

Florida Department of Education

DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| School Name: Sleepy Hill Middle School | District Name: Polk |
| Principal: Dr. Kathryn Blackburn | Superintendent: Dr. Sherrie Nickell |
| SAC Chair: Mr. Cameron Taylor | Date of School Board Approval: |

Student Achievement Data:

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](#)

Highly Effective Administrators

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

List your school's highly effective 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) |
|---------------------|-----------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Principal | Dr. Kathryn Blackburn | BA- Elementary Education MS- Educational Leadership Educational Doctorate | 2 | 12 | Sleepy Hill Middle School 2011-2012: Grade: D Reading mastery- 6 th grade- 42 %, 7 th grade-35%, 8 th grade-35 % Math mastery- 6 th grade- 27%, 7 th grade-29%, 8 th grade-30 % Science mastery-23 % Writing Mastery- 74% |
| Assistant Principal | Laura Bailey | BS- English Education, University of Central Florida; MS-Educational Leadership, University of South Florida Certification- English Education 6-12, ESOL Endorsement, Educational Leadership K-12, State of Florida | 7 | 7 | Sleepy Hill Middle School 2011-2012: Grade: D Reading mastery- 6 th grade- 42 %, 7 th grade-35%, 8 th grade-35 % Math mastery- 6 th grade- 27%, 7 th grade-29%, 8 th grade-30 % Science mastery-23 % Writing Mastery- 74% |
| Assistant Principal | Byron Williams | B.S.-Special Education, University of South Florida; Masters in Educational Leadership K-12, University of South Florida. | 3 | 4 | Sleepy Hill Middle School 2011-2012: Grade: D Reading mastery- 6 th grade- 42 %, 7 th grade-35%, 8 th grade-35 % Math mastery- 6 th grade- 27%, 7 th grade-29%, 8 th grade-30 % Science mastery-23 % Writing Mastery- 74% |

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Highly Effective Instructional Coaches

List your school's highly effective 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 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) |
|-----------------------|--------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| Math | Gene Combs | Middle Grades Math (5-9) Educational Leadership BA Music ED.S Educational Leadership | 9 | 3 | Sleepy Hill Middle School 2011-2012: Grade: D Reading mastery- 6 th grade- 42 %, 7 th grade-35%, 8 th grade-35 % Math mastery- 6 th grade- 27%, 7 th grade-29%, 8 th grade-30 % Science mastery-23 % Writing Mastery- 74% |
| LFS Coach | Jennifer Bookhamer | BA-Psychology MS Ed. Leadership Certification: Middle Grades Integrated Curriculum Reading Endorsement ESOL Educational Leadership | .5 | .5 | Sleepy Hill Middle School 2011-2012: Grade: D Reading mastery- 6 th grade- 42 %, 7 th grade-35%, 8 th grade-35 % Math mastery- 6 th grade- 27%, 7 th grade-29%, 8 th grade-30 % Science mastery-23 % Writing Mastery- 74% |
| Title One Facilitator | Pamela Hoffman | BS- Health Education MS- Health Education Health K-12 General Science Biology | 2 | 2 | Sleepy Hill Middle School 2011-2012: Grade: D Reading mastery- 6 th grade- 42 %, 7 th grade-35%, 8 th grade-35 % Math mastery- 6 th grade- 27%, 7 th grade-29%, 8 th grade-30 % Science mastery-23 % Writing Mastery- 74% |

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

| | | | | | |
|--------------------|----------------|--|-----|-----|---|
| Reading | Alathea Towles | BS PreK- Primary/Elementary Education MS Ed. Leadership | 1.5 | 1.5 | Sleepy Hill Middle School 2011-2012: Grade: D Reading mastery- 6 th grade- 42 %, 7 th grade-35%, 8 th grade-35 % Math mastery- 6 th grade- 27%, 7 th grade-29%, 8 th grade-30 % Science mastery-23 % Writing Mastery- 74% |
| Teacher Trainer | John Campbell | BS-Education MS-Curriculum and Instruction | 4.5 | 0 | Sleepy Hill Middle School 2011-2012: Grade: D Reading mastery- 6 th grade- 42 %, 7 th grade-35%, 8 th grade-35 % Math mastery- 6 th grade- 27%, 7 th grade-29%, 8 th grade-30 % Science mastery-23 % Writing Mastery- 74% |

Highly Effective Teachers

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

| Description of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date | Not Applicable (If not, please explain why) |
|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| 1.Monthly meetings highlighting topics/issues of concern. | AP, Reading AIF | 5-2013 | |
| 3. Partnering new teachers with veteran staff. | AP, Reading AIF | 6-2013 | |
| 4. Observations of experienced teachers for gaining knowledge of various teaching strategies. | Administration, Resource Teachers | 6-2013 | |
| 5.Feedback on evaluations/classroom walk-throughs throughout the year | Administration, Resource Teachers | 6-2013 | |
| under the direction of Learning-Focused Strategies (LFS) Model. | Leadership Team | 6-2013 | |
| 6. Offer safe/orderly work environment | Administration | 6-2013 | |

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

| | | | |
|--|------------------------------|--------|--|
| 7. Additional training, strategies and support in classroom management for new teachers and/or teachers in need of help. | Resource and Leadership Team | 6-2013 | |
|--|------------------------------|--------|--|

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

List all instructional staff and paraprofessionals who are teaching out-of-field and/or who are NOT highly effective.

| Name | Certification | Teaching Assignment | Professional Development/Support to Become Highly Effective |
|---------------------|--|---------------------|---|
| Benedict, Dixie | English (6-12) Reading Endorsement | Reading | Out of Field ESOL District Training/Classes |
| Blackman, Cornelius | Elementary Education K-6 English (6-12) ESOL Middle Grades Integrated Curriculum Exceptional Student Education | ESE-VE | Out of Field Reading District Training/Classes |

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

| | | | |
|-----------------|--|----------------|--|
| Giunta, Gina | Elementary Education K-6 Physical Education K-12 Reading Endorsement | Reading | Out of Field ESOL District Training/Classes |
| Horvatin, David | Elementary Education K-6 Middle Grades Integrated Curriculum Physical Education K-12 | Math | Out of Field ESOL District Training/Classes |
| Lane, Deborah | Elementary Education K-6 Emotionally Handicapped (K-12) Middle Grades Integrated Curriculum Social Sciences 6-12 Exceptional Student Education | ESE-VE | Out of Field ESOL and Reading District Training/Classes |
| Piper, Jan | Elementary Education K-6 English (6-12) Middle Grades English 5-9 Middle Grades Social Science 5-9 | Social Studies | Out of Field ESOL District Training/Classes |
| Winslow, Arla | Elementary Education K-6 Middle Grades Integrated Curriculum | Language Arts | Out of Field ESOL District Training/Classes |

Staff Demographics

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

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

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

| 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 | % Highly Effective Teachers | % Reading Endorsed Teachers | % National Board Certified Teachers | % ESOL Endorsed Teachers |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 67 | 7%-(5) | 31%-(21) | 27%-(18) | 34%-(27) | 34%-(23) | 100% | 13%-(9) | 3%-(2) | 33%-(22) |

Teacher Mentoring Program

Please describe the school’s teacher mentoring program 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 |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|
|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|

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

| | | | |
|---|---------------------|---|---|
| <p>Alathea Towles, Jennifer Bookhamer, Gene Combs, Pamela Hoffman, Byron Williams, Laura Bailey</p> | <p>New Teachers</p> | <p>AP's and Reading AIF oversee beginning teachers.</p> <p>Leadership Team oversees instructional strategies being used in classrooms and classroom management concerns and strategies.</p> <p>AP's and Reading AIF hold monthly meetings with new and struggling teachers to address concerns and topics pertinent to the time.</p> <p>AP's and Reading AIF also oversee the beginning teacher process to ensure all paperwork is completed correctly and on time.</p> | <p>Orientation for new teachers highlighting expectations, including District, and school systems. Monthly meetings highlighting topics/issues of concern.</p> <p>Observations of experienced teachers for gaining knowledge of various teaching strategies.</p> <p>Feedback on evaluation data and observations/classroom walk-throughs throughout the year under the direction of Learning-Focused Strategies (LFS) Model.</p> <p>Additional training, strategies and support in classroom management for new teachers and/or teachers in need of help.</p> |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

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 funds school-wide services to Sleepy Hill Middle School. The Title I funds provide supplemental instructional resources and interventions for students with academic achievement needs. Title I, Part A, support provides after school/summer instructional programs, supplemental instructional materials, resources teachers, technology for students, professional development for the staff, and resources for the parents |
| Title I, Part C- Migrant N/A |
| Title I, Part D Provides Transition Facilitators to assist students with transition from Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) facilities back into their zoned schools. The Transition Facilitators communicate with the Guidance Counselors at schools to facilitate the transfer of records and appropriate placement |
| Title II Professional development resources are available to Title I schools through Title II funds. In addition, School Technology Services provide technical support, technology training, and licenses for software programs and web-based access via Title II – D funds. Funds available to Sleepy Hill Middle School are used to purchase technology based professional development software |
| Title III Professional development resources are available to Title I schools through Title II funds. In addition, School Technology Services provide technical support, technology training, and licenses for software programs and web-based access via Title II – D funds. Funds available to Sleepy Hill Middle School are used to purchase technology based professional development software |
| Title X- Homeless The Hearth program, funded through Title X, provides support for identified homeless students. Title I provides support for this program, and many activities implemented by the Hearth program are carried out in coordination with the Migrant Education Program (MEP) funded through Title I, Part C |
| Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) Funding for SAI will be used in conjunction with Title 1 funds to provide after school tutoring for students who are in need of remediation in reading, math, science and writing |
| Violence Prevention Programs Title IV provides violence and drug prevention programs in schools in order to promote a safe school environment. Examples of violence prevention programs include anti-bullying, gang awareness, gun awareness, etc. |
| Nutrition Programs N/A |
| Housing Programs N/A |
| Head Start N/A |

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

| |
|--|
| Adult Education The school houses a GED program offered to adults in the area as well as parents. |
| Career and Technical Education All eighth-grade students are assessed by the E-PEP to help determine their career interests and form career paths for high school. The eighth-grade guidance counselor meets with these students as they learn about their career interests. Career Planning is also provided to eighth-grade students within their US History classes. Seventh-grade students are provided career planning through Choices and their guidance counselor. As an elective choice 7 and 8 th grade student may select computer, ITV, business systems, and technology classes. |
| Job Training N/A |
| Other |

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

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

Identify the school-based RtI Leadership Team. **Principal, Dr. Blackburn, Assistant Principal, Byron Williams, Guidance Counselor, Sandy Mathieu and Deans, Rubel McDaniel and Bob Greco** ,Provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI, conducts assessment of RtI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities.

Select General Education Teachers, Leadership Team Members, April Dolyak and Lindsey RauckProvide information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.

Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers, Doleciea Hearns Participate in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching.

Instructional Coach(es) ,Jennifer Bookhamer:

Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered “at risk;” assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

Reading Instructional Specialist, Alatheia Towles: Provides guidance on K-12 reading plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans.

School Psychologist: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates data-based decision making activities.

Technology Specialist: Develops or brokers technology necessary to manage and display data; provides professional development and technical support to teachers and staff regarding data management and display.

Speech Language Pathologist: Educates the team in the role language plays in curriculum, assessment, and instruction, as a basis for appropriate program design; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systemic patterns of student need with respect to language skills

Student Services Personnel: Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. In addition to providing interventions, school social workers continue to link child-serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child’s academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Describe how the school-based RtI Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate RtI efforts? The Leadership Team will focus meetings around one question: How do we develop and maintain a problem-solving system to bring out the best in our schools, our teachers, and in our students?

The team meets once a week to engage in the following activities:

Review universal screening data and link to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The team will also facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.

