Florida Department of Education

DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

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

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Robert E. Lee High School	District Name: Duval Co.
Principal: Dr. Denise D. Hall	Superintendent: Mr. William Pratt-Dannals
SAC Chair: Mr. Michael Hawk	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.
School Grades Trend Data (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)
High School Feedback Report
K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

Administrators

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

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 (Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AYP information along with the associated school year)

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

Principal	Denise Duncan Hall	Ph.D. Ed Leadership / MS Administration / BS. Math Ed.	7	17	Robert E. Lee High School gains to a C 2005. The students tested at level 3 and above was 51% and 73% of all students made math gains. In 2006, students that tested at level 3 and above rose 1 percentage point. Our math gains dropped that year to 62%. Robert E. Lee High School gains to a C 2007-2009. In 2007, the students that tested at levels 3 and above were 57%, 65% in 2008 and 67% in 2009. 2007 66% gains, 2008 68% gains, 2009 74% gains 2007-2008 63% bottom Q, 2008 61%, 2009 73% Robert E. Lee High School drops to a D 2010. 3 and above FCAT 63%, 66% gains, 59% bottom Q Robert E. Lee High School gains to a B in 2011. 3 and above FCAT 69%, 75% gains, 59% bottom Q
Assistant Principal	Jaime Dusinberre	M.Ed. Ed Leadership BA English English 6-12, Ed Leadership K-12	7	7	Robert E. Lee High School gains to a C 2005. The students tested at level 3 and above was 51% and 73% of all students made math gains. In 2006, students that tested at level 3 and above rose 1 percentage point. Our math gains dropped that year to 62%. Robert E. Lee High School gains to a C 2007-2009. In 2007, the students that tested at levels 3 and above were 57%, 65% in 2008 and 67% in 2009. 2007 66% gains, 2008 68% gains, 2009 74% gains 2007-2008 63% bottom Q, 2008 61%, 2009 73% Robert E. Lee High School drops to a D 2010. 3 and above FCAT 63%, 66% gains, 59% bottom Q Robert E. Lee High School gains to a B in 2011. 3 and above FCAT 69%, 75% gains, 59% bottom Q

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

Assistant Principal	Marie George	B.A. Music Education M.A. Supervision and Administration EDD in progress Ed Leadership K-12 Music K-12	3	2	Sandalwood High School gains to an A in 2010. Robert E. Lee High School gains to a B in 2011. 3 and above FCAT 69%, 75% gains, 59% bottom Q
Assistant Principal	Carolyn McDuffie	Masters Ed Leadership B.S. Mathematics Ed.S Mathematics Ed Leadership K-12 Math 5-9	2	6	Terry Parker High School gains to a C 2009-2010 First Coast High School - drop to a D 2009-2010 First Coast High School – gains to a C 2010-2011 Robert E. Lee High School gains to a B in 2011. 3 and above FCAT 69%, 75% gains, 59% bottom Q
Assistant Principal	Corey Miller	Masters of Education Educational Leadership	1	7	Westwood Middle School 2006-2011 C Ed White High School 2011 - C

| Assistant Principal | Andrea Harter | B.A. Journalism / MFA Educational Leadership 6-12 English | 6 | 1 | Teacher at Lee for the past five years. *2012 School Grade not yet released. Lee Gains to a B in 2011.

Robert E. Lee Senior High (2008-2011) DDCDB

Most recent year released results (2011): FCAT Data: Level 3 or higher past four years in reading: 37 percent (2011); 31 percent (2010); 36 percent (2009); 41 percent (2008). Level 3 or higher in math by year: 69, 63, 67, 65 percent respectively. Learning Gains by year: (reading, respectively: 48, 37, 44, 51 percent); (math, respectively: 75, 66,74,68). Lowest 25 percent (reading, respectively: 49, 35, 44, 43 percent) Lowest 25 percent (math , respectively: 49, 35, 44, 43) AYP information N, N. N. N |

