

Florida Department of Education



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

2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Avalon Middle School	District Name: Orange
Principal: Judith Frank	Superintendent: Dr. Barbara M. Jenkins
SAC Chair: Jackie Carroll and Gladys Cabrera	Date of School Board Approval: 1/29/13

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

[High School Feedback Report](#)

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

Administrators

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

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

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

Principal	Judith Frank	Ed.S. in Educational Leadership MA in Curriculum and Instruction BA in Elementary Education Certification in Ed leadership, Elementary Education, Middle Grades Science and ESOL Endorsed	7	15	1997/2001 Assistant Principal Discovery MS "A" rated school. AYP was not in place at the time 2001/2006 Corner Lake Middle School "A" rated school, did not make AYP during any of the school years. 2006/2011 Avalon Middle School "A" rates school, did not make AYP during any of the school years. Made AYP for reading in all subgroups during 2010/2011 school year
Assistant Principal I.	Jose Gonzalez	Ed.S. in Educational Leadership MS in Exceptional Education BS in Exceptional Education. Certified in Educational Leadership and Exceptional Student Education	1	7	2005/2006 Cheney ES "A" rated school during school years 2004/2006, "B" rated school during school year 2006/2007 and "A" rated school during school year 2007/2008. Students did make AYP 2008/2011 Chickasaw ES "A" rated school all years. School Made AYP 2008/2010 2006/2011 Avalon Middle School "A" rated school. Made AYP for reading in all subgroups during 2010/2011 school year
Assistant Principal	Kelly Maldonado	MA in Educational Leadership BA in Elementary Education Certified in Ed Leadership, English 5-9, Elementary Education, and ESOL Endorsed	1	7	2005/2006 Stone Lakes ES "A" rated school, no AYP data for first year as it was a new school 2006/2011 Glenridge MS "A" rated school all years, did not make AYP during any of the school years. During SY 9/10 made significant gains with AYP subgroup Black Reading Students and made 97% AYP that school year. 2006/2011 Avalon Middle School "A" rated school. Made AYP for reading in all subgroups during 2010/2011 school year

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)
--------------	------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------	---	--

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

Science, LA, Math, SS	Donna Kesterson	BA Graphic Arts Certifications: Secondary/Elementary Education	1	14	2007-2011 Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT) Corner Lake Middle School. Corner Lake MS was an "A" school from 2007-2011. Corner Lake did not make AYP from 2007-2011.
Reading	Cheryl Vanatti	MS in Reading BS in Elem. Ed. Certifications: Grades K-12 Reading, ESOL Endorsement, English Grades 6-12, Elementary Education, Media Specialist K-12	Less than 1	4	Ms. Vanatti served as a Lit. Coach at Glenridge MS. The school made an A, but did not meet AYP. Ms. Vanatti is a highly qualified literacy coach.

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. Interviewed and hired only highly qualified teachers	Administration	August 2012
2. SREB (Southern Regional Educational Board) training for all staff	Administration and Instructional Coaches	June 2014
3. Administrative and coaching support and team building	Administration	Ongoing

-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
None	

Staff Demographics

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

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

*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
101	14% (14)	34% (34)	29% (29)	23% (23)	58% (59)	100%	9% (9)	7% (7)	20% (20)

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
Jody Bernier	Lisa Farrell	Common Department	Monthly meetings
Matthew Gilson	Rob Lattin	Common Department	Monthly meetings
Cynthia Hilyer	Jennifer Mack	Common Department	Monthly meetings
Fadia Hussein	Dawn Bray	Common Department	Monthly meetings
Tom Myers	David Santiago	Common Department, Proximity	Monthly meetings
Katie Hoey	Beth Feeley	Common Department	Monthly meetings
Matthew Gilson	Albert Cervellera	Common Department	Monthly meetings
Carol Henn	Jessica Monheim	Common Department	Monthly meetings
Keith Hilyer	Kelly Hobby	Common Department	Monthly meetings
Candace Pekins	Barbara Henderson	Proximity	Monthly meetings
David Webster Gardiner	Christina Pfaff	Proximity	Monthly meetings
Shannon Yenor	Nidia Reyes	Proximity	Monthly meetings

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

Lisa McChesney	Lloyd Kinderknecht	Proximity	Monthly meetings
Leann King	Kailee Smith	Common Department	Monthly meetings
Nicole Hernandez-Craig	Jennifer Bittel	Common Department	Monthly meetings
Kris Peterfeso	Melissa Corson	Proximity, Team	Monthly meetings
Gail Moss	Geraldine Rosa	Proximity	Monthly meetings
Lindsey Herold	Ayita Patrick	Proximity	Monthly meetings
Frank Walsh	Sandy Jensen	Common Department	Monthly meetings
Jessica Lucas	Marie Winchester	Common Department	Monthly meetings
Jarrin Warren	Jacklyn Stroz	Common Department	Monthly meetings

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

Please describe how federal, state, and local services and programs will be coordinated and integrated in the school. Include other Title programs, Migrant and Homeless, Supplemental Academic Instruction funds, as well as violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, career and technical education, and/or job training, as applicable.

Title I, Part A
Title I, Part C- Migrant
Title I, Part D
Title II
Title III
Title X- Homeless

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

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Violence Prevention Programs
Nutrition Programs
Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. Judy Frank, Radames Seda, Jose Gonzalez, Kelly Maldonado, Katie Pedicelli, Janet Martin, Cheryl Vanatti, Lisa Farrell, Leann King, Colleen Mastrobuono, Jody Bernier, and Sharon Henry.
Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts? The team will be meeting on a monthly basis to discuss student achievement data, review content goals and discuss strategies to increase effective teaching methods and student success. Focus will remain on the core instructional programs and discussion on research based intervention for areas of need.
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? RtI leaders reviewed the school wide data and shared information with staff and School Advisory Council. School Improvement Plan was developed and implemented based on this student achievement information.
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. To begin the school year FCAT scores and trends including subgroup data was reviewed with staff. Prior years discipline data was reviewed with grade level teachers. Teachers and administration developed a grade level specific behavior monitoring system. Benchmark, writing prompts, FAIR, grade level common assessments, IMS, and Edusoft mini assessments will all be used to progress monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the programs.

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

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. Entire staff was given an overview of the RtI process. The RtI team meets with grade level academic departments to review and discuss interventions for the tier 2 and tier 3 students on a monthly basis.

Describe the plan to support MTSS. ESE and classroom teachers will work collaboratively to identify Tier 3 students and remediate on a daily basis.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Judy Frank, Kelly Maldonado, Jose Gonzalez, Kathryn Pedicelli, Janet Martin, Cheryl Vanatti, Donna Kesterson, Kim Koza, Jody Bernier, Sharon, Henry, Lisa Farrell, Vicki Babington, Donald Hilyer, Fadia Ahmed Hussien Maribel Lopez, Nicole Harrington, Billy Bass, Nicole Hernandez-Craig, and Leann King.

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The LLT meets on a monthly basis to share data and implement literacy initiatives across the curriculum.

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? Training lead teachers on how to implement the literacy CCSS.

Public School Choice

- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**

Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.

**Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition*

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

N/A

**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?

Teachers will review their student reading data (Benchmark, FCAT, and FAIR) to understand student needs within the classroom. All teachers will document implementation of the five *Making Middle Grades Work* literacy goals.

**High Schools Only*

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

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

N/A

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

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

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

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#).