Meeting Dates:

August 23, 2012

September 25, 2012

October 18, 2012

November 15, 2012

December 12, 2012

January 24, 2013

February 26, 2013

March 25, 2013

April 30, 2013

May 15, 2013

Describe the role of the school-based RtI Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? The RtI Leadership Team met with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and principal to help develop the SIP. The team provided data on: Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets; academic and social/emotional areas that needed to be addressed; helped set clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, Relationship); facilitated the development of a systemic approach to teaching (Gradual Release, Essential Questions, Activating Strategies, Teaching Strategies, Extending, Refining, and Summarizing); and aligned processes and procedures.

RtI Implementation

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior. Baseline data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Assessment and Information Management System (AIMS web), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) Progress Monitoring: PMRN, AIMS web, Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM), FCAT Simulation Midyear: Discovery Learning for Instruction in Reading , Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR). End of year: Discovery Learning, AIMS web, FCAT Frequency of Data Days: twice a month for data analysis

Describe the plan to train staff on RtI.

Professional development will be provided during teachers' common planning time and small sessions will occur throughout the year. Two PD sessions entitled: "RtI: Problem Solving Model: Building Consensus Implementing and Sustaining Problem-Solving/RtI" and "RtI: Challenges to Implementation Data-based Decision-making, and Supporting and Evaluating Interventions" will take place in mid-August and in October. The RtI team will also evaluate additional staff PD needs during the weekly RtI Leadership Team meetings. In addition, the Leadership team will be required to obtain the certification obtained by taking the on-line PD course offered by USF.

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

The team will have monthly meetings with APA as facilitator. The team will discuss and develop plans for students identified as being At-Risk.

Describe the plan to train staff on RtI. Professional development will be provided during teachers' planning time and small sessions will occur throughout the year. Two PD sessions entitled: "RtI: Problem Solving Model: Building Consensus Implementing and Sustaining Problem-Solving/RtI" and "RtI: Challenges to Implementation Data-based Decision-making, and Supporting and Evaluating Interventions" will take place in mid-September and in October. The RtI team will also evaluate additional staff PD needs during the weekly RtI Leadership Team meetings. In addition, the Leadership team will be required to obtain the certification obtained by taking the on-line PD course offered by USF.

Describe plan to support MTSS.

The School-Based Leadership Team will meet regularly to monitor and evaluate intervention strategies as well as make any adjustments in implementation as needed.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The school literacy team is composed of the Principal, AP's, Reading AIF, Learning Focused Coach, Title I Coordinator, and Media Specialist.

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

Scheduled weekly meeting facilitated by the principal. Each member is responsible for contributing to the development of the professional development, pacing guide, and curriculum support materials, model effective teaching strategies, and monitor implemented practices. The team is responsible for problem solving and brainstorming to support struggling students. They are also responsible for developing a plan to integrate technology to support and motivate struggling readers.

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? The team will develop a plan to implement the infusion of technology for our struggling readers to support motivation to read chapter books. They will also plan and develop a plan to successfully implement an AR program.

The high yield strategies will consist of summarizing, extended thinking, vocabulary, literature circles and novel-based instruction.

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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.

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

For schools with Grades 6-12, describe the plan to ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility of every teacher.

All teachers will participate in Florida Continuous Improvement Model which includes teaching reading and administering an assessment tool for each for the clusters in the reading content areas using Odyssey and/or all ancillary materials that provide support in reading clusters. In addition, all teachers will have FCAT Stems task cards that they will use to set up all reading assignments in all classrooms. The AIF will email the monthly reading focus and have PLCs to ensure teachers know how to effectively embed reading strategies in their instruction.

****High Schools Only***

Note: Required for High School-Sec. 1003.413(g)(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?

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?

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](#).

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|----------------|--|
| <p>1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.</p> | 1a.1L limited background knowledge to make connections to text. | 1.1. LFS follow-up, on-going PD for LFS to include building background knowledge and summarization. Preloading to include building background knowledge. 1.2. Data talks | 1a.1. Administration and Resource Teachers | 1a.1. Multiple measures, to include Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review of Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. District and DOE observations and feedback Review of common benchmark assessments | 1a.1. Discovery Education assessments (short term- 3 administrations per year); FCAT (long term- annual). common benchmark assessments District walkthrough protocol DOE feedback | | |
| | | 1a.1. Data talks 1a.1 LEARN 360 1a.1 AR 1a.1 CISM | Principal, APC, Guidance Counselors | | | | |
| | | | Administration, Resource Team | | | data reports | |
| | | | | | | Retention Rate | |
| | | | | Review of computer generated assessments | | | |
| | | | 1a.2. E2020 and Virtual School | | | | |
| | | | 1a.3. Additional Teacher Support | | end of the year renewal | | |
| | | 1a.2. Over-aged Students | 1.2. E2020 and Virtual School | | | | |
| | | 1a.3. Teacher Turnover | 1.3. Additional Teacher Support | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | |
| <p>Reading Goal #1a: In grades 6-8, 35% (288) of students will achieve a level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test.</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>25%(206) of students were level 3.</p> | <p>At least 42% will achieve level 3 on FCAT.</p> | <p>At least 35% (288) Will achieve level 3 on FCAT.</p> | | | | |
| | | <p>1a.4 Teachers limited in content knowledge</p> | <p>1a.4 Ensure grade level text is used and evaluated for text complexity.</p> | <p>Administration, Reading AIF, LFS Coach</p> | <p>Classroom walkthroughs Text complexity review and feedback</p> | <p>District walkthrough protocol, text complexity rubric</p> | |
| | | | <p>1a.4 Ongoing implementation of CISM.</p> | | | | |
| <p>1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.</p> | <p>1b.1. Limited awareness of students with disabilities' needs.</p> | <p>1b.1. Provide teacher/administrators with booklet title ESE Accommodations and Modifications for use in PLC discussions. Attend professional training opportunities.</p> | <p>1b.1. Administration and ESE Facilitator</p> | <p>1b.1. Review of PLC discussions and follow ups Classroom walkthroughs and feedback given on use of ESE strategies Review implementation of strategies learned from professional training opportunities</p> | <p>1b.1. PLC notes District walkthrough protocol Training follow up activities</p> | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| <p>Reading Goal #1b: <i>In grades 6-8, 41% (5) of students will score levels 4, 5 and 6 on the Alternate Assessment Reading Test.</i></p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p><i>36% (4) of students scored at levels 4, 5 and 6 in Reading.</i></p> | <p><i>41% (5) of students will score levels 4, 5 and 6 in Reading.</i></p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>1b.2. Students not motivated to learn.</p> | <p>1b.2. Beginning of the year, icebreakers and team building activities to build teacher rapport with students. Multi-tiered System Supports LFS follow-up and PD.</p> | <p>1b.2. Administration, LFS Coach, Reading AIF, ESE Facilitator, SBLT</p> | <p>1b.2. Classroom walkthroughs Review of SBLT meetings</p> | <p>1b.2. District walkthrough protocol</p> | |
| | | <p>1b.3.</p> | <p>1b.3.</p> | <p>1b.3.</p> | <p>1b.3.</p> | <p>1b.3.</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 group:</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>2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in reading.</p> | <p>2a.1. Student Motivation to learn.</p> | <p>2a.2 Beginning of the year, icebreakers and team building activities to build teacher rapport with students. Multi-tiered System Supports LFS follow-up and PD</p> | <p>2a.1. Administration, LFS Coach, Reading AIF, SBLT</p> | <p>2a.1. Classroom walkthroughs</p> | <p>2a.1. District walkthrough protocol</p> | | |

