected to participate in the EOC field test, then data can be collected.	1.1. District wide progress monitoring test and commons assessments.	1.1. Civics Teacher	1.1. Data talks over progress monitoring data from Data Director.	1.1.Civics EOC field test
Civics Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<b>60% (186) of the students enrolled in Civics will score at Level 3 on the Civics EOC.</b>	N/A	60% (186)					
			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
<b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.</b>			2.1. If we are not selected to participate in the EOC field test, then data can be collected.	2.1. District wide progress monitoring test and commons assessments.	2.1. Civics Teacher	2.1. Data talks over progress monitoring data from Data Director.	2.1.Civics EOC field test
Civics Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<b>20% (62) of the students enrolled in Civics will score at Levels 4 &amp; 5 on the Civics EOC</b>	N/A	20% (62)					

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

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

		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.
--	--	------	------	------	------	------

**Civics Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
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 Prog. Mon. Writing	7 / Civics	Schroepfer	All Civics Teachers	Aug. 2012	Quarterly assessments	Peggy Reninan
Quarterly PLC Mtgs.	7/ Civics	Schroepfer	All Civics Teacher	Sept. 2012; Nov. 2012; Feb. 2013; Apr. 2013	Quarterly assessments	Cathy Schroepfer
Civics Prog. Mon. Revision	7/ Civics	Schroepfer	All Civics Teachers	Summer 2013	Quarterly assessments	Peggy Reninan

**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
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
CCSS Training	Substitutes all teacher 2 days	Title II and School Recognition	1280.00
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:</b>			

*End of Civics Goals*

**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
<b>1. Attendance</b>			1.1. The Compulsory Attendance process relies on the teachers to initiate the process for investigating excessive absences.	1.1. Teachers will be trained in the new Compulsory Attendance process to track students that have excessive absences.	1.1. Steve Mills	1.1. Attendance records will be monitored quarterly to check the number of students with excessive absences.	1.1. Quarterly attendance reports.
Attendance Goal #1:	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
	95.3% 876	97% 921					
During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students with 10 or more absences will be reduced by 10% (33).	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	13% (123)	10% (95)					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.



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

		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
--	--	------	------	------	------	------

**Attendance Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
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
Compulsory Attendance Process	6-8	Steve Mills	All Teachers and Administrators	August 20, 2012	Quarterly monitoring of attendance records.	Steve Mills

**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
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			

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

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:</b>			

*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
<b>1. Suspension</b>			1.1. Deerlake Middle School had one of the lowest rates of ISS in the district last year and it will be difficult to reduce this number even further.	1.1. Teachers will be trained in the use of Educator's Handbook software in order to be able to track discipline trends.	1.1. Assistant Principal (Steve Mills) and Dean of Students (Lisa Thompson)	1.1. The Assistant Principal and Dean of students will review the number of suspensions at the end of every quarter.	1.1. Educators Handbook Data
Suspension Goal #1:	2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions					
	86	76					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School					
	51	43					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	39	29					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School					
	3% (29)	2.6% (25)					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

**Suspension Professional Development**

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

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

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
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
Educators Handbook	6-8	Steve Mills	All	August 20, 2012	Quarterly monitoring of attendance data.	Steve Mills

**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
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*End of Suspension Goals*

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

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

**Parent Involvement Goal(s)**

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1. Parent Involvement</b>			1.1. There are already a high number of parent volunteer hours at the school.	1.1. Continue to make volunteering opportunities more visible through announcements on the listserv, at open house, the school newsletter and any other available opportunity.	1.1.Principal	1.1. Quarterly monitoring of the number of documented parent volunteers.	1.1. The total number of documented parent volunteers at the end of the school year.
<u>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>					
During the 2012-2013 school-year, the number of documented volunteer hours will increased to 2700.	2650.50 hours	2700 hours					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

**Parent Involvement Professional Development**

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

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

**Parent Involvement Budget**

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

*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				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
<b>STEM Goal #1:</b> <b>Maintain the number of students taking higher level math and science (Algebra I Honors, Algebra I, Geometry Honors, Earth Space Science Honors and Biology Honors)</b>	1.1. Students need opportunities to develop higher-order thinking skills.	1.1. Use Argument Driven Inquiry lessons in science once per nine weeks to develop thinking skills and incorporate common core literacy in science standards.	1.1. Science Teachers and Dept Head (Marla Blair)	1.1. Teacher and student rubrics for ADI lessons and student growth on ADI activity grades.	1.1. Documentation of strategies in science lesson plans (one per nine weeks) and number of students who qualify for higher level math and science classes in 2013-2014.
	1.2. Increase application of higher order (common core) math skills	1.2. Use common core strategies and application activities in math courses	1.2. Math teachers and Dept Head (Rima Kelley)	1.2. Teacher and student rubrics for CC lessons and student growth on FCAT Math.	1.2. Documentation of strategies in math lesson plans (one per nine weeks) and number of students who qualify for higher level math and science classes in 2013-2014.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

**STEM Professional Development**

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
ADI training	Science (all)	M. Blair	Science (all)	TBA	Monitoring of one lesson per nine weeks starting Jan. 2013	Marla Blair, Dept. Head
Writing Word Problems from Expressions, equations and scenarios	Math (all)	R. Kelley	Math (all)	Once per month	Inclusion of writing word problems on assessments in math classes	Rima Kelley, Dept. Head

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

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

**STEM Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
ADI training	FSU Teach Program	TBA	TBA
Writing Word Problems	TBA	TBA	TBA
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*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
<b>CTE Goal #1:</b>  <b>Provide career awareness to all 8th Grade students.</b>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

**CTE Professional Development**

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (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
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*End of CTE Goal(s)*

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

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

**Final Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
<b>Reading Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$2777.00</b>
<b>CELLA Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Mathematics Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$1280.00</b>
<b>Science Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$1280.00</b>
<b>Writing Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$2400.00</b>
<b>Civics Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$1280.00</b>
<b>U.S. History Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Attendance Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Suspension Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Dropout Prevention Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Parent Involvement Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>STEM Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>CTE Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Additional Goals</b>	<b>Total:</b>
	<b>Grand Total: \$9017.00</b>

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

**Differentiated Accountability**

**School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance**

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

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

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 SAC will meet quarterly throughout the school year. They will discuss school-wide issues and budgetary concerns. They will also approve and monitor the school improvement process throughout the year.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Our SCA will approve the expenditure of all school improvement funds (\$0.00) and how they are distributed.	\$0.00

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

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