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.	1A.1.Lack of reading scaffolding within the content areas	1A.1.Provide professional development for effective strategies to scaffold students into content area texts	1A.1.Administration Department Chairs Literacy Coach CRT	1A.1.Lesson Plans Formal/Informal Observations Data Collection Sheets	1A.1.State, District, and school based assessments: FCAT Benchmarks Mini Benchmarks iObservation PLC Minutes		

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

<p><u>Reading Goal #1A:</u> <i>The school goal is for 33% of students to achieve proficiency in reading.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>30% (470)</p>	<p>33% (517)</p>					
		<p>1A.2.Lack of teaching explicit reading skills within the language arts classroom</p>	<p>1A.2. Provide ongoing professional development with precise questioning techniques and lesson planning</p>	<p>1A.2. Administration Department Chairs Literacy Coach CRT</p>	<p>1A.2. Lesson Plans Formal/Informal Observations Data Collection Sheets</p>	<p>1A.2. State, District, and school based assessments: FCAT Benchmarks Mini Benchmarks iObservation PLC Minutes</p>	
		<p>1A.3. Lack of rigor in instruction. Ongoing professional development for teachers to redesign assignments/ assessments to include cognitively complex work</p>	<p>1A.3.Continue to unwrap standards and work towards understanding of the depth of knowledge required</p>	<p>1A.3. Administration Department Chairs Literacy Coach CRT SREB Coach</p>	<p>1A.3. Lesson Plans Formal/Informal Observations Data Collection Sheets</p>	<p>1A.3. State, District, and school based assessments: FCAT Benchmarks Mini Benchmarks iObservation PLC Minutes</p>	
<p>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.</p>	<p>1B.1.</p>	<p>1B.1.</p>	<p>1B.1.</p>	<p>1B.1.</p>	<p>1B.1.</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #1B:</u> N/A</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					

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

		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.	2A.1.Lack of rigor in instruction	2A.1. Continue to unwrap standards and work towards understanding the depth of knowledge required	1A.2. Administration Literacy Coach CRT	1A.2. Lesson Plans Formal/Informal Observations	1A.2. State, District, and school based assessments: FCAT Benchmarks Mini Benchmarks iObservation Share Point		
Reading Goal #2A: <i>The school goal is to increase the number of students scoring at level 4 & 5 on the Reading FCAT.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	6 – 45% (229) 7 – 43% (234) 8 – 43% (221)	6 – 48% (244) 7 – 46% (251) 8 – 46% (236)					
		2A.2.Lack of understanding/ resources to incorporate multiple sources	2A.2.Require teachers to plan lessons that incorporate multiple sources of valid and reliable texts that set expectations of 21 st Century skills	2A.2. Administration Literacy Coach CRT	2A.2. Lesson Plans Formal/Informal Observations	2A.2. State, District, and school based assessments: FCAT Benchmarks Mini Benchmarks iObservation Share Point	

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

		2A.3.Lack of instruction that offers opportunities to engage and motivate high achieving students	2A.3.Require teachers to develop lessons ensuring student application and extension of knowledge. Continue use of common planning to allow teachers time to develop engaging lessons	2A.3.Administration Leadership	2A.3. Lesson Plans Formal/Informal Observations	2A.3. State, District, and school based assessments: FCAT Benchmarks Mini Benchmarks iObservation Share Point	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
<u>Reading Goal #2B:</u> N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	3A.1. Lack of response to Intervention Tier 3 remediation	3A.1. Implement scheduled time for targeted Tier 3 intervention	3A.1. ESE teachers Staffing Specialist Teachers	3A.1.RTI Documentation Data	3A.1.FAIR State, District, and school based assessments: FCAT Benchmarks Mini Benchmarks Classroom Formative Assessments		

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

<u>Reading Goal #3A:</u> <i>The school goal is for 77% of students to make learning gains in Reading.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	74% (1,160)	77% (1,207)					
		3A.2.Lacking a culture of school-wide literacy	3A.2. Offer on-going literacy centered activities throughout the various content areas	3A.2.Administration, LRT, Literacy Coach, Media Specialist	3A.2. Informal/Formal Observation	3A.2. iObservation	
		3A.3.Lack of fidelity within the Critical Thinking/ PAWS classes	3A.3.Provide PD training on research based critical thinking/ discussion pedagogy	3A.3.Administration, PAWS Coaches, LRT, Literacy Coach	3A.3.PAWS CWT forms Informal/Formal Observation	3A.3.PAWS surveys iObservation	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
<u>Reading Goal #3B:</u> N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
		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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4A.1. Lack of student reading mastery and completion of required course content	4A.1. Continued implementation of school-wide policy for students completing key assignments towards mastery	4A.1. Administration ICU Teachers Content area teachers	4A.1. Progress Reports Report Cards Informal/Formal Observation	4A.1. State, District, and school based assessments: FCAT Benchmarks FAIR		
<u>Reading Goal #4:</u> <i>The school goal is for 74 of the lowest 25% to make learning gains in Reading.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	71% (278)	74% (290)					
		4A.2. Lack of research based instructional strategies that engage and motivate students.	4A.2. Require teachers to develop lessons that differentiate and ensure student application and extension of knowledge	4A.2. Literacy Coach, LRT, Administration, Reading teachers.	4A.2. Informal/Formal Observation Lesson Plans PLC Minutes	4A.2. State, District, and school based assessments: FCAT Benchmarks FAIR iObservation Share Point	
		4A.3.Lack of authentic literacy and grade level resources to promote rigorous instruction	4A.3. Investigate opportunities to incorporate authentic literacy to promote rigorous instruction. Require teachers to develop lesson plans that infuse authentic literacy within the Lexile bands set forth by CCSS	4A.3. Literacy Coach, LRT, Administration, Reading teachers, Media Specialist	4A.3. Lesson Plans Informal/Formal Observation	4A.3. State, District, and school based assessments: FCAT Benchmarks FAIR iObservation Share Point	

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

4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.. <u>Reading Goal #4B:</u> N/A.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.		
	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance.*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance.*</u>					
		4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	
		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
--	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	--

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

<p>5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</p>	<p>Baseline data 2010-2011</p>	<p>Asian – 83 Black – 66 Hispanic – 64 White – 81 English Language Learners – 37 Students with Disabilities – 39 Economically Disadvantaged - 59</p>	<p>Asian- 86 Black - 72 Hispanic - 70 White - 84 English Language Learners - 48 Students with Disabilities - 49 Economically Disadvantaged - 66</p>	<p>Asian- 87 Black - 75 Hispanic - 73 White - 86 English Language Learners - 53 Students with Disabilities - 54 Economically Disadvantaged - 69</p>	<p>Asian- 89 Black - 77 Hispanic - 76 White - 87 English Language Learners - 58 Students with Disabilities - 59 Economically Disadvantaged - 73</p>	<p>Asian- 90 Black - 80 Hispanic - 79 White - 89 English Language Learners - 63 Students with Disabilities - 64 Economically Disadvantaged - 76</p>	<p>Asian- 92 Black - 83 Hispanic - 82 White - 91 English Language Learners - 69 Students with Disabilities - 70 Economically Disadvantaged - 80</p>
<p><u>Reading Goal #5A:</u> <i>Asian- 86 Black - 72 Hispanic - 70 White - 84 English Language Learners - 48 Students with Disabilities - 49 Economically Disadvantaged - 66</i></p>							
<p>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:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>		
<p>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p>	<p>5B.1. Acquisition of the English language</p>	<p>5B.1. Provide a DLA implementing the Rosetta Stone software</p>	<p>5B.1. Administration, CCT, ELL teachers and instructional coach</p>	<p>5B.1. Benchmarks, mini assessments, Rosetta Stone data and lesson plans</p>	<p>5B.1. FCAT and benchmarks</p>		