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

| Reading Goal #2a: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| In grades 6-8, 22% or (181) students will achieve above proficiency on the 2013 FCAT reading test. No regressions. | | | | | | | |
| | 13 % (107) achieved levels 4 and 5. | 22 % (181) will achieve levels 3 or 4 on FCAT Reading. | | | | | |
| | | 2a.2. No engagement in reading long, complex text. | 2a.2. Implement an AR literacy reward program to promote reading stamina. Implement and deliver research based curriculum to engage students in rigorous assignments. 2a.2 Ongoing Implementation of CISM and Springboard curriculum. Preloading to prepare for Common Core. | 2a.2. Literacy Team | 2a.2. Review AR data Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT District and DOE observations and feedback Classroom walkthroughs Review common benchmark assessments | 2a.2. AR data Discovery Assessment data District walkthrough protocol DOE feedback common benchmark assessments | |
| | | 2a.3 Not providing rigorous tasks | 2a.3 PD, Curriculum Supports, LFS 2a.3 CISM 2a.3 PLC's to design Standard Benchmark Assessments. 2a.3 ERP. . Ongoing teacher evaluations, and differentiated Professional Development according to ongoing data. Preloading to prepare for Common Core. | 2a.3 Administration, Resource Teachers | 2a.3 Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE walkthroughs and feedback Review Common Benchmark Assessments Review Discovery Assessments Review PLC notes Review PD follow up | 2a.3 District walkthrough protocol DOE feedback Common benchmark data Discovery Assessment data PLC notes PD follow up | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| <p>2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.</p> | <p>2b.1. Low expectation for student success.</p> | <p>2b.1. Teacher rapport building with students. School wide high expectations and learning environment.</p> | <p>2b.1. Administration, Resource teachers, ESE Facilitator</p> | <p>2b.1. Classroom walkthroughs</p> | <p>2b.1. District walkthrough protocol</p> | | |
| <p>Reading Goal #2b: <i>In grades 6-8, 52% (6) of students will score a level 7 or above on the Alternate Assessment Reading Test.</i></p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p><i>45% (5) of students scored a level 7 or above.</i></p> | <p><i>52% (6) of students will score a level 7 or above on the Alternate Assessment Reading Test.</i></p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>2b.2. Students not challenged/engaged in activities that meet ability levels.</p> | <p>2b2. Use data to determine students' academic levels. Lesson planning that incorporates challenging course work to meet standards/benchmarks. Preloading to prepare for Common Core.</p> | <p>2b.2. Administration, resource teachers, ESE Facilitator</p> | <p>2b.2. Classroom walkthroughs Review lesson plans Review progress monitoring assessments</p> | <p>2b.2. District walkthrough protocol Lesson plans Progress monitoring assessments data</p> | |
| | | <p>2b.3</p> | <p>2b.3</p> | <p>2b.3</p> | <p>2b.3</p> | <p>2b.3</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 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. Teachers not identifying correct interventions | 3a.1. LFS follow-up with additional intervention programs. Ongoing teacher evaluations, and differentiated Professional Development according to ongoing data. 3a.1 LEARN 360 | 3a.1. Administration and resource teachers | 3a.1. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Review PD follow up | 3a.1. Discovery Assessment Data Common Assessment Data PD follow up | | |
| Reading Goal #3a: In grades 6-8, 100% or 824 students will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | <i>55% (453) of students made learning gains.</i> | <i>100% or 824 students will make learning gains on FCAT Reading.</i> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| | | 3a.2. Students not properly grouped for differentiated instruction. | 3a.2. Provide PD modeling for teachers on differentiated instruction using current ongoing data. | 3a.2.Principal, APC, Reading AIF | 3a.2. Review PD follow up Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations Review common benchmark assessments Review Discovery Assessments | 3a.2.PD follow up District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data | |
| | | 3a.3. Ineffective Instruction | 3a.3. Professional Development on flexible grouping and collegial planning. . Ongoing teacher evaluations, and differentiated Professional Development according to ongoing data. Preloading to prepare for Common Core. | 3a.3. Administration and resource teachers | 3a.3. Review PD follow up Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations Review common benchmark assessments Review Discovery Assessments | 3a.3. PD follow up District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data | |
| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. | 3b.1. Student motivation | 3b.1. School wide high expectations and engaging learning environment. Beginning of the year, icebreakers and team building activities to build teacher rapport with students. Multi-tiered System Supports LFS follow-up and PD | 3b.1. Administration, resource teachers and SBLT | 3b.1. Classroom walkthroughs Review SBLT meetings Review PD follow up | 3b.1. District walkthrough protocol SBLT meeting notes PD follow up | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|---|--|
| <p>Reading Goal #3b: <i>In grades 6-8, 100% (6) students will make learning gains on the Alternate Assessment Reading Test.</i></p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p><i>83% (5) of students made learning gains.</i></p> | <p><i>100% (6) students will make learning gains on the Alternate Assessment Reading Test.</i></p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>3b.2. Student engagement.</p> | <p>3b.2. Lesson planning that incorporates collaborative learning and hands-on activities. Preloading to prepare for Common Core.</p> | <p>3b.2. Administration, Reading AIF, ESE Facilitator</p> | <p>3b.2. Review lesson plans Classroom walkthroughs</p> | <p>3b.2. Lesson plans District walkthrough protocol</p> | |
| | | <p>3b.3.</p> | <p>3b.3.</p> | <p>3b.3.</p> | <p>3b.3.</p> | <p>3b.3.</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 group:</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>4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</p> | <p>4a.1. Identifying correct interventions</p> | <p>4a.1. LFS follow up, with additional interventions programs. Ongoing teacher evaluations, and differentiated Professional Development according to ongoing data. 3a.1 LEARN 360</p> | <p>4a.1. Administration and resource teachers</p> | <p>4a.1. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Review PD follow up</p> | <p>4a.1. Discovery Assessment Data Common Assessment Data PD follow up</p> | | |
| <p>Reading Goal #4a: In grades 6-8, 100% (206) students in the lowest quartile will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test.</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p><i>56% (115) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains.</i></p> | <p><i>100% (206) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on FCAT Reading.</i></p> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| | | 4a.2. Students having difficulty making connections with content. | 4a.2. Professional Development on flexible grouping and collegial planning. 4a.2 CISM 4a.2 LFS Focus on background knowledge and summarization Preloading to prepare for Common Core. | 4a.2. Administration and resource teachers | 4a.2. Review PD follow up Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations Review common benchmark assessments Review Discovery Assessments | 4a.2. PD follow up District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data | |
| | | 4a.3 Ineffective Instruction | 4a.3. Marzano's six-step vocabulary development. 4a.3 PLC's . Professional Development on flexible grouping and collegial planning. . Ongoing teacher evaluations, and differentiated Professional Development according to ongoing data. Preloading to prepare for Common Core. | 4a.3. Administration and resource teachers | 4a.3. Review PD follow up Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations Review common benchmark assessments Review Discovery Assessments Review PLC notes | 4a.3. PD follow up District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data PLC notes | |
| 4b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. | 4b.1. Student engagement. | 4b.1. Lesson planning that incorporates collaborative learning and hands-on activities. Preloading to prepare for Common Core. | 4b.1. Administration, Reading AIF, ESE Facilitator | 4b.1. Review lesson plans Classroom walkthroughs | 4b.1. Lesson plans District walkthrough protocol | | |
| Reading Goal #4b: | 2012 Current | 2013 Expected | | | | | |
| <i>In grades 6-8, 100%(2) of students in lowest 25% will make learning gains on the Alternate Assessment Reading Test.</i> | <u>Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| | <i>50% (1) of students in lowest 25% made learning gains.</i> | <i>100%(2) of students in lowest 25% will make learning gains on the Alternate Assessment Reading Test.</i> | | | | | |
| | | 4b.2. Student motivation | 4b.2. School wide high expectations and engaging learning environment. Beginning of the year, icebreakers and team building activities to build teacher rapport with students. Multi-tiered System Supports LFS follow-up and PD | 4b.2. Administration, resource teachers and SBLT | 4b.2. Classroom walkthroughs Review SBLT meeting notes Review PD follow up | 4b.2. District walkthrough protocol SBLT meeting notes PD follow up | |
| | | 4b.3 | 4b.3. | 4b.3. | 4b.3. | 4b.3. | |
| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | |
| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Baseline data 2010-2011 <i>39% of students in grades 6-8 were proficient in reading as measured by the FCAT Reading Test.</i> | 44% of students in grades 6-8 were proficient in reading as measured by the FCAT Reading Test. | 49% of students in grades 6-8 will be proficient in reading as measured by the FCAT Reading Test. | 54% of students in grades 6-8 will be proficient in reading as measured by the FCAT Reading Test. | 59% of students in grades 6-8 will be proficient in reading as measured by the FCAT Reading Test. | 64% of students in grades 6-8 will be proficient in reading as measured by the FCAT Reading Test. | 70% of students in grades 6-8 will be proficient in reading as measured by the FCAT Reading Test. |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| <p><u>Reading Goal #5A:</u> 49% of students in grades 6-8 will be proficient in reading as measured by the FCAT Reading Test.</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>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p> | <p>5B.1. White: 61% Black: 44% Hispanic: 57% Asian: 0% American Indian: 0%</p> <p>Classroom instruction lacks rigor.</p> | <p>5B.1. LFS follow-up, PD, Support CISM LEARN 360 PLC's review course assignments and test development. . Multi-tiered System Supports LFS follow-up and PD. Preload for Common Core. Ongoing teacher evaluations, and differentiated Professional Development according to ongoing data.</p> | <p>5B.1. Administration, resource teachers, SBLT</p> | <p>5B.1. Review PD follow up Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations Review PLC notes Review SBLT meeting notes Review Discovery Assessments Review common benchmark assessments</p> | <p>5B.1. PD follow up District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback PLC notes SBLT meeting notes Discovery Assessment data Common benchmark data</p> | | |

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

| <u>Reading Goal</u> <u>#5B:</u> | <u>2012 Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| 61% of whites will score proficiency on FCAT Reading. 44% of blacks will score proficiency on FCAT Reading. 57% of Hispanics will score proficiency on FCAT Reading. | | | | | | | |
| | White: 56% Black:39% Hispanic: 52% Asian: 0% American Indian: 0% Scored proficient on FCAT Reading for grades 6-8. | White: 61% Black: 44% Hispanic:57% Asian: 0% American Indian: 0% Will score proficient of FCAT Reading for grades 6-8. | | | | | |
| | | 5B.2. Cultural stereotyping of students. | 5B.2. Assign mentors to meet with students weekly. | 5B.2. Dean, Title 1 Facilitator | 5B.2. Review of mentor attendance and observations | 5B.2. Record of mentors' attendance | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| | | 5B.3. Lack of engagement in instruction | 5B.3. Integrate effective instructional strategies to increase student engagement. CISM. Multi-tiered System Supports LFS follow-up and PD. Preload for Common Core. Ongoing teacher evaluations, and differentiated Professional Development according to ongoing data. | 5B.3. Administration, resource teachers, SBLT | 5B.3. Review PD follow up Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations Review PLC notes Review SBLT meeting notes Review Discovery Assessments Review common benchmark assessments | 5B.3. PD follow up District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback PLC notes SBLT meeting notes Discovery Assessment data Common benchmark data | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. | 5C.1. Students limited expressive and receptive language. | 5C.1. LFS follow-up and additional PD, test strategy materials 5C.1 Provide information on effective ESOL strategies in PLC's and PD. | 5C.1. Administration and resource teachers | 5C.1. Multiple measures, to include Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Review PD follow up Review PLC notes Classroom walkthroughs Review lesson plans | 5C.1. Discovery Assessment data Common benchmark data PD follow up PLC notes District walkthrough protocol Lesson plans | | |

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

| <u>Reading Goal</u> <u>#5C:</u> | <u>2012 Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 45% of ELL students will score proficiency on FCAT Reading. | | | | | | | |
| | 40% of ELL students scored proficiency on FCAT Reading. | 45% of ELL students will score proficiency on FCAT Reading. | | | | | |
| | | 5C.2. Negative Peer Pressure | 5C.2. Assign mentors to meet with students weekly | 5C.2. Dean and Title 1 Facilitator | 5C.2. Review of mentor attendance and observations | 5C.2. Attendance of mentors' records | |
| | | 5C.3. Lack of engagement in instruction. | 5C.3. Integrate effective instruction. Strategies to increase student engagement. CISM. Multi-tiered System Supports LFS follow-up and PD. Preload for Common Core. Ongoing teacher evaluations, and differentiated Professional Development according to ongoing data. | 5C.3. Administration, resource teachers, SBLT | 5C.3. Review PD follow up Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations Review SBLT meeting notes Review Discovery Assessments Review common benchmark assessments | 5C.3. PD follow up District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback SBLT meeting notes Discovery Assessment data Common benchmark data | |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. | 5D.1. Comprehension Levels- Below grade level skills. | 5D.1.. LFS follow-up and intervention plan with one-on-one sessions 5E.1 Use data to form small flexible groups in which instruction may be scaffold. Multi-tiered System Supports LFS follow-up and PD. Preload for Common Core. Ongoing teacher evaluations, and differentiated Professional Development according to ongoing data. | 5D.1. Administration, resource teachers, ESE Facilitator, SBLT | 5D.1. Review PD follow up Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations Review SBLT meeting notes Review Discovery Assessments Review common benchmark assessments | 5D.1. PD follow up District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback SBLT meeting notes Discovery Assessment data Common benchmark data | | |
| <u>Reading Goal #5D:</u> 38% of students with disabilities will score proficiency on FCAT Reading. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| | 33% of students with disabilities scored proficiency on FCAT Reading. | 38% of students with disabilities will score proficiency on FCAT Reading. | | | | | |
| | | 5D.2. Administration and teachers limited awareness of SWD needs. | 5D.2. Provide PD on documenting and implementing accommodations for administration, guidance and teachers. | 5D.2.ESE Facilitator | 5D.2. Review PD follow up Review lesson plans Classroom walkthroughs | 5D.2. PD follow up Lesson plans District walkthrough protocol | |
| | | 5D.3. Students are not provided modifications and accommodations | 5D.3. Provide PD on strategic instructional model for teachers with students with Disabilities | 5D.3. Administration, ESE Facilitator | 5D.3. Review PD follow up Classroom walkthroughs Review lesson plans | 5D.3. PD follow up District walkthrough protocol Lesson plans | |
| 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. Comprehension Levels- Below grade level skills.</p> | <p>5E.1 LFS follow-up and intervention plan with one-on-one sessions 5E.1 Use data to form small flexible groups in which instruction may be scaffolded. Multi-tiered System Supports LFS follow-up and PD. Preload for Common Core. Ongoing teacher evaluations, and differentiated Professional Development according to ongoing data.</p> | <p>5E.1. Administration, resource teachers, SBLT</p> | <p>5E.1. Review PD follow up Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations Review SBLT meeting notes Review Discovery Assessments Review common benchmark assessments</p> | <p>5E.1. PD follow up District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback SBLT meeting notes Discovery Assessment data Common benchmark data</p> | | |
| <p><u>Reading Goal #5E:</u> 51% of economically disadvantaged students will score proficiency on FCAT Reading.</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>46% of economically disadvantaged students scored proficiency on FCAT Reading.</p> | <p>51% of economically disadvantaged students will score proficiency on FCAT Reading.</p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>5E.2. Students have limited access to Role Models</p> | <p>5E.2 Assign mentors to meet with students weekly. 5E.2 Establish class routine and a climate of high expectations for students</p> | <p>5E.2. Administration, Dean, Title 1 Facilitator</p> | <p>5E.2. Review of mentor attendance Classroom walkthroughs/ observations</p> | <p>5E.2. Mentors' attendance records District walkthrough protocol</p> | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | 5E.3 Students have limited access to reading materials and technology at home. | 5E.3 Open Media Center and Computer labs to students and family. AR | 5E.3 Administration, Media Specialist, Reading AIF | 5E.3 Review parent attendance data Review AR data | 5E.3 Parents' attendance data AR data | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|

Reading 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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring |
| Developing HOT Questions | All Grade Levels | Jennifer Bookhamer | Elective, and New Teachers School Wide | 1 st Nine Weeks | Weekly Walk-through | Leadership Team |
| Data Chats | All Grade Levels | Jen Bookhamer | School-wide | 1 st nine weeks | Daily Walk-throughs | Jen Bookhamer |