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

Instructional Coaches

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of School Grades, **FCAT/statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%)**, and ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Cross-Curricular	Laura Gruninger	Social Studies 6-12 Reading K-12 English 6-9 Ed. Leadership	6	10	Robert E. Lee High School gains to a C 2005. The students tested at level 3 and above was 51% and 73% of all students made math gains. In 2006, students that tested at level 3 and above rose 1 percentage point. Our math gains dropped that year to 62%. Robert E. Lee High School gains to a C 2007-2009. In 2007, the students that tested at levels 3 and above were 57%, 65% in 2008 and 67% in 2009. 2007 66% gains, 2008 68% gains, 2009 74% gains 2007-2008 63% bottom Q, 2008 61%, 2009 73% Robert E. Lee High School drops to a D 2010. 3 and above FCAT 63%, 66% gains, 59% bottom Q Robert E. Lee High School gains to a B in 2011. 3 and above FCAT 69%, 75% gains, 59% bottom Q
ELA & Reading	Curran, Bonnie	Elementary Education English 5-9 ESOL Reading Endorsement	3	1	Robert E. Lee High School drops to a D 2010. 3 and above FCAT 63%, 66% gains, 59% bottom Q Robert E. Lee High School gains to a B in 2011. 3 and above FCAT 69%, 75% gains, 59% bottom Q

Math	Natasha Morrison	Math 6-12	14	3	Robert E. Lee High School gains to a C 2005. The students tested at level 3 and above was 51% and 73% of all students made math gains. In 2006, students that tested at level 3 and above rose 1 percentage point. Our math gains dropped that year to 62%. Robert E. Lee High School gains to a C 2007-2009. In 2007, the students that tested at levels 3 and above were 57%, 65% in 2008 and 67% in 2009. 2007 66% gains, 2008 68% gains, 2009 74% gains 2007-2008 63% bottom Q, 2008 61%, 2009 73% Robert E. Lee High School drops to a D 2010. 3 and above FCAT 63%, 66% gains, 59% bottom Q Robert E. Lee High School gains to a B in 2011. 3 and above FCAT 69%, 75% gains, 59% bottom Q
Data	Suzanne Patterson	Business Education 6 – 12 Vocational Education	1	1	

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
1. On-going professional development through planning period meetings, faculty meetings and quarterly instructional days.	Design Team	Ongoing
2. Full-time instructional coaching staff to support and assist teachers in honing their craft.	Principal	Ongoing
3. Monthly Beginning Teacher meetings designed to keep new teachers connected, informed and on track in TIP.	PDF	Ongoing

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

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	**% Highly Qualified Teachers**	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
92	20% (18)	23% (21)	33% (30)	20% (18)	25% (23)	74%(68)	9% (8)	1% (1)	10% (9)

June 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011   9

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

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Patrick Carmody	Jack Strickland	Department Chair/ Mathematics	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Brenda Hennessey	Hillary Street	Chemistry Teacher	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Rosalyn Bloxom-Johnson	Irma Santos-Sandiago	World Language/ Veteran Teacher w/ 15 years of experience	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Kristin Bishop	Ronnie Smith	English Department Chair/Masters in English	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Pamela Clark	Kimberly Sambol-Tosco	Social Studies	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings

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

Kelli Padgett	Alec Puig	Social Studies/ Department Chair	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Laura Gruninger	Suzanne Patterson	Data Coach/ Instructional Coach	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Marian Walker	Rebekah Padilla	Engineering/B&L Lead Teacher	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Danielle MacClary	Bonnie Curran	Reading/Reading Coach	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Laura Gruninger	Theresa Khiyami	ESE/Instructional Coach	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Jon Allen	Joseph Edwin	Science	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Bonnie Curran	Katie Kanane n	Reading/Reading Coach	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Kristin Bishop	Wyonna Johnson	ELA	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings

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

Bonnie Jean Curran	Luke	Reading/Reading Coach	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Jon Allen	Morgan Hunter	Science	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Gruninger, Laura	Robert Baldwin	ROTC	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Karen Norris/ Laura Gruninger	Sydney Wyatt	Close proximity. Is assigned a math buddy	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Laura Gruninger	Christine Howard	Science department chair and a physic teacher.	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Brenda Hennessey	Justin Lopez	Chemistry teacher.	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Laura Gruninger	Shannon Falon	Math Coach to math teacher	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Truitt/ Norris	Brittany Biggs	ELA	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings