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

<p><u>Reading Goal #5B:</u> <i>The goal for the school will be to decrease the number of students not proficient by 3% per subgroup.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>White:12.7% (84) Black:25.9% (38) Hispanic:30.7% (169)</p>	<p>White:9.7% (64) Black:22.9% (33) Hispanic:27.7% (152)</p>					
		<p>5B.2. Lack of researched-based instructional strategies that are real-world and relevant and engage students in the learning grade level curriculum</p>	<p>5B.2. Require teachers to develop lessons that ensure students' application or extension of prior knowledge. Set established requirements for teachers to work together to improve instructional practice including weekly planning periods for interdisciplinary planning and monthly department meetings for standards-based content</p>	<p>5B.2. Administration, instructional coach and leadership team.</p>	<p>5B.2. Benchmarks, mini assessments and lesson plans</p>	<p>5B.2. State, District, and school based assessments</p>	
		<p>5B.3. Lack of teacher training on ELL teaching and assessment strategies</p>	<p>5B.3. Provide professional development training to teachers on current trends and practices within ELL instruction</p>	<p>5B.3. CCT, admin, instructional coach and guidance counselors</p>	<p>5B.3. Benchmarks, mini assessments and lesson plans</p>	<p>5B.3. State, District, and school based assessments</p>	
<p>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:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>		

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

<p>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p>	<p>5C.1. Lack of researched based instructional strategies that are real-world and relevant and engage students in the learning grade level curriculum</p>	<p>5C.1. Require teachers to develop lessons that ensure students' application or extension of prior knowledge. Set established requirements for teachers to work together to improve instructional practice including weekly planning periods for interdisciplinary planning and monthly department meetings for standards-based content.. Implement Tier 3 remediation for students not acquiring content skills in a timely manner</p>	<p>5C.1. Administration, CT, ELL teacher, LRT, Literacy Coach.</p>	<p>5C.1. Creating appropriate IEP goals, lesson plans, CWT, benchmark and mini assessments</p>	<p>5C.1. State, District, and school based assessments, Achievement of IEP goals</p>		
<p>Reading Goal #5C: <i>The school goal will be to decrease the number of students not proficient by 3% to 47.6% within the ELL subgroup.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>50.6% (109) not proficient</i></p>	<p><i>47.6% (103)</i></p>					
		<p>5C.2. Providing intervention in a timely manner for students falling behind</p>	<p>5C.2. Implementation of school wide policy for students re-doing key assignments to high standards for mastery</p>	<p>5C.2. Administration, content teachers and intervention teachers</p>	<p>5C.2. Attainment of their IEP goals benchmark and mini assessment</p>	<p>5C.2. State, District, and school based assessments</p>	
		<p>5C.3. Lack of students feeling a connection to the school and believe that adults in the school care about them and expect them to learn</p>	<p>5C.3. Create a system in which ESE teachers and regular education teachers teach habits of success in the areas of relationships, organization, time management, study skills, reading and writing skills, setting goals and making plans for reaching them</p>	<p>5C.3. Administration, staffing specialist, ESE teachers, general education teachers and guidance counselors.</p>	<p>5C.3. Attainment of their IEP goals, benchmark and mini assessment</p>	<p>5C.3. State, District, and school based assessments</p>	

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		
<p>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p>	<p>5D.1. Lack of researched based instructional strategies that are real-world and relevant and engage students in the learning grade level curriculum</p>	<p>5D.1. Require teachers to develop lessons that ensure students' application or extension of prior knowledge. Set established requirements for teachers to work together to improve instructional practice including weekly planning periods for interdisciplinary planning and monthly department meetings for standards-based content</p>	<p>5D.1. Administration, instructional coach and leadership team.</p>	<p>5D.1. Benchmarks, mini assessments and lesson plans</p>	<p>5D.1. State, District, and school based assessments</p>		

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

Reading Goal #5D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>The school goal will be to decrease the number of students not proficient by 3% to 59.8% within the SWD subgroup.</i>							
	<i>62.8% (123) not proficient</i>	<i>59.8% (117)</i>					
		5D.2. Providing intervention in a timely manner for students falling behind	5D.2. Implementation of school wide policy for students re-doing key assignments to high standards for mastery	5D.2. Administration, content teachers and intervention teachers	5D.2. Benchmarks, mini assessments and lesson plans	5D.2. State, District, and school based assessments	
		5D.3. Lack of mastery of content/ standards at the same rate as non-SWD	5D.3. Require teachers to develop lessons that ensure students' application or extension of prior knowledge. Set established requirements for teachers to work together to improve instructional practice including weekly planning periods for interdisciplinary planning and monthly department meetings for standards-based content. Implement Tier 3 remediation for students not acquiring content skills in a timely manner	5D.3. Administration Staffing Specialist ESE teachers General Ed. Teachers Guidance Counselors	5D.3. Examination of IEP goals and completion of content standards	5D.3. State, District, and school based assessments	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p>	<p>5E.1. Lack of researched based instructional strategies that are real-world and relevant and engage students in the learning grade level curriculum</p>	<p>5E.1. Require teachers to develop lessons that ensure students' application or extension of prior knowledge. Set established requirements for teachers to work together to improve instructional practice including weekly planning periods for interdisciplinary planning and monthly department meetings for standards-based content</p>	<p>5E.1. Administration, instructional coach and leadership team, and literacy coach.</p>	<p>5E.1. Benchmarks, mini assessments and lesson plans</p>	<p>5E.1. State, District, and school based assessments</p>		
<p>Reading Goal #5E: <i>The school goal is to decrease the number of students not proficient by 3% to 26.1% within the ED subgroup.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>29.1% (223) not proficient 70.9% (545) proficient</p>	<p>26.1% (205)</p>					

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

		5E.2.Lack of mastery of content/standards at the same rate as economically disadvantaged	5E.2.Require teachers to develop lessons that ensure students' application or extension of prior knowledge. Set established requirements for teachers to work together to improve instructional practice including weekly planning periods for interdisciplinary planning and monthly department meetings for standards-based content.. Implement Tier 3 remediation for students not acquiring content skills in a timely manner	5E.2.Administration Staffing Specialist ESE teachers General Ed. Teachers Guidance Counselors	5E.2.Examination of IEP goals and completion of content standards	5E.2.State, District, and school based assessments	
		5E.3.Lack of parental involvement in the academic areas	5E.3.Implement and encourage parent math/literacy night events. Continue implementation and increase parent participation in science events	5E.3.Administration Department Chairs Teachers Guidance	5E.3.Increased numbers at school-wide events	5E.3.Parent/student surveys	

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
	PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring
Common Core	All	SREB	All, school-wide	Quarterly	Lesson plans, teacher coaching, formal/informal observations, school-based staff development.	Administration Literacy Coach LRT

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

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

OCPS Black Belt	All	OCPS	Literacy Coach Media Specialist LRT 2 LA Teachers 2 Math Teachers 1 Administrator	On-going	School school-based staff development.	Literacy Coach Media Specialist LRT 2 LA and 2 Math teachers 1 Administrator
-----------------	-----	------	--	----------	--	--