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|
| Collaborative Structures and Summarization | All Grade Levels | Model Teachers | School-wide | 1 st nine weeks | Daily and Weekly Walk-throughs | Leadership Team |
| Marzano's Vocabulary Development | All Grade Levels | Dr. Blackburn, Alatheia Towles | School-wide | 1 st nine weeks | Daily and Weekly Walk-throughs | Leadership Team |

Reading 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 |
| Scope Magazines | Reading magazines , high interest | Title 1 | 500.00 |
| Junior Scholastic Magazines | Reading magazines, high interest | Title 1 | 500.00 |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Reading electronic book | Technology, Title 1 and Title 11 | Title 1 and Title 2 | 7200.00 |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Teacher use of electronic book | In house | | 0 |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |

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

| | | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| Subtotal: | | | |
| 8200.00 Total: | | | |

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

| 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. Limited background knowledge to make connections to text. | 1.1. LFS follow-up, on-going PD for LFS to include building background knowledge and summarization. Data talks LEARN 360 AR CISM Share/Review ESOL Strategies in PLC's Preloading to prepare for Common Core. | 1.1. Administration and Resource Teachers | 1.1. Multiple measures, to include Subjective teacher ratings, District and DOE observations and feedback Review common benchmark assessments Review PLC notes | 1.1. Common benchmark assessments District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback PD follow up PLC notes | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| <p>CELLA Goal #1: 56% (56) of students will score proficient in Listening/Speaking.</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>51% (51) students scored proficient in Listening/Speaking.</p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>1.2. Over-aged Students</p> | <p>1.2. E2020 and Virtual School</p> | <p>1.2. Principal, APC, Guidance Counselors</p> | <p>1.2. computer generated assessments</p> | <p>1.2.Data reports</p> |
| | | <p>1.3. Limited vocabulary.</p> | <p>1.3 PD on vocabulary development incorporating ESOL strategies. ESOL strategies shared in PLC's.</p> | <p>1.3. Administration and resource teachers</p> | <p>1.3. Review PD follow up Classroom walkthroughs Review lesson plans Review PLC notes</p> | <p>1.3.PD follow up District walkthrough protocol Lesson plans PLC notes</p> |
| <p>Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.</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>2. Students scoring proficient in Reading.</p> | <p>2.1. Limited background knowledge to make connections to text.</p> | <p>2.1. LFS follow-up, on-going PD for LFS to include building background knowledge and summarization. Data talks LEARN 360 AR CISM Share/Review ESOL Strategies in PLC's Preloading to prepare for Common Core.</p> | <p>2.1. Administration and Resource Teachers</p> | <p>2.1. Multiple measures, to include Subjective teacher ratings, District and DOE observations and feedback Review common benchmark assessments Review PLC notes</p> | <p>2.1. Common benchmark assessments District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback PD follow up PLC notes</p> | |
| <p>CELLA Goal #2: 26% (26) students will score proficient in Reading.</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :</u></p> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| | 24% (24) of students scored proficient in Reading. | | | | | |
| | | 2.2. Limited vocabulary | 2.2. PD on vocabulary development incorporating ESOL strategies. ESOL strategies shared in PLC's | 2.2. Administration and Resource Teachers | 2.2. Review PD follow up Classroom walkthroughs Review lesson plans Review PLC notes | 2.2. PD follow up District walkthrough protocol Lesson plans PLC notes |
| | | 2.3 Not actively engaged in instruction. | 2.3 LFS follow-up, on-going PD CISM AR Share/review effective ESOL strategies in PLC's Preloading to prepare for Common Core. | 2.3 Administration and Resource Teachers | 2.3 Review PD follow up Classroom walkthroughs Review lesson plans Review PLC notes Review AR data | 2.3 PD follow up District walkthrough protocol Lesson plans PLC notes AR data |
| Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 3. Students scoring proficient in Writing. | 3.1 Poor basic understanding (FCAT Level 3.0 and higher) of writing process. | 3.1. PD on writing process and rubric. Share/Review ESOL strategies in PLC's Preloading to prepare for Common Core. | 2.1. Administration, resource teachers | 2.1. Review PD follow up Review PLC notes Classroom walkthrough Review lesson plans | 2.1.PD follow up PLC notes District walkthrough protocol Lesson plans | |
| CELLA Goal #3: 30% (30) of students will score proficient in Writing. | <u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| | 27% (27) of students scored proficient in Writing. | | | | | |
| | | 3.2. Limited vocabulary | 3.2 PD on vocabulary development incorporating ESOL strategies. ESOL strategies shared in PLC's | 2.2. Administration and Resource Teachers | 2.2. Review PD follow up Classroom walkthroughs Review lesson plans Review PLC notes | 2.2. PD follow up District walkthrough protocol Lesson plans PLC notes |
| | | 3.3 | 3.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

| Middle School Math ematics 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. Weak or limited computation skills | 1a.1. LFS follow-up with scaffolding and planning. Discuss with colleagues during PLC's Attend professional learning opportunities Preloading to prepare for Common Core. | 1a.1. Administration and Resource Teachers | 1a.1. Multiple measures, to include Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Classroom Walkthroughs District and DOE observations and feedback Review common benchmark assessments Review PLC notes | 1a.1. Discovery Education assessments (short term- 3 administrations per year); FCAT (long term- annual). common benchmark assessments District walkthrough protocol DOE feedback PLC notes | | |

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

| <u>Mathematics Goal #1a:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|---|--|
| In grades 6-8, 31% (261) students will achieve a level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Math Test. | | | | | | | |
| | <i>21% (177) of students scored a level 3.</i> | <i>31% (261) of students will achieve a level 3 on the FCAT Math Test.</i> | | | | | |
| | | 1a.2. Teachers with poor math core concept understanding | 1a.2. Monthly Professional development and common planning. Review course description/benchmarks/ standards/ curriculum maps in PLC's | 1a.2. Administration and Math AIF | 1a.2. Multiple measures, to include Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Classroom Walkthroughs District and DOE observations and feedback Review common benchmark assessments Review PD follow up Review PLC notes | 1a.2. Discovery Education assessments (short term- 3 administrations per year); FCAT (long term- annual). common benchmark assessments District walkthrough protocol DOE feedback PLC notes | |
| | | 1a.3. Students not actively or authentically engaged. | 1a.3. Cooperative Learning Project Based Learning with teacher as facilitator. Preloading to prepare for Common Core. | 1a.3. Administration and Resource Teachers | 1a.3. Multiple measures, to include Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Classroom Walkthroughs District and DOE observations and feedback Review common benchmark assessments | 1a.3. Discovery Education assessments (short term- 3 administrations per year); FCAT (long term- annual). common benchmark assessments District walkthrough protocol DOE feedback | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| <p>1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</p> | <p>1b.1. Limited awareness of students with disabilities' needs.</p> | <p>1b.1. Provide teacher/administrators with booklet title ESE Accommodations and Modifications for use in PLC discussions. Attend professional training opportunities.</p> | <p>1b.1. Administration, ESE Facilitator</p> | <p>1b.1. Classroom Walkthroughs Review PLC notes Review lesson plans District and DOE observations</p> | <p>1b.1. District walkthrough protocol PLC notes Lesson plans District and DOE feedback</p> | | |
| <p>Mathematics Goal #1b: <i>In grades 6-8, 41% (5) of students will score levels 4, 5 and 6 on the Alternate Assessment Math Test.</i></p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p><i>36% (4) of students scored a level 4, 5, and 6.</i></p> | <p><i>41% (5) of students will score levels 4, 5 and 6 on the Alternate Assessment Math Test.</i></p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>1b.2. Students not motivated to learn.</p> | <p>1b.2. Teacher rapport building with students. School wide high expectations and engaging learning environment. Beginning of the year, icebreakers and team building activities to build teacher rapport with students. Multi-tiered System Supports LFS follow-up and PD</p> | <p>1b.2. Administration, Resource Teachers and SBLT</p> | <p>1b.2. Classroom walkthroughs Review SBLT meeting notes Review PD follow up</p> | <p>1b.2. District walkthrough protocol SBLT meeting notes PD follow up</p> | |

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

| | | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|-------|--|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics. | 2a.1. Many teachers lack understanding of core concepts | 2a.1. Monthly Professional development and common planning. Review course description/ benchmarks/ standards/ curriculum maps in PLC's | 2a.1. Administration and Math AIF | 2a.1. Multiple measures, to include Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Classroom Walkthroughs District and DOE observations and feedback Review common benchmark assessments Review PD follow up Review PLC notes | 2a.1. Discovery Education assessments (short term- 3 administrations per year); FCAT (long term- annual). common benchmark assessments District walkthrough protocol DOE feedback PLC notes | | |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #2a:</u> In grades 6-8, 16% or 134 students will achieve above proficiency on the 2013 FCAT Math Test. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | <i>8% (67) of students scored a level 4 or 5.</i> | <i>16%(134)of students will achieve a level of 4 or 5on the FCAT Math Test.</i> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | 2a.2. Advanced students not challenged. | 2a.2. Student Centered learning –teacher as facilitator Collaborative Pairs Cooperative Learning Summarizing and note taking Preloading to prepare for Common Core. | 2a.2. Administration, Math AIF | 2a.2. Multiple measures, to include Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, A Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Classroom Walkthroughs District and DOE observations and feedback Review common benchmark assessments | 2a.2. Discovery Education assessments (short term- 3 administrations per year); FCAT (long term- annual). common benchmark assessments District walkthrough protocol DOE feedback | |
| | | 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. Low expectation for student success. | 2b.1. Teacher rapport building with students. School wide high expectations and learning environment. | 2b.1. Administration, Resource teachers, ESE Facilitator | 2b.1. Classroom walkthroughs | 2b.1. District walkthrough Protocol | | |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #2b:</u> <i>In grades 6-8, 52% (6) of students will score a level 7 or above on the Alternate Assessment Math Test.</i> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| | <i>45% (5) of students scored a level 7 or above.</i> | <i>52% (6) of students will score a level 7 or above on the Alternate Assessment Math Test.</i> | | | | | |
| | | 2b.2. Students not challenged/engaged in activities that meet ability levels. | 2b.2. Use data to determine students' academic levels. Lesson planning that incorporates challenging course work to meet standards/benchmarks. Preloading to prepare for Common Core. | 2b.2. Administration, Resource teachers, ESE Facilitator | 2b.2. Classroom walkthroughs Review lesson plans Review progress monitoring assessments | 2b.2. District walkthrough protocol Lesson plans Progress monitoring assessments data | |
| | | 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 | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|------------------------------|--|
| <p>3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.</p> | <p>3a.1. Students begin school year with below level skills.</p> | <p>3a.1. LFS follow-up and on-going support provided through scaffolding. Use data to form small flexible groups in which instruction may be scaffolded. LEARN 360 Preloading to prepare for Common Core.</p> | <p>3a.1. Administration and resource teachers</p> | <p>3a.1. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Review PD follow up</p> | <p>3a.1. Discovery Assessment Data Common Assessment Data PD follow up</p> | | |
| <p><u>Mathematics Goal #3a:</u> In grades 6-8, 75% or 505 students will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math Test.</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p><i>50% (421) made learning gains.</i></p> | <p><i>75% (638) of students will make learning gains.</i></p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>3a.2. Parents not equipped to help students at home</p> | <p>3a.2. Parent Night</p> | <p>3a.2. Administration, Title 1 Facilitator, Math AIF</p> | <p>3a.2. Review Attendance Record</p> | <p>3a.2. Attendance Data</p> | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | 3a.3. Not enough Practice and not completing homework. | 3a.3. Writing to Summarize, daily Incentive Program. Discuss and share best practices in PLC's | 3a.3. Administration and resource teachers SBLT | 3a.3. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Review PLC notes Review SBLT meeting notes | 3a.3. District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data PLC notes SBLT notes | |
| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. | 3b.1. Student motivation | 3b.1. Teacher rapport building with students. School wide high expectations and engaging learning environment. Beginning of the year, icebreakers and team building activities to build teacher rapport with students. Multi-tiered System Supports LFS follow-up and PD | 3b.1. Administration, resource teachers and SBLT | 3b.1. Classroom walkthroughs Review SBLT meeting notes Review PD follow up | 3b.1. District walkthrough protocol SBLT meeting notes PD follow up | | |
| Mathematics Goal #3b: <i>In grades 6-8, 100% (6) students will make learning gains on the Alternate Assessment Math Test.</i> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| | <i>83% (5) of students made learning gains</i> | <i>100% (6) students will make learning gains on the Alternate Assessment Math Test.</i> | | | | | |
| | | 3b.2. Student engagement. | 3b.2. Lesson planning that incorporates collaborative learning and hands-on activities. Preloading to prepare for Common Core. | 3b.2. Administration, Reading AIF, ESE Facilitator | 3b.2. Review lesson plans Classroom walkthroughs | 3b.2. Lesson plans District walkthrough protocol | |
| | | 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 | | |
| 4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. | 4a.1. Students begin school year with below level skills. | 4a.1. LFS follow-up and on-going support provided through scaffolding. Use data to form small flexible groups in which instruction may be scaffold. LEARN 360 Preloading to prepare for Common Core. | 4a.1. Administration and resource teachers | 4a.1. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Review PD follow up | 4a.1. Discovery Assessment Data Common Assessment Data PD follow up | | |