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

Laura Gruninger	Caroline Kaigh	Instructional Coach as mentor with a math buddy assigned.	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Deb Truitt	Emily May	ELA/Reading Coach	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Patrick Carmody	Sean Rampacek	Math department chair	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Laura Gruninger	Thomas Gallagher	Instructional Coach as mentor with a biology buddy teacher	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Laura Gruninger	Eric Vincent	Instructional Coach with support from engineering department	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Kathy Kaleel	Elliot Bougis	Instructional Coach with support from World Language department chair	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Kristin Bishop	Amy Donofrio	ELA	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Laura Gruninger	Mark Ingram	Instructional Coach with math buddy teacher assigned.	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings

Laura Gruninger	Evelyn Borland	Instructional Coach-social studies background	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Laura Gruninger	Kyendal Eaton	ELA/Reading Coach	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Laura Gruninger	Jasmin Esparza	ESOL	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Vamecia Powell	Maritza Gonzalez	ELA	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings

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

Additional Requirements

*Coordination and Integration-**Title I Schools Only*

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

Title I, Part A   Create a Parent Welcome Center offering resource materials to assist parents with developing strategies to insure their child's success in high school and beyond. Hold parent meetings focused on increasing parent involvement in their students' education. Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through after-school, Saturday School, and tutoring. Funds were use to hire personnel.
Title I, Part C- Migrant
Title I, Part D
Title II
Title III
Title X- Homeless
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Violence Prevention Programs
Nutrition Programs   HOPE classes will participate in Fuel Up to Play 60 program that focuses on nutrition and exercise.

Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education Continue to build an International Business and Logistics Career Academy focusing on logistics. The academy will continue to work with JaxPort to provide opportunities for future employment, scholarships, internships, and experiences in logistics. Pursue a Non-Profit Career Academy for the Liberal Arts Community to begin with 2012-2013 school year; Service, Engagement, Relationship, and Volunteerism. Students completing this track will earn Microsoft certification.
Job Training:The Business and Logistics Community has developed Lee's second academy and is on its way to becoming Nationally Certified by National Career Academy Coalition. Students completing this track will earn Microsoft certification. The Science Engineering Academy Magnet students have an opportunity to become Auto Computer-Aided Design certified and have been awarded National Model Academy status. Currently seeking their first recertification.
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 MTSS leadership team.

Denise Hall, Principal

Marie George, Assistant Principal, Curriculum

Carolyn McDuffie, Assistant Principal, RtI

Laura Gruninger, Instructional Coach

Bonnie Curran, Literacy Coach

Kelli Padgett, Social Studies Department Chair

Michelle Crossley-Taylor, Guidance Department Chair

Anne Jacques, Art Teacher

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

Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts? The focus of the RTI Leadership Team will be governed by the following essential questions: What does the data tell us? What do we want the data to tell us? What interventions will be used to meet the needs of students who did not demonstrate mastery after each core instruction and supplemental intervention? What other steps can we take to calibrate the work governing this initiative? The Leadership team will meet once a week as a whole group to monitor the progress of intervention strategies outlined in the School Improvement Plan. Teachers will screen data in their respective PLCs and make informed instructional decisions; an extensive review of data from formatives and benchmarks will assist in identifying intentional non-learners and failed learners. The PLCs will then devise a plan to provide interventions to students as per noted patterns and/or deficiencies presented by the data at hand. The administrative team will meet weekly to discuss classroom monitoring of instructional strategies and provide support. The teacher led RTI team will meet twice a month after the Lead teacher meets with the Leadership and Monitoring Teams. This team will fully support the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans and ensure that the staff knows how and when to apply each Tier; will develop, lead, and evaluate school core content programs; will identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum assessment and intervention approaches; will identify systematic patterns of student needs and provide strategies gained via district training to identify appropriate, and evidence-based intervention strategies; also, the team will assist with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for students and collect, analyze, and disseminate data relating to progress made through RTI implementation.
Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? The RTI Leadership team perused the data from the previous school year. Duties were disseminated at different levels for each subgroup of the RTI Leadership team. They worked together in the gathering of data used to develop the needs assessment of the school. The Principal shared the data with SAC to solicit their assistance with external resources. The Assistant Principal shared the PLC information with department heads to solicit their input as the SIP is developed, as well as, organized the needed training for the teacher-led RTI subgroup. Entities will be provided data on all targets set for each Tier; academic and social areas will be addressed via seminars and via Guidance Counselors for other students; the PLCs will develop a strategic plan to adjust classroom instruction and shift intentional interventions whenever there are areas that need attention with the use of an interventionists. The RTI Leadership subgroups will collectively work together to monitor the interventions, adjust the modification thereof, and align the entire schemata. The SIP is a living document and will be treated as such, as data is collected, desegregated, analyzed and used to differentiate instruction for each child.
MTSS Implementation