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
Jamestown Navigator	CRIP – Comprehensive Reading Intervention Program	School Budget	\$9,900.00
6 Minute Solution	SRIP – Supplemental Rdg. Int. Program	School Budget	\$130.00
Increase Read Advantage	SRIP	School Budget	\$1,500.00
Subtotal: \$11,530.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Jamestown Navigator	CRIP – Comprehensive Reading Intervention Program	School Budget	Included above
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
SREB Common Core Training	Training	School Budget	\$2,000.00
Subtotal:\$2,000.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
USA Today Intensive Rdg.	Intensive Rdg. Program	School Budget	\$400.00
Subtotal:\$400.00			
Total: \$13,930.00			

End of Reading Goals

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

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition					
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.	1.1. Lack of differentiated instruction to meet the needs of listening/speaking ELL students.	1.1. Implement differentiation training to allow teachers to meet the needs of ELL learners	1.1. Administration CT Classroom teachers	1.1. Lesson Plans Formal/Informal Observations	1.1. iObservation CELLA	
CELLA Goal #1: <i>The school goal is for 83% (37) of all students to be proficient in listening/speaking.</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					
	<i>80% (36)</i>					
		1.2. Grouping of various levels of beginning to proficient students	1.2. Group ELL students based on needs to differentiate instruction	1.2. Administration CT Classroom teachers	1.2. Lesson Plans Formal/Informal Observations	1.2. iObservation CELLA
		1.3. Lack of technology to implement speaking strategies	1.3. Continue implementation of Rosetta Stone software	1.3. Administration CT Classroom teachers	1.3. Lesson Plans Formal/Informal Observations	1.3. iObservation CELLA Testing reports from Rosetta Stone
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	

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.	2.1. Academic progress for some students in reading is already one or more year below grade level	2.1. Implement Keystone as the Core reading with fidelity Maintain focus and consistency through the use of Keystone Daily ESOL strategies intervention and enrichment	2.1. Administration CT	2.1. Lesson Plans Formal/Informal Observations	2.1. iObservation CELLA	
CELLA Goal #2: <i>The school goal is for 54% of ELL students to be proficient in Reading.</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:					
	51% (23)					
		2.2. Consistent monitoring	2.2. After benchmark testing, new intervention groups will be developed to reteach skills that were not mastered. Direct instruction, ability grouping, and the applying and reinforcing of vocabulary. Use data to drive instruction.	2.2. Administration CT	2.2. Lesson Plans Formal/Informal Observations	2.2. iObservation CELLA
		2.3. Lack of expectations of ELL students.	2.3. Implement teacher training of cultural awareness. Multicultural Fair	2.3. Administration CT	2.3. Lesson Plans Formal/Informal Observations	2.3. iObservation CELLA
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	

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

<p>3. Students scoring proficient in writing.</p>	<p>2.1. Less than 40% of students are proficient in writing when entering middle school.</p>	<p>2.1. Continue to implement <u>Write for the Future/ Writing ESOL strategies.</u> Collect and analyze writing prompt data. Conduct a Family Writing Night. Implement Thinking Maps in all classrooms. RTI Continuing Implementing Bloom's Taxonomy strategies</p>	<p>2.1. Principal, teachers, Reading Coach, CRT, CT</p>	<p>2.1. Monitor Classroom Walkthrough, data chart, teacher lesson plans. Writing samples will be reviewed by RTI team and Writing teacher. Collect sign-in Sheets from Writing Night. Marzano principles.</p>	<p>2.1. CELLA data, FCAT data, Classroom Walkthrough data, School wide scale, monthly writing assessments</p>	
<p><u>CELLA Goal #3:</u> <i>The school goal is for 61% of ELL students in writing to be proficient.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u></p>					
	<p>58% (26)</p>					
		<p>2.2. Schedule and implement a vertical writing PLC</p>	<p>2.2. Ensure seamless continuity of writing throughout grade levels and focus calendars aligned to benchmarks</p>	<p>2.2. Principal, teachers, Reading Coach, CRT</p>	<p>2.2. Lesson plans, Classroom visits, Writing samples</p>	<p>2.2. Classroom visits, monthly writing assessments</p>
		<p>2.3. Ability grouping of 6-7-8 graders in January 2012-13</p>	<p>2.3. Differentiate instruction for each group based on ELL needs</p>	<p>2.3. Principal, teachers, Reading Coach, CRT, CT</p>	<p>2.3. Lesson plans, Classroom visits, Writing samples</p>	<p>2.3. Weekly writing assessments, Lesson plans</p>

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
N/A			
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Total: \$0.00			

End of CELLA Goals

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1A: N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	

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

1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #1B:</u> <i>N/A</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
		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		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #2A:</u> N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#2B:</u>	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #3A:</u> N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
		3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #3B:</u> N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

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

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011						
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5A: N/A							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#5B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A							
	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

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

<u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A							
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #5E:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A							
		5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	
		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.	1A.1. Teacher knowledge of Common Core math Standards and implementation strategies	1A.1. Use of PLC meetings to unwrap the standards and develop and implement appropriate lesson plans for student achievement	1A.1. School Administration Math Teachers CRT OTIS Educator SREB Coach	1A.1. PLC Meeting Notes Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations Common Assessments	1A.1. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports		
<u>Mathematics Goal #1A:</u> <i>By July 2013, 35percent of students will score at a level 3.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

	32% (490)	35%(545)					
		1A.2. Teacher knowledge of technology integration	1A.2. Implementation of appropriate technology into lessons	1A.2. School Administration Math Teachers CRT OTIS Educator	1A.2. PLC Meeting Notes Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations	1A.2. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports	
		1A.3. Students not familiar with how to monitor their progress towards standards mastery	1A.3. Develop data boards and data chats to check mastery of the math standards	1A.3. School Administration Math Teachers CRT SREB Coach	1A.3. PLC Notes Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations	1A.3. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #1B:</u> N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
		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		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.	2A.1. Teacher knowledge of Common Core math Standards and implementation strategies	2A.1. Use of PLC meetings to unwrap the standards and develop and implement appropriate lesson plans for student achievement.	2A.1. School Administration Math Teachers CRT OTIS Educator SREB Coach	2A.1. PLC Meeting Notes Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations Common Assessments	2A.1. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports		
<u>Mathematics Goal #2A:</u> <i>By July 2013, 43 percent of students will score at a level 4 and level 5.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	40% (613)	43%(669)					
		2A.2. Teacher knowledge of technology integration	2A.2. Implementation of appropriate technology into lessons	2A.2. School Administration Math Teachers CRT OTIS Educator	2A.2. PLC Meeting Notes Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations	2A.2. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports	
		2A.3. Students not familiar with how to monitor their progress towards standards mastery	2A.3. Develop data boards and data chats to check mastery of the math standards	2A.3. School Administration Math Teachers CRT SREB Coach	2A.3. PLC Notes Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations	2A.3. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports	

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

2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #2B:</u> <i>N/A</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
		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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3A.1. Teacher knowledge of Common Core math Standards and implementation strategies	3A.1. Use of PLC meetings to unwrap the standards and develop and implement appropriate lesson plans for student achievement	3A.1. School Administration Math Teachers CRT SREB Coach	3A.1. PLC Meeting Notes Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations Common Assessments	3A.1. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports		
<u>Mathematics Goal #3A:</u> <i>By July 2013, 73 percent of students will make a learning gain in math</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	70% (1090)	73% (1137)					
		3A.2. Teacher knowledge of technology integration	3A.2. Implementation of appropriate technology into lessons	3A.2. School Administration Math Teachers CRT OTIS Educator	3A.2. PLC Meeting Notes Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations	3A.2. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports	
		3A.3. Students not familiar with how to monitor their progress towards standards mastery	3A.3. Develop data boards and data chats to check mastery of the math standards	3A.3. School Administration Math Teachers CRT SREB Coach	3A.3. PLC Notes Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations	3A.3. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports	