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

| <u>Mathematics Goal #4a:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|---|--|
| In grades 6-8, 70% or 149 students in the lowest quartile will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math Test. | | | | | | | |
| | <i>50% (105) students in the lowest 25% made learning gains.</i> | <i>70% (149) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains.</i> | | | | | |
| | | 4a.2. Some teachers are in need of accessing resources, ideas, strategies to improve pedagogical practices in the classroom. | 4a.2. Discuss in PLC's. LFS Professional development Attend professional learning opportunities LEARN 360 | 4a.2. Administration and resource teachers | 4a.2. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations Review PD follow up Review PLC notes | 4a.2. District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data PD follow up PLC notes | |
| | | 4a.3 | 4a.3. | 4a.3. | 4a.3. | 4a.3. | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| <p>4b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</p> | <p>4b.1. Student engagement.</p> | <p>4b.1. Lesson planning that incorporates collaborative learning and hands-on activities. Preloading to prepare for Common Core.</p> | <p>4b.1. . Administration, Reading AIF, ESE Facilitator</p> | <p>4b.1. Review lesson plans Classroom walkthroughs</p> | <p>4b.1. Lesson plans District walkthrough protocol</p> | | |
| <p><u>Mathematics Goal #4b:</u> <i>In grades 6-8,100%(2) of students in lowest 25% will make learning gains on the Alternate Assessment Math Test</i></p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p><i>100% (2) of students in lowest 25% made learning gains.</i></p> | <p><i>100%(2) of students in lowest 25% will make learning gains on the Alternate Assessment Math Test.</i></p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>4b.2. Student motivation</p> | <p>4b.2. Teacher rapport building with students. School wide high expectations and engaging learning environment. Beginning of the year, icebreakers and team building activities to build teacher rapport with students. Multi-tiered System Supports LFS follow-up and PD</p> | <p>4b.2. Administration, resource teachers and SBLT</p> | <p>4b.2. Classroom walkthroughs Review SBLT meeting notes Review PD follow up</p> | <p>4b.2. District walkthrough protocol SBLT meeting notes PD follow up</p> | |

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

| | | 4b.3 | 4b.3. | 4b.3. | 4b.3. | 4b.3. | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | |
| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Baseline data 2010-2011 33% of students in grades 6-8 were proficient in math as measured by the FCAT Math Test. | 39% of students in grades 6-8 were proficient in math as measured by the FCAT Math Test. | 44% of students in grades 6-8 were proficient in math as measured by the FCAT Math Test. | 50% of students in grades 6-8 were proficient in math as measured by the FCAT Math Test. | 55% of students in grades 6-8 were proficient in math as measured by the FCAT Math Test. | 61% of students in grades 6-8 were proficient in math as measured by the FCAT Math Test. | 67% of students in grades 6-8 were proficient in math as measured by the FCAT Math Test. |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u> 44% of students in grades 6-8 were proficient in math as measured by the FCAT Math Test. | | | | | | | |
| 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>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p> | <p>5B.1. White:54% Black:37% Hispanic: 54% Asian: 0% American Indian: 0%</p> <p>Students are not motivated to learn.</p> | <p>5B.1. Use of technology to support learning. Presenting material in an engaging way that will help motivate students. Teacher rapport building with students. School wide high expectations and engaging learning environment. Beginning of the year, icebreakers and team building activities to build teacher rapport with students. Multi-tiered System Supports LFS follow-up and PD</p> | <p>5B.1.Administration and resource teachers</p> | <p>5B.1. Classroom walkthroughs Review SBLT meeting notes Review PD follow up</p> | <p>5B.1. District walkthrough protocol SBLT meeting notes PD follow up</p> | | |
| <p><u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u> 54% of whites will score proficiency on FCAT Math. 37% of blacks will score proficiency on FCAT Math. 54% of Hispanics will score proficiency on FCAT Math.</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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| | White: 49% Black: 32% Hispanic: 49% Asian: 0% American Indian: 0% | White: 54% Black: 37% Hispanic: 54% Asian: 0% American Indian: 0% | | | | | |
| | Scored proficiency on FCAT Math for grades 6-8. | Will score proficiency on FCAT Math for grades 6-8. | | | | | |
| | | 5B.2. Cultural Stereotypes | 5B.2. Assign mentors to meet with students weekly. | 5B.2. Dean, Title 1 Facilitator | 5B.2. Review of mentor attendance and observations | 5B.2. Record of mentors' attendance | |
| | | 5B.3. Students have difficulty making connections to the content. | 5B.3. LFS PD and follow up Collaborative Pairs Discuss instructional best practices in PLC's. Writing to summarize. Preloading to prepare for Common Core. | 5B.3. Administration and resource teachers | 5B.3. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations Review PD follow up Review PLC notes | 5B.3. District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data PD follow up PLC notes | |
| 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>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p> | <p>5C.1. Language skills are not at grade level</p> | <p>5C.1. Visual models and aids. Graphic Organizers. LFS PD and follow up</p> | <p>5C.1. Administration and resource teachers</p> | <p>5C.1. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations Review PD follow up</p> | <p>5C.1. District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data PD follow up</p> | | |
| <p><u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u> 48% of ELL students will score proficiency on FCAT Math.</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>43% of ELL students scored proficiency on FCAT Math.</p> | <p>48% of ELL students will score proficiency on FCAT Math.</p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>5C.2. Teachers not implementing ESOL strategies</p> | <p>5C.2. PD on ESOL strategies. Discuss instructional best practices in PLC's Use with fidelity.</p> | <p>5C.2. Administration and resource teachers</p> | <p>5C.2. Review PD follow up Review PLC notes Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations Review lesson plans</p> | <p>5C.2. PD follow up PLC notes District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Lesson plans</p> | |
| | | <p>5C.3. 3Low expectation of student success</p> | <p>5C.3. Teacher rapport building with students. School wide high expectations and learning environment.</p> | <p>5C.3. Administration and resource teachers</p> | <p>5C.3. Classroom walkthroughs</p> | <p>5C.3. District walkthrough protocol</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>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p> | <p>5D.1. Students are not properly placed in inclusion classes with appropriate support.</p> | <p>5D.1. Alter master schedule to enable proper scheduling Review/Discuss accommodations/modifications in PLC's.</p> | <p>5D.1. Administration, ESE Facilitator</p> | <p>5D.1. Monitor ESE student enrollment and IEP's Review PLC notes Classroom walkthroughs</p> | <p>5D.1. Master schedule PLC notes District walkthrough protocol</p> | | |
| <p><u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u> 35% of students with disabilities will score proficiency on FCAT Math.</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>30% of students with disabilities scored proficiency on FCAT Math.</p> | <p>35% of students with disabilities will score proficiency on FCAT Math.</p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>5D.2. Low Expectations for student success</p> | <p>5D.2. Teacher rapport building with students. School wide high expectations and learning environment.</p> | <p>5D.2. Administration and resource teachers, ESE Facilitator</p> | <p>5D.2. Classroom walkthroughs</p> | <p>5D.2. District walkthrough protocol</p> | |

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

| | | 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. Students have limited access to educated role models. | 5E.1. Assign mentors to meet with students weekly. | 5E.1. Dean, Title 1 Facilitator | 5E.1. Review of mentor attendance and observations | 5E.1. Record of mentors' attendance | | |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #5E:</u> 48% of economically disadvantaged students will score proficiency on FCAT Math. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| | 43% of economically disadvantaged students scored proficiency on FCAT Math. | 48% of economically disadvantaged students will score proficiency on FCAT Math. | | | | | |
| | | 5E.2. Students have limited access to technology at home. | 5E.2 Parent and Family Night Regular access to computer labs. Use of technology tools in the classroom. | 5E.2. Administration, Title 1 Facilitator, Network Manager | 5E.2. Review attendance records Review computer lab access Classroom walkthroughs | 5E.2. Attendance records Computer lab schedule District walkthrough protocol | |
| | | 5E.3 | 5E.3 | 5E.3 | 5E.3 | 5E.3 | |

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| <p>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra.</p> | <p>1.1. Teacher will need knowledge regarding exactly what the student outcome should be for a particular lesson/unit or benchmark/standard. (New teacher)</p> | <p>1. Review with Math AIF course description benchmarks/standards/curriculum maps/item specs Discuss instructional best practices in PLC's Preloading to prepare for Common Core.</p> | <p>1.1. Administration, Math AIF</p> | <p>1.1. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations</p> | <p>1.1. District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data PLC notes</p> | | |
| <p><u>Algebra Goal #1:</u> <i>In grades 7 and 8, 55% of students will score proficient on the Algebra EOC.</i></p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p><i>50% (16) of students scored proficient.</i></p> | <p><i>55% of students will achieve proficiency on the Algebra EOC.</i></p> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| | | 1.2. Teacher in need of accessing resources, ideas, strategies to improve pedagogical practices in the classroom. | 1.2. Discuss in PLC's. LFS Professional development Attend professional learning opportunities LEARN 360 | 1.2. Administration and resource teachers | 1.2. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations Review PD follow up Review PLC notes | 1.2. District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data PD follow up PLC notes | |
| | | 1.3. Lack of rigor and contextual practice. | 2. 1.3. Review with Math AIF course description benchmarks/ standards/curriculum maps/item specs Discuss instructional best practices in PLC's Preloading to prepare for Common Core. | 1.3. Administration and resource teachers | 1.3. Leadership team observation data Review common benchmark assessments Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations | 3. District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data PLC notes | |
| 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>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra.</p> | <p>2.1. Teacher will need knowledge regarding exactly what the student outcome should be for a particular lesson/unit or benchmark/standard. (New teacher)</p> | <p>1. Review with Math AIF course description benchmarks/standards/curriculum maps/item specs Discuss instructional best practices in PLC's Preloading to prepare for Common Core.</p> | <p>2.1. Administration, Math AIF</p> | <p>2.1. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations</p> | <p>2.1. District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data PLC notes</p> | | |
| <p><u>Algebra Goal #2:</u> <i>In grades 7 and 8, 45% of students will score proficient on the Algebra EOC.</i></p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p><i>44% (14) of students scored proficient.</i></p> | <p><i>45% of students will achieve proficiency on the Algebra EOC.</i></p> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|---|---|
| | | 2.2. Teacher in need of accessing resources, ideas, strategies to improve pedagogical practices in the classroom. (new teacher) | 2.2. Discuss in PLC's. LFS Professional development Attend professional learning opportunities LEARN 360 | 2.2. Administration and resource teachers | 2.2. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations Review PD follow up Review PLC notes | 2.2. District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data PD follow up PLC notes | |
| | | 2.3. Lack of rigor and contextual practice. | 2.3. Review with Math AIF course description benchmarks/standards/ curriculum maps/item specs Discuss instructional best practices in PLC's Preloading to prepare for Common Core. | 2.3. Administration and resource teachers | 2.3. Leadership team observation data Review common benchmark assessments Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations | 3. District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data PLC notes | |
| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | |
| 3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Baseline data 2010-2011 <u>N/A</u> | 94% of students in grades 7-8 scored proficient in Algebra 1 as measured by the Algebra 1 EOC Test. | 95% of students in grades 7-8 will score proficient in Algebra 1 as measured by the Algebra 1 EOC Test. | 96% of students in grades 7-8 will score proficient in Algebra 1 as measured by the Algebra 1 EOC Test. | 97% of students in grades 7-8 will score proficient in Algebra 1 as measured by the Algebra 1 EOC Test. | 97% of students in grades 7-8 will score proficient in Algebra 1 as measured by the Algebra 1 EOC Test. | 97% of students in grades 7-8 will score proficient in Algebra 1 as measured by the Algebra 1 EOC Test. |
| <u>Algebra Goal #3A:</u> 95% of students in grades 7-8 will score proficient in Algebra 1 as measured by the Algebra 1 EOC Test. | | | | | | | |