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.

The following sources will be used as based line data:

Reading: The results from IR Classes; the Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN) data retrieved via Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), and the 2011-2012 Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), AP results for **Mathematics and Science.** Progress Monitoring: PMRN for **Reading**; Formatives; Summatives; Writing prompts and Benchmarks **for Reading, Mathematics, Science**, and **Writing.** Midyear Assessments: FAIR; School-based Common Assessments and District Benchmarks. End of Year: FAIR, FCAT, PSAT, PERT, and AP.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The staff was trained on RtI during our preplanning and will be trained throughout the year during planning period meetings and faculty meetings.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The staff will create action plans to support the data reflecting student performance with time-lines.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

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

Denise Hall, Principal

Jaime Dusinberre, Assistant Principal

Corey Miller, Assistant Principal

Laura Gruninger, Instructional Coach

Bonnie Curran, ELA Literacy Coach

Kristin Bishop, ELA Department Chair

David Gaslin, Reading Department Chair

Janie Jones, Media Specialist

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

The Monitoring Team visits classes and shares the findings during the weekly meetings. A member of the monitoring team will meet with designated teachers during PLCs to discuss the assessment results and student progress. During classroom walkthroughs, teachers will provide a member of the monitoring team with a toolkit consisting of: lesson plans, data, student work, efforts of RTI and differentiated instruction (as noted on lesson plans) to address individual student needs. The areas of concern are shared with the Leadership team lead teacher. The Leadership Team brainstorms and shares strategies with the entire faculty. In addition, the Reading teacher shares the FAIR scores with the ELA teachers to ensure that they assist struggling students as evidenced by the data. In support of the district's reading goals and our school-based reading goals, we have established a bi-weekly protocol whereby each PLC investigates into our Reading deficiencies and discusses ways/strategies to close the gaps. Each PLC reviews data to ensure that reading in the content area is consistent with our school goals. The monitoring team meets with the teachers during Quarterly Curriculum Reviews to formulate plans for effective implementation of targeted reading goals and gauge the progress on targets set on the IPDP. The main goal is to continuously address the instructional rigor in our reading curriculum and the way in which it is being delivered across all content and grade levels to provide next steps for improving the reading achievement of all students/subgroups.

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

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?
Collaboration during PLC – Perused data from common assessments, identify areas of concern and share strategies to address the weak areas.
Use Benchmark baseline data to implement mini focus lessons
The LLT will focus on reading and writing across the content areas, targeted reading strand instruction through FCIM, and authentic reading experiences.

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.

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

Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition
Describe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs as applicable.

Grades 6-12 Only Sec. 1003.413 (2)(b) F.S
For schools with grades 6-12, how does the school ensure that every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student?

The Reading Coach will meet with the reading department during the PLC meetings to present strategies for reading in the content area. Teachers will share reading strategies during PLC, and the Reading coach will assist with understanding reading across all content areas. Our teachers are content experts, however; getting content across is sometimes a challenge in some classrooms; strategies that work best to decode difficult passages and to derive meaningful experiences from interaction with the text are shared with all subject areas. Teachers not directly in an ELA or Reading subject, particularly the Social Studies teachers, are seeking Content-Area Reading professional development to ensure our students receive consistent training across the curriculum to read any passage in any subject with clarity. We plan to have faculty learning meetings to ensure that everyone understands all contexts in which teaching and learning occurs. We discuss all aspects of content literacy instruction across the curriculum while ensuring that everyone understands the relationship between reading and learning. In addition, teachers are required to provide students with reading strategies for any and every piece of text read in class. All professional development includes reading strategies and creating an instructional tool box for teachers.