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

3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #3B:</u> <i>N/A</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
		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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4A.1. Students not receiving additional time and support in mathematics	4A.1. Implementation of an intensive math class	4A.1. Intensive math teacher CRT School Administration SREB Coach	4A.1. Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations Class and district assessments	4A.1. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports		
Mathematics Goal #4: <i>By July 2013, 64 percent of students in the lowest 25 percent will make a learning gain in math</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	61% (950).	63% (982)					
		4A.2. Teacher knowledge of technology integration	4A.2. Implementation of appropriate technology into lessons	4A.2. School Administration Math Teachers CRT OTIS Educator	4A.2. PLC Meeting Notes Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations	4A.2. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports	
		4A.3. Students not familiar with how to monitor their progress towards standards mastery	4A.3. Develop data boards and data chats to check mastery of the math standards	4A.3. School Administration Math Teachers CRT SREB Coach	4A.3. PLC Notes Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations	4A.3. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports	

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

4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #4B:</u> N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance.*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance.*</u>					
		4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	
		4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
--	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	--

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

<p>5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</p>	<p>Baseline data 2010-2011</p>	<p>Asian – 84 Black – 55 Hispanic – 61 White – 78 English Language Learners – 41 Students with Disabilities – 36 Economically Disadvantaged - 57</p>	<p>Asian – 87 Black – 63 Hispanic – 68 White – 82 English Language Learners – 51 Students with Disabilities – 47 Economically Disadvantaged - 64</p>	<p>Asian – 88 Black – 66 Hispanic – 71 White – 84 English Language Learners – 56 Students with Disabilities – 52 Economically Disadvantaged - 68</p>	<p>Asian – 89 Black – 70 Hispanic – 74 White – 85 English Language Learners – 61 Students with Disabilities – 57 Economically Disadvantaged - 71</p>	<p>Asian – 91 Black – 74 Hispanic – 77 White – 87 English Language Learners – 66 Students with Disabilities – 63 Economically Disadvantaged – 75</p>	<p>Asian – 92 Black – 78 Hispanic – 81 White – 89 English Language Learners – 71 Students with Disabilities – 68 Economically Disadvantaged - 79</p>
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u> <i>Asian – 87 Black – 63 Hispanic – 68 White – 82 English Language Learners – 51 Students with Disabilities – 47 Economically Disadvantaged - 64</i></p>							
<p>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:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>		
<p>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p>	<p>5B.1. Engaging students and making the content relevant.</p>	<p>5B.1. Implementation of relevant and engaging lessons. Training and support given to teachers using Marzano Design Questions 2 and 5</p>	<p>5B.1. School Administration CRT OTIS Educator SREB Coach All Teachers</p>	<p>5B.1. Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations Class and district assessments</p>	<p>5B.1. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports</p>		

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

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

<p><u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5B: <i>By July 2013, all subgroups will decrease their percent not proficient by 3%</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>				
	<p>White:20% (132) Black:47% (75) Hispanic:56% (329) Asian:11% (10)</p>	<p>White:17% (113) Black: 44% (70) Hispanic:53% (310) Asian:8% (7)</p>				
		<p>5B.2. Teacher knowledge of technology integration</p>	<p>5B.2. Implementation of appropriate technology into lessons</p>	<p>5B.2. School Administration Math Teachers CRT OTIS Educator</p>	<p>5B.2. PLC Meeting Notes Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations</p>	<p>5B.2. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports</p>
		<p>5B.3. Students not familiar with how to monitor their progress towards standards mastery</p>	<p>5B.3. Develop data boards and data chats to check mastery of the math standards</p>	<p>5B.3. School Administration Math Teachers CRT SREB Coach</p>	<p>5B.3. PLC Notes Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations</p>	<p>5B.3. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports</p>
<p>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:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>	
<p>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p>	<p>5C.1. Engaging students and making the content relevant</p>	<p>5C.1. Implementation of relevant and engaging lessons. Training and support given to teachers using Marzano Design Questions 2 and 5</p>	<p>5C.1. School Administration CRT OTIS Educator SREB Coach All Teachers</p>	<p>5C.1. Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations Class and district assessments</p>	<p>5C.1. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports</p>	

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

<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#5C:</u> <i>By July 2013 ELL students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease by 3%</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	53% (120)	50%(113)					
		5C.2. Teacher knowledge of technology integration	5C.2. Implementation of appropriate technology into lessons	5C.2. School Administration Math Teachers CRT OTIS Educator	5C.2. PLC Meeting Notes Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations	5C.2. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports	
		5C.3. Students not familiar with how to monitor their progress towards standards mastery	5C.3. Develop data boards and data chats to check mastery of the math standards	5C.3. School Administration Math Teachers CRT SREB Coach	5C.3. PLC Notes Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations	5C.3. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5D.1. Engaging students and making the content relevant	5D.1. Implementation of relevant and engaging lessons. Training and support given to teachers using Marzano Design Questions 2 and 5	5D.1. School Administration CRT OTIS Educator SREB Coach All Teachers	5D.1. Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations Class and district assessments	5D.1. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports		

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

Mathematics Goal #5D: <i>By July 2013 SWD students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease by 3%</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	68%(132)	65%(120)					
		5D.2. Teacher knowledge of technology integration	5D.2. Implementation of appropriate technology into lessons	5D.2. School Administration Math Teachers CRT OTIS Educator	5D.2. PLC Meeting Notes Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations	5D.2. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports	
		5D.3. Students not familiar with how to monitor their progress towards standards mastery	5D.3. Develop data boards and data chats to check mastery of the math standards	5D.3. School Administration 5C.3. Math Teachers CRT SREB Coach	5D.3. PLC Meeting Notes Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations	5D.3. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5E.1. Engaging students and making the content relevant	5E.1. Implementation of relevant and engaging lessons. Training and support given to teachers using Marzano Design Questions 2 and 5	5E.1. School Administration CRT OTIS Educator SREB Coach All Teachers	5E.1. Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations Class and district assessments	5E.1. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#5E:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>					
<i>By July 2013 Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease by 3%</i>							
	34%(273)	31% (248)					
		5E.2. Teacher knowledge of technology integration	5E.2. Implementation of appropriate technology into lessons	5E.2. School Administration Math Teachers CRT OTIS Educator	5E.2. Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations Class and district assessments	5E.2. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports	
		5E.3. Students not familiar with how to monitor their progress towards standards mastery	5E.3. Develop data boards and data chats to check mastery of the math standards	5E.3. School Administration Math Teachers CRT SREB Coach	5E.3. Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations Class and district assessments	5E.3. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports	

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Mathematics Goal #2: N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.		
Mathematics Goal #3: N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
		3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	
		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.	1.1. Teacher knowledge of technology integration	1.1. Implementation of appropriate technology into lessons	1.1. 5E.2. School Administration Math Teachers CRT OTIS Educator	1.1. Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations Class and district assessments	1.1. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports		
Algebra 1 Goal #1: By July 2013 35% of students taking Algebra 1 will be proficient.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	32% (71)	35%(77)					