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>3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.</p> | <p>3B.1. 95% of students in grades 7-8 will score proficient in Algebra 1 as measured by the Algebra 1 EOC Test. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: Teacher will need knowledge regarding exactly what the student outcome should be for a particular lesson/unit or benchmark/standard. (New teacher)</p> | <p>3B.1. Review with Math AIF course description benchmarks/standards/curriculum maps/item specs Discuss instructional best practices in PLC’s Preloading to prepare for Common Core.</p> | <p>3B.1. Administration, Math AIF</p> | <p>3B.1. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations</p> | <p>3B.1. District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data PLC notes</p> | | |
| <p><u>Algebra Goal #3B:</u> 95% of students in grades 7-8 will score proficient in Algebra 1 as measured by the Algebra 1 EOC Test.</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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| | 94% of students in grades 7-8 scored proficient in Algebra 1 as measured by the Algebra 1 EOC Test. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: | 95% of students in grades 7-8 will score proficient in Algebra 1 as measured by the Algebra 1 EOC Test. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: | | | | | |
| | | 3B.2. Teacher in need of accessing resources, ideas, strategies to improve pedagogical practices in the classroom. | 3B.2. Discuss in PLC's. LFS Professional development Attend professional learning opportunities LEARN 360 | 3B.2. Administration and resource teachers | 3B.2. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations Review PD follow up Review PLC notes | 3B.2. District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data PD follow up PLC notes | |
| | | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| <p>3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.</p> | <p>3C.1. Teacher will need knowledge regarding exactly what the student outcome should be for a particular lesson/unit or benchmark/standard. (New teacher)</p> | <p>3C.1. Review with Math AIF course description benchmarks/standards/curriculum maps/item specs Discuss instructional best practices in PLC's Preloading to prepare for Common Core.</p> | <p>3C.1. Administration, Math AIF</p> | <p>3C.1. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations</p> | <p>3C.1. District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data PLC notes</p> | | |
| <p><u>Algebra Goal #3C:</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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| | | 3C.2. Teacher in need of accessing resources, ideas, strategies to improve pedagogical practices in the classroom. | 3C.2. Discuss in PLC's. LFS Professional development Attend professional learning opportunities LEARN 360 Review ESOL strategies in PLC's | 3C.2. Administration, Math AIF | 3C.2. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations Review PD follow up Review PLC notes | 3C.2. District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data PD follow up PLC notes | |
| | | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.</p> | <p>3D.1. Teacher will need knowledge regarding exactly what the student outcome should be for a particular lesson/unit or benchmark/standard. (New teacher)</p> | <p>3D.1. Review with Math AIF course description benchmarks/standards/curriculum maps/item specs Discuss instructional best practices in PLC's Preloading to prepare for Common Core.</p> | <p>3D.1. Administration, Math AIF, ESE Facilitator</p> | <p>3D.1. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations</p> | <p>3D.1. District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data PLC notes</p> | | |
| <p>Algebra Goal #3D: 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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| | | 3D.2. Teacher in need of accessing resources, ideas, strategies to improve pedagogical practices in the classroom. | 3D.2. Discuss in PLC's. Attend professional learning opportunities Review ESE accommodations/modifications in PLC's | 3D.2. Administration, Math AIF, ESE Facilitator | 3D.2. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations Review PD follow up Review PLC notes | 3D.2. District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data PD follow up PLC notes | |
| | | 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 | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| <p>3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.</p> | <p>3E.1. Teacher will need knowledge regarding exactly what the student outcome should be for a particular lesson/unit or benchmark/standard. (New teacher)</p> | <p>3E.1. Review with Math AIF course description benchmarks/standards/curriculum maps/item specs Discuss instructional best practices in PLC's Preloading to prepare for Common Core.</p> | <p>3E.1. Administration, Math AIF</p> | <p>3E.1. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations</p> | <p>3E.1. District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data PLC notes</p> | | |
| <p>Algebra Goal #3E: 95% of students in grades 7-8 will score proficient in Algebra 1 as measured by the Algebra 1 EOC Test.</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>94% of students in grades 7-8 scored proficient in Algebra 1 as measured by the Algebra 1 EOC Test.</p> | <p>95% of students in grades 7-8 will score proficient in Algebra 1 as measured by the Algebra 1 EOC Test.</p> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | 3E.2. Teacher in need of accessing resources, ideas, strategies to improve pedagogical practices in the classroom. | 3E.2 Discuss in PLC's. LFS Professional development Attend professional learning opportunities LEARN 360 | 3E.2. Administration, Math AIF | 3E.2. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations Review PD follow up Review PLC notes | 3E.2. District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data PD follow up PLC notes | |
| | | 3E.3 | 3E.3 | 3E.3 | 3E.3 | 3E.3 | |

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course Goals

* 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 | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.</p> | <p>1.1. Teachers will need knowledge regarding exactly what the student outcome should be for a particular lesson/unit or benchmark/standard.</p> | <p>1. Review with Math AIF course description benchmarks/standards/curriculum maps/item specs. Preloading to prepare for Common Core.</p> | <p>1.1. Administration, Math AIF</p> | <p>1.1.. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations</p> | <p>1.1. District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data PLC notes</p> | | |
| <p><u>Geometry Goal #1:</u> <i>In Grade 8, 55% of students will score proficient in Geometry.</i></p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>NA</p> | <p><i>55% of students will score proficient in Geometry.</i></p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>1.2. Teacher in need of accessing resources, ideas, strategies to improve pedagogical practices in the classroom.</p> | <p>1.2. Discuss in PLC's. LFS Professional development Attend professional learning opportunities LEARN 360</p> | <p>1.2. Administration, Math AIF</p> | <p>1.2. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations Review PD follow up Review PLC notes</p> | <p>1.2. District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data PD follow up PLC notes</p> | |
| | | <p>1.3.</p> | <p>1.3.</p> | <p>1.3.</p> | <p>1.3.</p> | <p>1.3.</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 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. Teachers will need knowledge regarding exactly what the student outcome should be for a particular lesson/unit or benchmark/standard. | 2.1. Review with Math AIF course description benchmarks/standards/curriculum maps/item specs. Preloading to prepare for Common Core. | 2.1. Administration, Math AIF | 2.1.. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations | 2.1. District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data PLC notes | | |
| <u>Geometry Goal #2:</u> <i>In Grade 8, 45% of students will score proficient in Geometry.</i> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | NA | <i>45% of students will score proficient in Geometry.</i> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | 2.2. Teacher in need of accessing resources, ideas, strategies to improve pedagogical practices in the classroom. | 2.2. Discuss in PLC's. LFS Professional development Attend professional learning opportunities LEARN 360 | 2.2. Administration, Math AIF | 2.2. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations Review PD follow up Review PLC notes | 2.2. District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data PD follow up PLC notes | |
| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | |
| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | |
| 3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Baseline data 2010-2011 <u>NA</u> | N/A | 91% of students in grade 8 will score proficient in geometry as measured by the Geometry EOC Test. | 92% of students in grade 8 will score proficient in geometry as measured by the Geometry EOC Test. | 93% of students in grade 8 will score proficient in geometry as measured by the Geometry EOC Test. | 94% of students in grade 8 will score proficient in geometry as measured by the Geometry EOC Test. | 95% of students in grade 8 will score proficient in geometry as measured by the Geometry EOC Test. |
| <u>Geometry Goal #3A:</u> 91% of students in grade 8 will score proficient in geometry as measured by the Geometry EOC Test. | | | | | | | |
| 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>3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.</p> | <p>3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: Teachers will need knowledge regarding exactly what the student outcome should be for a particular lesson/unit or benchmark/standard.</p> | <p>3B.1. Review with Math AIF course description benchmarks/standards/curriculum maps/item specs. Preloading to prepare for Common Core.</p> | <p>3B.1. Administration, Math AIF</p> | <p>3B.1.. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations</p> | <p>3B.1. District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data PLC notes</p> | | |
| <p><u>Geometry Goal #3B:</u> <i>In Grade 8, 91% of students will score proficient in Geometry.</i></p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p><i>N/A</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p> | <p><i>91% of students will score proficient in Geometry.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| | | 3B.2. Teacher in need of accessing resources, ideas, strategies to improve pedagogical practices in the classroom. | 3B.2. Discuss in PLC's. LFS Professional development Attend professional learning opportunities LEARN 360 | 3B.2. Administration, Math AIF | 3B.2. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations Review PD follow up Review PLC notes | 3B.2. District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data PD follow up PLC notes | |
| | | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. | 3C.1. | 3C.1. | 3C.1. | 3C.1. | 3C.1. | | |
| <u>Geometry Goal #3C:</u> NA <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|-----------------|-------|--|
| | | 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. | | |
| <u>Geometry Goal #3D:</u> NA <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | | | | | |
| | | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | |
| | | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| 3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. | 3E.1. Teachers will need knowledge regarding exactly what the student outcome should be for a particular lesson/unit or benchmark/standard. | 3E.1. Review with Math AIF course description benchmarks/standards/curriculum maps/item specs Preloading to prepare for Common Core. | 3E.1. Administration, Math AIF | 3E.1. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations | 3E.1. District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data PLC notes | | |
| <u>Geometry Goal #3E:</u> In Grade 8, 90% of students will score proficient in Geometry. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | NA | 90% of students will score proficient in Geometry. | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | 3E.2. Teacher in need of accessing resources, ideas, strategies to improve pedagogical practices in the classroom. | 3E.2 Discuss in PLC's. LFS Professional development Attend professional learning opportunities LEARN 360 | 3E.2. Administration, Math AIF | 3E.2. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations Review PD follow up Review PLC notes | 3E.2. District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data PD follow up PLC notes | |
| | | 3E.3 | 3E.3 | 3E.3 | 3E.3 | 3E.3 | |

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

| | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD 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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring |

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|--------------------|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|
| Developing HOT Questions | All Grade Levels | Jennifer Bookhamer | Elective, and New Teachers School Wide | 1 st Nine Weeks | Weekly Walk-through | Leadership Team |
| Data Chats | All Grade Levels | Jen Bookhamer | School-wide | 1 st nine weeks | Daily Walk-throughs | Jen Bookhamer |
| Collaborative Structures and Summarization | All Grade Levels | Model Teachers | School-wide | 1 st nine weeks | Daily and Weekly Walk-throughs | Leadership Team |

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 |
| Use of SMART Technology | Technology, Title 1, and Title 2 | Title 1 and District Technology, Title 2 | 12,000 |
| | | | 12,000 |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |

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

| | | | |
|----------------------|--|--|--|
| 24,000 Total: | | | |
|----------------------|--|--|--|