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

		1.2. Students not familiar with how to monitor their progress towards standards mastery	1.2. Develop data boards and data chats to check mastery of the math standards	1.2. School Administration Math Teachers CRT SREB Coach	1.2. Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations Class and district assessments	1.2. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports	
		1.3. Use of rigorous assessment that engages students at the higher level of Web's Depth of Knowledge	1.3. Continued training by SREB and implementation of performance assessments and real world application	1.3. School Administration Math Teachers CRT SREB Coach	1.3. Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations Class and district assessments	1.3. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.	2.1. Teacher knowledge of technology integration	2.1. Implementation of appropriate technology into lessons	2.1. School Administration Math Teachers OTIS Educator	2.1. Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations Class and district assessments	2.1. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports		
Algebra Goal #2: By July 2013 66% of students taking Algebra 1 will score at level 4 or 5.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u> *	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u> *					
	63% (140).	66%(146)					
		2.2. Students not familiar with how to monitor their progress towards standards mastery	2.2. Develop data boards and data chats to check mastery of the math standards	2.2. School Administration Math Teachers CRT SREB Coach	2.2. Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations Class and district assessments	2.2. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports	

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

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

		2.3. Use of rigorous assessment that engages students at the higher level of Webb's Depth of Knowledge	2.3. Continued training by SREB and implementation of performance assessments and real world application	2.3. School Administration Math Teachers CRT SREB Coach	2.3. Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations Class and district assessments	2.3. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports	
Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011						
<u>Algebra 1 Goal #3A:</u> N/A							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3B.1. Teacher knowledge of technology integration	3B.1. Implementation of appropriate technology into lessons	3B.1. School Administration Math Teachers CRT OTIS Educator	3B.1. Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations Class and district assessments	3B.1. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports		

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

Algebra 1 Goal #3B: <i>By July 2013 all students enrolled in Algebra will be proficient.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	White:.03% (4) Black: 0%(0) Hispanic:.05% (1) Asian: 0%(0) American Indian:0% (0)	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		3B.2. Students not familiar with how to monitor their progress towards standards mastery	3B.2. Develop data boards and data chats to check mastery of the math standards	3B.2. School Administration Math Teachers CRT SREB Coach	3B.2. Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations Class and district assessments	3B.2. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports	
		3B.3. Use of rigorous assessment that engages students at the higher level of Webb's Depth of Knowledge	3B.3. Continued training by SREB and implementation of performance assessments and real world application	3B.3. School Administration Math Teachers CRT SREB Coach	3B.3. Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations Class and district assessments	3B.3. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.		

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

Algebra 1 Goal #3C: N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u> *	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u> *					
		3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	
		3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.		
Algebra 1 Goal #3D: N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u> *	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u> *					
		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		
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3E.1. Teacher knowledge of technology integration	3E.1. Implementation of appropriate technology into lessons	3E.1. School Administration Math Teachers CRT OTIS Educator	3E.1. Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Observations Class and district assessments	3E.1. School, district and state assessments Share Point I Observation Reports		
<u>Algebra 1 Goal #3E:</u> By July 2013, all students enrolled in algebra will be proficient.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	2% (1)	0% (0)					
		3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	
		3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

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

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

Geometry EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Geometry Goal #1: The school goal is to maintain proficiency levels in Geometry.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	98% (53)	To maintain					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
<u>Geometry Goal #2:</u> N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
		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		
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2011-2012						
<u>Geometry Goal #3A:</u> N/A							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
<u>Geometry Goal #3B:</u> N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

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

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

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

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional						
---------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

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

Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.							
	PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
	Implementation of CCSS	All	SREB	Teacher leaders	10/1-2, 12/11, 2/7/13, 3/6/12, 5/14/13	SREB coaching	Administration
	Rigor	All	Dept. Chair	All Math teachers	Monthly meetings	PLC Minutes	Administration

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Implementation of mobile devices	Purchase of iPADS and Doceri software	School Budget	\$5,000.00
Subtotal: \$5,000.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

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

Implementation of CCSS	SREB Coaching	School Budget	\$2,000.00
State Conference	Florida State Conference for teachers of Mathematics	School Budget	\$1,650.00
Subtotal: \$3,650.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total: \$8,650.00			

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

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

<p>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.</p>	<p>1A.1. Lack of rigor in science instruction</p>	<p>1A.1. Teachers to develop assignments that will engage and challenge students and better prepare them to actively and analytically engage in inquiry</p>	<p>1A.1. Teachers, SREB Coach, Science Department Chair, CRT, and Administration.</p>	<p>1A.1. District, school, and State level assessments, lesson plans, formal and informal observations.</p>	<p>1A.1. District, school, and State level assessments, Share Point, iObservations.</p>		
<p>Science Goal #1A: <i>The school goal is for 45% of students to attain a level 3 on the FCAT science.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>42% (212)</p>	<p>45% (252)</p>					
		<p>1A.2. Students not familiar with how to monitor their progress towards standards mastery</p>	<p>1A.2. Teachers to develop and maintain data boards and engage students in data chats to chart their progress in the mastery of science benchmarks</p>	<p>1A.2. Teachers, SREB Coach, Science Department Chair, CRT, and Administration.</p>	<p>1A.2. District, school, and State level assessments</p>	<p>1A.2. District, school, and State level assessments</p>	
		<p>1A.3. Lack of focus on math and technology in science</p>	<p>1A.3. Teachers to focus on the math and technology opportunities offered in the new science Fusion program to increase diagnostic abilities, support inquiry, and improve problem-solving skills</p>	<p>1A.3. Teachers, OTIS coordinator, Mentors, SREB Coach, Science Department Chair, CRT, and Administration</p>	<p>1A.3. Review of lessons, review of interactive science notebooks, review of completed STEM activities/projects, and formal and informal observation.</p>	<p>1A.3. Share Point, iObservation</p>	
<p>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.</p>	<p>1B.1.</p>	<p>1B.1.</p>	<p>1B.1.</p>	<p>1B.1.</p>	<p>1B.1.</p>		

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

<u>Science Goal #1B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A							
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.	1A.1. Lack of rigor in science instruction	1A.1. Teachers to develop assignments that will engage and challenge students and better prepare them to actively and analytically engage in inquiry	1A.1. Teachers, SREB Coach, Science Department Chair, CRT, and Administration.	1A.1. District, school, and State level assessments, lesson plans, formal and informal observations.	1A.1. District, school, and State level assessments, Share Point, iObservations.		
<u>Science Goal #2A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>The school goal is for 25% of students to attain a level of 4 or 5 on the FCAT science.</i>							

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

	22% (110)	25% (140)					
		1A.2. Students not familiar with how to monitor their progress towards standards mastery	1A.2. Teachers to develop and maintain data boards and engage students in data chats to chart their progress in the mastery of science benchmarks	1A.2. Teachers, SREB Coach, Science Department Chair, CRT, and Administration.	1A.2. District, school, and State level assessments	2A.2. District, school, and State level assessments	
		1A.3. Lack of focus on math and technology in science	1A.3. Teachers to focus on the math and technology opportunities offered in the new science Fusion program to increase diagnostic abilities, support inquiry, and improve problem-solving skills	1A.3. Teachers, OTIS coordinator, Mentors, SREB Coach, Science Department Chair, CRT, and Administration	1A.3. Review of lessons, review of interactive science notebooks, review of completed STEM activities/projects, and formal and informal observation.	2A.3. Share Point, iObservation	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
<u>Science Goal #2B:</u> N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
		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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

High School Science Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
<u>Science Goal #1:</u> N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
<u>Science Goal #2:</u> N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

Biology 1 EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student						

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

	Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
<u>Biology 1 Goal #1:</u> N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		

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

Biology 1 Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A							
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

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

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Science Education Program	All grades	District personnel, CRT, Department chair	All science teachers	Quarterly district meetings Monthly PLC and department meetings	Formal and informal observations Reviewing student achievement via monthly data reports and classroom data boards.	Administration
Using Data Effectively in Instruction to Improve Outcomes	All grades	District personnel, CRT, Department chair	All science teachers	Quarterly district meetings Monthly PLC and department meetings	Formal and informal observations Reviewing student achievement via monthly data reports and classroom data boards.	Administration
Teaching with Fidelity	All grades	District personnel, CRT, Department chair	All science teachers	Quarterly district meetings Monthly PLC and department meetings	Formal and informal observations Reviewing student achievement via monthly data reports and classroom data boards.	Administration

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
Hands on Life Science inquiry	Di-section Kits	School budgets	\$5,800.00
Subtotal: \$5,800.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

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

			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Implementation of rigor and grading practices	State and local conferences	School funding	\$1,000.00
Subtotal: \$1,000.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Total: \$6,800.00			

End of Science Goals

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

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.	1A.1.Lack of evidence based writing within the content areas	1A.1.Training and implementation of Common Core State Standards	1A.1. Administration LRT Literacy Coach LA teachers SREB trainer	1A.1. Lesson Plans Formal/Informal Observations Student writing samples	1A.1.School-wide writing assessments FCAT		
<u>Writing Goal #1A:</u> <i>The school goal is for 89% of 8th grade students to score at a level 4 or higher.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	86% (441)	89% (457)					
		1A.2. Lack of cohesiveness among LA teachers and implementation of writing strategies	1A.2. Implementation of training on the Florida Writes rubric	1A.2. Administration LRT Literacy Coach LA teachers	1A.2. Lesson Plans Formal/Informal Observations Student writing samples	1A.2. School-wide writing assessments FCAT	

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

		1A.3. Lack of uniform expectations of writing skills across the content areas	1A.3. Set clear writing expectations campus-wide	1A.3. Administration LRT Literacy Coach LA teachers	1A.3. Lesson Plans Formal/Informal Observations Student writing samples	1A.3. School-wide writing assessments FCAT	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Writing Goal #1B: N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
		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

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Writing Expectations	All	LA teachers	All	Nov. 2012	Review of student samples	Dept. Chairs & Administration, LRT
CCSS	All	SREB & OCPS	LA Department	TBD	LA teachers train fellow staff members	Administration, Literacy Coach

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Implement school-wide writing expectations	LA teachers	School Budget	\$100.00
CCSSS Training	OCPS		
Subtotal: \$100.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Subtotal:			
Total: \$100.00			

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

Civics Professional Development

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

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

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

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Civics Goals

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

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

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
U.S. History Goal #2: <i>N/A</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

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

U.S. History Professional Development

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

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

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

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

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

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

End of U.S. History Goals

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance						
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Attendance	1.1. Student engagement in the work provided	1.1. Develop curriculum that inspires students to participate and engage in school	1.1. Administration, teachers, CRT, and Reading Coach.	1.1. Monitoring monthly attendance and tardiness rates.	1.1. EDW attendance data.		
<u>Attendance Goal #1:</u> <i>Our goal is to maintain an average daily attendance of 98%.</i>	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					
	96% (1,613)	98% (1,581)					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>					
	111	75					

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

	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Students with</u> <u>Excessive</u> <u>Tardies (10 or</u> <u>more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Students with</u> <u>Excessive</u> <u>Tardies (10 or</u> <u>more)</u>					
	407	250					
		1.2. Parents are not familiar with OCPS Truancy Policy	1.2. Explain/outline OCPS Truancy Policy at Open House at the beginning of the school year	1.2. Administration, attendance clerk, and teachers.	1.2. Data analysis and frequent monitoring of attendance data.	1.2. Attendance records.	
		1.3. Student illness or family extenuating circumstances	1.3. Child study teams to meet with students and families as the problem is noted	1.3. Guidance, attendance clerk, school social worker, and administration.	1.3. Contract with student and family and continual progress checks	1.3. EDW attendance data.	

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

Attendance Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Engaging students with relevancy.	All grades	Administration	All staff	On-going throughout the school year.	Review areas of concern at team meetings.	Administration
Educating teacher child attendance study teams.	All grades	Administration	All staff	On-going throughout the school year.	Review areas of concern at team meetings.	Administration
Effective documentation of attendance.	All grades	Administration	All staff	On-going throughout the school year.	Review areas of concern at team meetings.	Administration

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
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			

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

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

Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Total: \$0.00			

End of Attendance Goals

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension						
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Suspension	1.1. Increased student enrollment (over facility capacity)	1.1. Modified schedule to minimize student unstructured time. Increased adult presence in common areas	1.1. Administration Teachers Guidance Counselors	1.1. Student and Teacher feedback. Discipline data.	1.1. EDW discipline data		
<u>Suspension Goal #1:</u> <i>The school goal is to reduce both in and out of school suspensions by 10% for the 2012-2013 school-year.</i>	<u>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u>					
	220	198					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>					
	112	100					

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

	<u>2012 Total</u> Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	<u>2013 Expected</u> Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	167	150					
	<u>2012 Total Number</u> of Students <u>Suspended</u> Out-of-School	<u>2013 Expected</u> Number of Students <u>Suspended</u> Out-of-School					
	101	91					
		1.2. Loss of instructional time due to discipline concerns	1.2. Conscious effort to only call students during PAWS or elective classes	1.2. Administration Grade Level Clerks	1.2. Pre and Post Teacher Survey	1.2. Results of survey	
		1.3. Teachers knowing how to handle the most common behavior issues on campus	1.3. Providing resources that show strategies for intervention when needed	1.3. Administration Teachers	1.3. Number of discipline referrals.	1.3. EDW discipline data.	

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
	PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring
Bus Drivers	All	Administration	Bus Drivers	9/7/2012	Monitor Referrals	Administration

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

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

Resources on how to manage the most common behavioral issues in the classroom.	All Grades	Administration, Coaches, and Leann King	All Teachers	Preplanning, Weekly Newsletters, Faculty Meetings	Monitor Referrals	Administration
--	------------	---	--------------	---	-------------------	----------------

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Establish consistent referral process with transportation	Meeting supplies	School Funding	\$150.00
Subtotal: \$150.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal: \$150.00			
Total: \$150.00			

End of Suspension Goals

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Dropout Prevention	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
<u>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</u> N/A	<u>2012 Current Dropout Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*</u>					
	<u>2012 Current Graduation Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*</u>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Parent Involvement	1. Lack of understanding of academic expectations	1.1. Clearly communicate to families in the community the efforts to reach grade level standards	1.1. Administration Leadership Team, SAC	1.1. Parent surveys	1.1. Results of parent surveys.		
<u>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</u> <i>Our school goal is for 83% of parents to be actively involved in school activities.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>					
	5,888	6,000					

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

		1. Schedule meetings and events at times that are conducive to parents and school	1.2. Schedule events at different times	1.2. Administration Leadership Team, SAC, ADDitions coordinator.	1.2. Parent surveys, attendance at events, sign-in sheets.	1.2. ADDitions sign-in data, sign in sheets, head count	
		1.3.Lack of community/business involvement with the school	1.3.Utilize weekly eNewsletter to highlight and encourage local business participation	1.3. Principal, PIE Coordinator	1.3. Increase in PIE numbers	1.3. PIE contracts	