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

| Elementary and Middle Science Goals | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. | 1a.1. Students have misconception regarding essential science concepts. | 1a.1.Utilize activating strategies to identify student misconceptions. Adapt instructional strategies to address student learning needs. Discuss instructional best practices in PLC’s Preloading to prepare for Common Core. | 1a.1.Administration and Science AIF | 1a.1. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations Review PLC notes | 1a.1. District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data PLC notes | | |

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

| Science Goal #1a: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| In grade 8, 25% (72) of students will score a level 3 on FCAT Science. | | | | | | | |
| | 20% (57) of students scored a level 3. | 25% (72) of students will score a level 3 on FCAT Science. | | | | | |
| | | 1. 1a.2. Lack of hands-on labs with common lab reports. | 1a.2. Increase use of inquiry based labs through coaching and curriculum development. | 1a.2. Administration and Science AIF | 1a.2. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations | 1a.2. District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data | |
| | | 1a.3. Poor Content Knowledge | 1a.3. Reading in Content Area, video clips, online resources, vocabulary development and PD Preloading to prepare for Common Core. | 1a.3. Administration and Resource teachers | 1a.3. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations Review PD follow up | 1a.3. District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data PD follow up | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| <p>1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Level 4, 5, and 6 in science.</p> | <p>1b.1. Students struggle with science vocabulary.</p> | <p>1b.1. Vocabulary taught in context along with the use of interactive word wall. Marzano's Vocabulary Development. PD</p> | <p>1b.1. Administration and Resource teachers, ESE Facilitator</p> | <p>1b.1. Classroom walkthroughs Review PD follow up Review progress monitoring assessments</p> | <p>1b.1. District walkthrough protocol PD follow up Progress monitoring assessment data</p> | | |
| <p><u>Science Goal #1b:</u> <i>In grade 8, 60% (3) of students will score levels 4, 5 ad 6 on the Alternate Assessment Science Test.</i></p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p><i>40% (2) of students scored levels 4, 5 and 6.</i></p> | <p><i>60% (3) of students will score levels 4, 5 ad 6 on the Alternate Assessment Science Test.</i></p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>1b.2 Poor Content Knowledge</p> | <p>1b.2. Reading in Content Area, video clips, online resources, vocabulary development and PD Preloading to prepare for Common Core.</p> | <p>1b.2. Administration and Resource teachers, ESE Facilitator</p> | <p>1b.2. Classroom walkthroughs Review PD follow up Review progress monitoring assessments</p> | <p>1b.2. District walkthrough protocol PD follow up Progress monitoring assessment data</p> | |
| | | <p>1b.3.</p> | <p>1b.3.</p> | <p>1b.3.</p> | <p>1b.3.</p> | <p>1b.3.</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 group:</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>2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.</p> | <p>2a.1. Students lack engagement and rigor</p> | <p>2a.1. Lesson planning incorporating collaborative structures and active, inquiry based instruction and summarization. Preloading to prepare for Common Core. SEPUP materials Inquiry labs</p> | <p>2a.1. Administration and Science AIF</p> | <p>2a.1. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations Review lesson plans</p> | <p>2a.1. District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data Lesson plans</p> | | |
| <p><u>Science Goal #2a:</u> <i>In grade 8, 5% (14) students will score a level 4 or 5 on FCAT Science Test.</i></p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p><i>3%(9) of students scored a level 4 or 5 on FCAT Science Test.</i></p> | <p><i>5%(14) of students will score a level of 4 or 5 on the FCAT Science Test.</i></p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>2a.2. Poor Background Knowledge</p> | <p>2a.2. Reading in Content Area, video clips, online resources, vocabulary development and PD Preloading to prepare for Common Core.</p> | <p>2a.2. Administration and resource teachers</p> | <p>2a.2. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations Review PD follow up</p> | <p>2a.2. District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data PD follow up</p> | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | 2a.3 Students fail to recognize the relevance of science in their daily lives leading to disengagement. | 2a.3 Utilize a variety of resources to engage students in curriculum relating to real world issues. SEPUP issues based | 2a.3Administration and Science AIF | 2a.3Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Review Objective Discovery Education assessments (3 administrations per year), aligned with FCAT. Review common benchmark assessments Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations | 2a.3 District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Common benchmarks assessments data Discovery assessments data | |
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. | 2b.1 Lack of hands-on labs and demonstrations | 2b.1. Increase use of inquiry based labs through coaching and curriculum development. Discuss instructional best practices in PLC's | 2.1.3Administration and Science AIF, ESE Facilitator | 2b.1. Classroom walkthroughs Review PLC notes | 2b.1.District walkthrough protocol PLC notes | | |
| <p>Science Goal #2b:</p> <p><i>In grade 8, 60% (3) of students will score level 7 or above on the Alternate Assessment Science Test.</i></p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| | 40% (2) of students scored level 7 or above. | 60% (3) of students will score level 7 or above on the Alternate Assessment Science Test. | | | | | |
| | | 2b.2. Poor Background Knowledge | 2b.2. Reading in Content Area, video clips, online resources, vocabulary development and PD Preloading to prepare for Common Core. | 2b.2. Administration and Resource teachers, ESE Facilitator | 2b.2. Classroom walkthroughs Review PD follow up Review progress monitoring assessments | 2b.2. District walkthrough protocol PD follow up Progress monitoring assessment data | |
| | | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | |

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

| High School Science Goals | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | | |
|--|--|----------|---|---|-----------------|--|--|
| 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>1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Level 4, 5, and 6 in science.</p> | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | | |
| <p>Science Goal #1: NA</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p><i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i></p> | <p><i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i></p> | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |
| <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 group:</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>2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.</p> | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | | |
| <p><u>Science Goal #2:</u> NA</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p><i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i></p> | <p><i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i></p> | | | | | |
| | | 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

Science Professional Development

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>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.</p> | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|--|----------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Developing HOT Questions | All Grade Levels | Jennifer Bookhamer | Elective, and New Teachers School Wide | 1 st Nine Weeks | Weekly Walk-through | Leadership Team |
| Data Chats | All Grade Levels | Jen Bookhamer | School-wide | 1 st nine weeks | Daily Walk-throughs | Jen Bookhamer |
| Collaborative Structures and Summarization | All Grade Levels | Model Teachers | School-wide | 1 st nine weeks | Daily and Weekly Walk-throughs | Leadership Team |
| SEPUP Content and Pedagogy | Seventh grade | District | Science | First Semester | Daily and Weekly Walk-throughs | Leadership Team |
| Marzano's Vocabulary Development | All Grade Levels | Dr. Blackburn, Alatheia Towles | School-wide | 1 st nine weeks | Daily and Weekly Classroom Walk-throughs | Leadership Team |

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 |
| Scholastic Science magazines | Title 1 | Title 1 | 500.00 |
| | | | |

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| 500.00 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: | | | |
| 500.00 Total: | | | |

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Writing Goals | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| 1a. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. | 1a.1. Poor basic understanding (FCAT Level 3.5 and higher) of writing process | 1a.1. PD on writing process and rubric. Teacher Writing Workshops for essay and Common Core, writing across the Curriculum. Student Writing Workshops Progress monitoring of essays X3 with student conferencing. Small group and individual instruction prior to FCAT assessment. | 1a.1. Administration and LFS Coach | 1a.1. Review PD follow up Review progress monitoring data Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations | 1a.1. PD follow up Progress monitoring data District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback | | |
| Writing Goal #1a: <i>In grade 8, 80% (224) of students will score a level of 3.5 or higher on the FCAT Writes.</i> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | <i>77% (216) of students scored a level 3.5 or higher.</i> | <i>80% (224) of students will score a level of 3.5 or higher on the FCAT Writes.</i> | | | | | |
| | | 1a.2. Weak Vocabulary Skills | 1a.2. PD on vocabulary development, with a school wide writing word bank with writing activities. | 1a.2. Administration and LFS Coach | 1a.2. Review PD follow up Review progress monitoring data Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations | 1a.2. PD follow up Progress monitoring data District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback | |
| | | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p>1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.</p> | <p>1b.1. Student engagement.</p> | <p>1b.1. Lesson planning that incorporates collaborative learning and hands-on activities. Multi-tiered System Supports LFS follow-up and PD. Preload for Common Core. Ongoing teacher evaluations, and differentiated Professional Development according to ongoing data.</p> | <p>1b.1. Administration, resource teachers and ESE Facilitator, SBLT</p> | <p>1b.1. Multiple measures, to include: Subjective teacher ratings, Leadership team observation data, Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations Review lesson plans Review SBLT meeting notes</p> | <p>1b.1. District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback Progress monitoring assessments Lesson plans SBLT notes</p> | | |
| <p>Writing Goal #1b: <i>In grade 8, 100% (5) of students will score a level 4 or above on the Alternate Assessment Writing Test.</i></p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p><i>100% (5) of students scored a level 4 or above.</i></p> | <p><i>100% (5) of students will score a level 4 or above on the Alternate Assessment Writing Test.</i></p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>1b.2. Student motivation</p> | <p>1b.2. School wide high expectations and engaging learning environment. Beginning of the year, icebreakers and team building activities to build teacher rapport with students. Multi-tiered System Supports LFS follow-up and PD</p> | <p>1b.2. Administration, resource teachers and ESE Facilitator, SBLT</p> | <p>1b.2. Classroom walkthroughs Review SBLT meeting notes Review PD follow up</p> | <p>1b.2. District walkthrough protocol SBLT meeting notes PD follow up</p> | |
| | | <p>1b.3.</p> | <p>1b.3.</p> | <p>1b.3.</p> | <p>1b.3.</p> | <p>1b.3.</p> | |

Writing Professional Development

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>Professional Development (PD) aligned with</p> | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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

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

| 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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Writing Across the Curriculum, and Common Core | 6,7,8 All subjects including electives. | Jennifer Bookhamer | All grades, All subjects | One PLC per 9 weeks. | Weekly classroom walk-throughs | Leadership Team |
| Developing HOT Questions | All Grade Levels | Jennifer Bookhamer | Elective, and New Teachers School Wide | 1 st Nine Weeks | Weekly Walk-through | Leadership Team |
| Data Chats | All Grade Levels | Jen Bookhamer | School-wide | 1 st nine weeks | Daily Walk-throughs | Jen Bookhamer |
| Collaborative Structures and Summarization Marzano's Vocabualry Development | All Grade Levels All Grade Levels | Model Teachers Dr. Blackburn, Alatheia Towles | School-wide School-wide | 1 st nine weeks 1 st nine weeks | Daily and Weekly Walk-throughs Daily and Weekly Walk-throughs | Leadership Team Leadership Team |

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 |

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

| | | | |
|--------------------------|---|-------------------------------|----------|
| Writing Work Shop | Title 1, School Internal Account budget | Title 1 and Internal Accounts | 500.00 |
| Binders | Title 1 | Title 1 | 1,400.00 |
| 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: | | | |
| 1900.00 Total: | | | |