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
	Lack of parent involvement in core curriculums.	All grades	Administration	All teachers	Monthly Faculty meetings, monthly PLC meetings, monthly Department meetings, and monthly leadership meetings	Websites, marquee, Progress Book, Teach-in eNewsletter, school-wide parent surveys, Parent Nights.	Administration and teachers
	District training for ADDitions volunteers.	All	OCPS District personnel	ADDitions Coordinator	Start of school year	Monitor the number of ADDitions volunteers. Keep track of attendance at school-wide events.	ADDitions Coordinator Administration
	District training for PIE	All	OCPS District personnel	PIE Coordinator	Start of school year	Monitor the number of PIE contracts. Keep track of attendance at school-wide events.	PIE Coordinator, Administration

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

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
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Total: \$0.00			

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: <i>Our goal is to increase the math and science outcomes on the FCAT exams.</i>	1.1.Lack of knowledge about the STEM program	1.1. Teachers will be required to attend staff development regarding the STEM program	1.1. Technology teacher OTIS Educator, Math and Science Department Chairs, CRT, and Administration.	1.1. Review of curriculum map and lesson plans, formal and informal observations, student reflections, and review of FCAT outcome data.	1.1. Share Point, iObservation, curriculum map, interactive science notebooks, displayed student work, FCAT results, and PLC notes.
	1.2.Teachers not able to include STEM in their lesson plans	1.2. Math and science teachers will include one STEM lesson in their respective curriculum on a quarterly basis	1.1. Technology teacher OTIS Educator, Math and Science Department Chairs, CRT, and Administration.	1.1. Review of curriculum map and lesson plans, formal and informal observations, student reflections, and review of FCAT outcome data.	1.1. Share Point, iObservation, curriculum map, interactive science notebooks, displayed student work, FCAT results, and PLC notes.
	2. Minimal exposure to technology that can be used in the classroom	1.3. Educate teachers about technology that may be used in their classes	1.1. Technology teacher OTIS Educator, Math and Science Department Chairs, CRT, and Administration.	1.1. Review of curriculum map and lesson plans, formal and informal observations, student reflections, and review of FCAT outcome data.	1.1. Share Point, iObservation, curriculum map, interactive science notebooks, displayed student work, FCAT results, and PLC notes.

STEM Professional Development

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

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

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
STEM Program	All	Technology teacher, OTIS educator	All math and science PLCs	Monthly PLC meetings	Sharing at PLC curriculum/Department meetings, observation of student work, review of student reflection, review of PLC documentation.	Administration, OTIS Coordinator, Math and Science Department chairs.
Developing and assessing a STEM Lesson	All	Technology teacher, OTIS educator	All math and science PLCs	Monthly PLC meetings	Sharing at PLC curriculum/Department meetings, observation of student work, review of student reflection, review of PLC documentation.	Administration, OTIS Coordinator, Math and Science Department chairs.
Project Lead the Way	All	Technology teacher, OTIS educator	All math and science PLCs	Monthly PLC meetings	Sharing at PLC curriculum/Department meetings, observation of student work, review of student reflection, review of PLC documentation.	Administration, OTIS Coordinator, Math and Science Department chairs.

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
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Attendance	Florida State Project Lead the Way training	School budget	\$3,141.50
Subtotal: \$3,141.50			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Total: \$3,141.50			

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
CTE Goal #1: N/A	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						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content / Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

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

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Additional Goal	1. Lack of student readiness for the rigor of HS coursework	1.1. ESE teachers will be trained in the rigor needed to promote readiness	1.1. Administration CCT Staffing Specialist	1.1. Increased enrollment in HS level classes	1.1. SMS Master Schedule		
Additional Goal #1: Increase enrollment and performance of students in Algebra I. Increase the number of ESE and ELL students enrolled in HS courses	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>					

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

	0%	5%					
		2. Proper identification of potential students	1.2. Share current data with faculty and staff	1.2. Administration CCT Staffing Specialist	1.2. Increased enrollment in HS level classes	1.2. SMS Master Schedule	
		3. Lack of teacher expectation for identified student population	1.3. Implement teacher training of cultural awareness- Multicultural Fair	1.3. Administration CCT Staffing Specialist	1.3. Increased enrollment in HS level classes	1.3. SMS Master Schedule	

Additional Goal(s)

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

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

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

	nt						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Additional Goal	1.1. Lack of teacher identifying students for advanced classes	1.1. Implement an indicator flow chart to properly and timely identify students for advanced classes	1.1. Administration LRT	1.1. Increased advanced level classes	1.1. SMS Master Schedule		
<u>Additional Goal #2:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>					
Increase the percentage of advanced classes from 33% - 36%	33%	36%					

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

1. Additional Goal	1.1. Lack of formal process to identify potential honor students	1.1. Implement a formal process that will appropriately identify potential students for the honors classes	1.1. Administration LRT	1.1. Increased enrollment in honors classes	1.1. SMS Master Schedule		
Additional Goal #3:	<u>2012 Current Level</u> *	<u>2013 Expected Level</u> *	1.				
Increase the number of honor students from 8% - 11%.	8%	11%	2.				

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

1. Additional Goal	1.1. Lack of student and teacher familiarity with Common Core standardized testing and NGSSS standardized testing	1.1. Increase teacher training of Common Core through District offered Black Belt training	1.1. Administration LRT	1.1. Decreased enrollment in intensive level classes.	1.1. SMS Master Schedule		
Additional Goal #4: Increase College and Career Readiness Decrease the number of students enrolled in intensive level classes from 28% to 25%.	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>	3.				
	28%	25%	4.				

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

1. Additional Goal	1.1. Students inability to participate in extracurricular requirements of the Fine Arts program	1.1. Increase community awareness of students with financial needs within the Fine Arts program to garner monetary support	1.1. Administration PIE Coordinator	1.1. Increased enrollment in Fine Arts	1.1. SMS Master Schedule		
<u>Additional Goal #5:</u> Increase the participation in the Fine Arts program from 49% to 52%.	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>	5.				
	49%	52%	6.				

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

1. Additional Goal	1.1. Students previously identified as SLD before entering middle school.	1.1. Increased understanding of the RTI process prior to referral to school psychologist for possible ESE staffing.	1.1. Administration LRT	1.1. Increased enrollment in honors classes	1.1. SMS Master Schedule		
Additional Goal #6: Decrease the disproportionate amount of Hispanic students labeled SLD as compared to our White students labeled SLD from 59% to 49%.	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>	7.				
	59%	49%	8.				

Additional Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Expectation for HS courses	All ESE/Ell teachers	Math Dept. Chair	All ESE/Ell teachers	Quarterly meetings	Increased enrollment in HS level classes	SMS Master Schedule

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

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

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

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Total: \$0.00			

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	Total: \$13,930.00
CELLA Budget	Total: \$0.00
Mathematics Budget	Total: \$8,650.00
Science Budget	Total: \$6,800.00
Writing Budget	Total: \$100.00
Civics Budget	Total: N/A
U.S. History Budget	Total: N/A
Attendance Budget	Total: \$0.00
Suspension Budget	Total: \$150.00
Dropout Prevention Budget	Total: N/A
Parent Involvement Budget	Total: \$0.00
STEM Budget	Total: \$3,141.50
CTE Budget	Total: N/A
Additional Goals	Total: \$0.00

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

Grand Total: \$29,630.00

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

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.
Assist in the decision making process in an effort to assist the school in meeting its academic goals. Advocate for overcrowding concerns. Make decisions for the utilization of school recognition funds.

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

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
No SAC funds are given to the school.	\$0.00