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

* 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 | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. | 1.1. Most students have limited background knowledge to allow for grade level instruction. | 1.1 CISM LEARN 360 LFS follow-up, on-going PD for LFS to include building background knowledge and summarization. Preloading to prepare for Common Core. Test Item Specifications Use of TCI Resources FL Joint Center for Citizenship DBQ Workshops (6 th and 7 th grade materials) | 1.1. Administration and resource teachers | 1.1. Review CISM lesson plans Review PD follow up Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations | 1.1. CISM Lesson plans PD follow up District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback | | |
| <u>Civics Goal #1:</u> <i>In grade 7, 55%of students will score a level 3on the Civics EOC.</i> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | NA | <i>55%of students will score a level 3on the Civics EOC.</i> | | | | | |
| | | 1. Some students are not actively engaged | 1.2 CISM LEARN 360 LFS follow up, on-going PD for LFS to include activators and summarization. Discuss effective instructional strategies in PLC’s | 1.2. Administration and resource teachers | 1.2. Review CISM lesson plans Review PD follow up Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations Review PLC notes | 1.2. CISM Lesson plans PD follow up District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback PLC notes | |
| | | 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 | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| <p>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.</p> | <p>2.1. Most students have limited background knowledge to allow for grade level instruction and rigor.</p> | <p>2.1. CISM LEARN 360 LFS follow-up, on-going PD for LFS to include building background knowledge and summarization. Preloading to prepare for Common Core.</p> | <p>2.1. Administration and resource teachers</p> | <p>2.1. Review CISM lesson plans Review PD follow up Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations</p> | <p>2.1. CISM Lesson plans PD follow up District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback</p> | | |
| <p><u>Civics Goal #2:</u> <i>In grade 7, 15% of students will score a level 4 or 5 on the Civics EOC.</i></p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>NA</p> | <p><i>15% of students will score a level 4 or 5 on the Civics EOC.</i></p> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| | | 2.2. Some students are not actively engaged | 2.2. CISM LEARN 360 LFS follow up, on-going PD for LFS to include activators and summarization. Discuss effective instructional strategies in PLC's | 2.2. Administration and resource teachers | 2.2. Review CISM lesson plans Review PD follow up Classroom walkthroughs District and DOE observations Review PLC notes | 2.2. CISM Lesson plans PD follow up District walkthrough protocol District and DOE feedback PLC notes | |
| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | |

Civics 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> | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| | 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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| | Developing HOT Questions | All Grade Levels | Jennifer Bookhamer | Elective, and New Teachers School Wide | 1 st Nine Weeks | Weekly Walk-through | Leadership Team |
| | Data Chats | All Grade Levels | Jen Bookhamer | School-wide | 1 st nine weeks | Daily Walk-throughs | Jen Bookhamer |
| Collaborative Structures and Summarization | All Grade Levels | Model Teachers | School-wide | 1 st nine weeks | Daily and Weekly Walk-throughs | Leadership Team | |

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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

End of Civics Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Attendance Goal(s) | Problem-solving Process to Increase | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| | 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. Making all students feel that school is a safe orderly place to learn free of distractions | 1.1. Explicit Instruction of School Wide Rules and Expectations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers will teach expectations and social skills to all students in the first week of school. • Grade level assemblies will be conducted to teach students expectations and social skills- Quarterly School-wide bully preventions and lesson plans are to be taught to students . | 1.1. Administration and classroom teachers | 1.1. Review recorded data | 1.1. Referrals, Teacher and student feedback | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|----------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|--|
| <p>Attendance Goal #1:</p> <p>Our goal at Sleepy Hill Middle School is to facilitate positive behavior change in our students and staff through the application of a MTSS approach to student attendance.</p> <p>2012-2013 Population- 842</p> <p>By spring 2013, we will reduce the number of students with excessive absences by 10%. (22)</p> <p>By spring of 2013, we will reduce the number of students with excessive tardiness by 80%. (422)</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>95%</p> | <p>96%</p> | | | | | |
| | <p><u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>218 (25.89%)</p> | <p>198</p> | | | | | |
| | <p><u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>527(62.59%)</p> | <p>105</p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>1.2 limited knowledge of expected social behavior.</p> | <p>1.2. social skills lesson</p> | <p>1.2. Administration and classroom teachers</p> | <p>1.2. Review recorded data</p> | <p>1.2. Referrals, Teacher and student feedback</p> | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|------------------------------|---|--|
| | | 2. Motivation | 3. Grade level assemblies MTSS | 1.3. Administration and classroom teachers | 1.3. Review recorded data | 1.3. Referrals, Teacher and student feedback | |
|--|--|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|------------------------------|---|--|

| | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| 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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring |
| MTSS | 6-8 | APA, SBLT | All staff | Monthly | Recorded data on various information (i.e. attendance, discipline, academics) | APA, SBLT |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

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 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Technology | | | |

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

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

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

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

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

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

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| <p>1. Suspension</p> | <p>1. Students do not know the correct way to handle adverse situations between peers.</p> | <p>1.1. Explicit Instruction of Appropriate/ Inappropriate Behaviors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers will teach expectations and social skills to all students in the first week of school. • Teachers will use behavior interventions within the classroom to deal with teacher-managed behaviors. • Teachers will use MTSS tools such as positive rewards, good behavior practices and teaching school wide expectations. • Grade level assemblies | <p>1.1.Discipline Committee, Assistant Principal, Deans, SBLT</p> | <p>1.1.Review number of disciplinary referrals and days of suspension on a monthly basis during discipline/leadership meeting</p> | <p>1.1.Discipline data/reports generated from Genesis.</p> | | |
|-----------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>will be conducted to teach students expectations and social skills.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students will role play both examples and non-examples of student expectations. • School-wide bully preventions and lesson plans are to be taught to students. | | | | | |
| <p>Suspension Goal #1:</p> <p>Our goal at Sleepy Hill Middle School is to facilitate positive behavior change in our students and staff through the application of a Response to Intervention approach to student behavior.</p> <p>By spring 2013, we will reduce the total number of Out-of-School suspensions by a minimum of 25% (263).</p> | <p><u>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u></p> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|--------------------------|------------------|--|
| | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | <u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u> | | | | | |
| | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | <u>2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u> | | | | | |
| | 1053 | 790 | | | | | |
| | <u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u> | | | | | |
| | 334 | 251 | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. Poor participation in grade level assemblies | 1.2. Students who display appropriate social skills will be rewarded school-wide incentives. | 1.2. Discipline Committee, Assistant Principal, Deans, SBLT | 1.2. Review data reports | 1.2.Data reports | |
| | | 1.3. Motivation | 1.3. Student Incentives | 1.3. Discipline Committee, Assistant Principal, Deans, SBLT | 1.3.Review data reports | 1.3.Data reports | |

Suspension Professional Development

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| 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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Total: | | | |

End of Suspension Goals

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 <u>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</u> <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i> | 1. Distance to travel to school | 1.1. Use Connect-Ed to communicate effectively. | 1.1. Administration and Title I Facilitator | 1.1. Review attendance Records and sign in sheets | 1.1. Activity participant Evaluations | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--------------------------------|---|---|---------------------------------------|--|
| 25% or 219 Sleepy Hill Middle School parents will attend a school function during the 2011-2012 school year. | <u>2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*</u> | | | | | |
| | 20% (175) currently attend functions at SHMS | 25% (219) is the expected number of parents who will attend SHMS functions. | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. Communication | 1.2. Plan family friend events | 1.2. Administration and Title 1 Facilitator | 1.2. Review attendance Records and sign in sheets | 1.2. Activity participant Evaluations | |
| | | 2. Time | 1.3. School Website | 1.3. Administration and Title 1 Facilitator | 1.3.3 Frequent Review of Website | 1.3. Website | |

Parent Involvement Professional Development

| | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| <p>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.</p> | | | | | | |
| 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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Parent Involvement Budget

| | | | |
|--|--|----------------|---------|
| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Student Agendas | Improve communication between school and parents | Title 1 | 2000.00 |
| Parent Workshops | Improve parent awareness of school-related information | Title 1 | 800.00 |
| Subtotal: 2800.00 | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Total: | | | |

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

April 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 students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g. 70% (35)).

| 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 |
| <p>STEM Goal #1: <i>In grades 6-8, 100% (154) students in the STEAM Academy will achieve proficiency by scoring at least a level 3 on all applicable sections of the FCAT and on the Algebra and Geometry EOC's.</i></p> | <p>1.1 New grade level added (8th grade). Teachers will need knowledge regarding exactly what the student outcome should be for a particular lesson/unit or benchmark/standard.</p> | <p>1.1. Review/discuss with resource teachers and in PLC's Create course description, unpack benchmarks/standards/curriculum maps/item specs.</p> | <p>1.1. Administration and resource team</p> | <p>1.1. Walk through feedback Lesson study, lesson plans, common assessment, student work samples</p> | <p>1. Observation protocol District assessments Benchmark assessments</p> |
| | <p>1.2 Teachers will need to maintain proficient/advanced level instruction for new grade level (8th grade).</p> | <p>3. CISM Through PLC's, teachers will create lesson design and discuss DBQ. Include cooperative learning and hands-on activities PLC's will review course assignments and test development</p> | <p>1.2. Administration and resource team</p> | <p>1.2. Lesson study product/plan Rubric for implementation using language from the walkthrough feedback form.</p> | <p>2. Observation protocol District assessments Benchmark assessments</p> |
| | <p>1.3 Science Fair Preparation STEAM Expo</p> | <p>1.3. Teachers will support all students in creation of a rigorous science fair project.</p> | <p>1.3. Administration and resource teachers for math and science.</p> | <p>1.3. Recorded data</p> | <p>1.3. Rubric focusing on level of math application EOC Benchmarks</p> |

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

STEM Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Lesson Study | 6-8 | District Representative | STEAM teachers, resource teachers, Admin. | Pre-planning week and PLC's | Lesson study product/plan Rubric for implementation using language from the walkthrough feedback form. | Administration and resource team |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

| 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 |

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

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| <p><u>CTE Goal #1:</u> <i>In year one, teachers will develop and create curriculum that will support student proficiency in Aerospace for year two.</i></p> | <p>1. Lessons need to reflect industry experience.</p> | <p>1.1. Assist teachers in developing project based learning based on industry standards. Teacher will work with high school teacher to create a seamless articulation in developing curriculum and assessments.</p> | <p>1.1. Administration and resource team.</p> | <p>1.1. Walk through feedback Lesson study, lesson plans, common assessment, student work samples</p> | <p>1. Observation protocol District assessments Benchmark assessments</p> |
| | <p>2. Students will have limited background knowledge.</p> | <p>2. CTE programs will develop advisory councils, partnerships with industry and post-secondary institutes, and connections for students to content area. Integrated curriculum. Make connections to feeder elementary schools to support awareness of the program.</p> | <p>1.2. Administration and resource team.</p> | <p>1.2. Walk through feedback Lesson study, lesson plans, common assessment, student work samples</p> | <p>2. Observation protocol District assessments Benchmark assessments</p> |
| | <p>3. Students will need vocabulary support and development in Aerospace.</p> | <p>3. Co-hort scheduling, integrated curriculum and individualized instruction. Best instructional strategies for vocabulary development. Encourage teachers to become NG-CAR PD certified. School will provide reading coach to support teachers.</p> | <p>1.3. Administration and resource team.</p> | <p>1.3. Walk through feedback Lesson study, lesson plans, common assessment, student work samples</p> | <p>3. Observation protocol District assessments Benchmark assessments</p> |

CTE Professional Development

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning</p> | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| 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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Lesson study | 6-8 | District Representation | Aerospace teachers, resource teachers, administration | Pre-planning, PLC's | Lesson study product/plan Rubric for implementation using language from the walkthrough feedback form. | Administration and resource team. |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

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 |
| | | | |
| | | | |

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

| | | | |
|------------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Total: | | | |

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

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

| Additional Goal(s) | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | | |
|---|--|----------|---|---|-----------------|--|--|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 1. Additional Goal | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|------|------|------|------|--|
| <u>Additional Goal #1:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level :*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level :*</u> | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

Additional Goals Professional Development

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

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

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Include only school-based funded | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|--|

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| Please provide the total budget from each section. | |
| Reading Budget | 8200.00Total: |
| Mathematics Budget | 1200.00Total: |

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

| | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Science Budget | 500.00Total: |
| Writing Budget | 1900.00Total: |
| Attendance Budget | Total: |
| Suspension Budget | Total: |
| Dropout Prevention Budget | Total: |
| Parent Involvement Budget | 2800.00Total: |
| Additional Goals | Total: |
| | 14,600.00 Grand Total: |

eva

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 |

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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

- Yes No

| |
|--|
| If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements. |
| |
| Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year. |
| The SAC will meet monthly. They will be involved with revising the School Improvement Plan as needed. They will be instrumental in making decisions in safety, students and funding. |

| Describe the projected use of SAC funds. | Amount |
|--|--------|
| | |
| | |
| | |