High Schools Only

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

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

Ninth- grade teacher teams meet weekly to discuss cross-curricular connections and to develop interdisciplinary units. Teachers within each small learning community work to develop cross-curricular connections, making these transparent to their students during lessons and discussions. SLC teachers work to support each other in the areas of mathematics and science, social studies, and writing to assist students in seeing the relationships between subjects.

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?

Robert E. Lee High School is divided into 4 learning communities: Business and Logistics, Early College, Liberal Arts and SEAM (Science Engineering Academy Magnet). Students choose their learning community either through magnet application or registration. Course progressions are set in each learning community with the intent of providing students a meaningful course of study and experiences to prepare them for future studies or employment in their areas of interest.

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

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.
Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.
Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public post-secondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report.
Students at Robert E. Lee High School meet twice per year with their guidance counselors during their 9th through 11th grade years. As 12th graders, they meet with their guidance counselors to discuss SAT/ACT registration, financial aid, scholarships and college applications in both the fall and spring semesters. Counselors host a Financial Aid night each spring to assist families in the financial aid process and provide one-on-one assistance to all seniors during Beacon, which is a cooperative project with the local universities to help students register for college financial aid, in February of each year. Robert E. Lee High School is a Jacksonville Commitment school and, therefore, has a college counselor on staff Tuesdays and Thursdays who assists with college searches and applications, as well as scholarship searches and applications in the College and Career Room.
Additionally, all 10th and 11th graders will be taking the PSAT in 2012. The PSAT has been offered to our Early College 9th graders to help assist guidance with college-readiness. The PSAT gives the student a chance to enter many competitions for prestigious scholarships and recognition programs conducted by the National Merit Scholarship Corporation scholarship programs. Students and parents have been provided with the National Merit website for more information. The PSAT is used to help students identify their strengths and it serves as a real-time practice test for an important college-entrance test, the SAT. The students PSAT/NMSQT can be used to estimate probable performance on the SAT. The scores will be helpful to the student in discussing his/her further education and choice of college with the guidance counselor.

Robert E. Lee's English IV teachers include the college application process as a major part of their first quarter instructions and assignments. Additionally, the school holds a 24-hour ACT preparatory practice session three times a year to give students practice on this Bright Futures qualifying test. Robert E. Lee High School's student mentoring program, the student ambassador program, incorporates college and career planning information into the monthly sessions coupled with leadership skills. With the help of Senate Bill 1908, Lee High School provides the Postsecondary Educational Readiness Test (PERT) for all juniors and seniors who have not taken a college-entrance exam in the spring of each year.

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

1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.	1A.1. Stagnation and boredom.	1A.1. Provide students choice in reading materials in order to build interest and confidence. Increase opportunities to read in all content area classrooms	1A.1. Intensive Reading Teachers Reading Coach Administrators	1A.1. Academic Journals, Book Discussions	1A.1. Portfolios, reading logs, book reviews.		
Reading Goal #1A: Robert E. Lee High School will increase the percentage of students showing proficiency in reading from that of 41% as shown on the 2012 FCAT to 46% as our target for 2013 FCAT	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	41 % (447)	*46%* *(500)*					

		1A.2. Students are embarrassed by their low levels of performance.	1A.2.Provide students opportunities to work in multiple settings	1A.2. Intensive Reading Teachers Reading Coach Administrators	1A.2.Student tracking via reading guides	1A.2.Student conferences	
		1A.3. Distractions	1A.3. Model fluent reading habits	1A.3.Intensive Reading Teachers Reading Coach Administrators	1A.3. Guided/shared reading	1A.3. Formative and Summative assessments based on the standards	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Reading Goal #1B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N	*N*					

		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.	2A.1. Stagnation and boredom.	2A.1. Provide students choice in reading materials in order to build interest and confidence. Increase opportunities to read in all content area classrooms	2A.1. ELA Teachers	2A.1. Academic Journals, Book Discussions	2A.1. Portfolios, reading logs, book reviews		
Reading Goal #2A: Robert E. Lee High School will increase the percentage of students showing above-proficiency in reading from that of 14% as shown on the 2012 FCAT to 19% as our target for 2013 FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	14 % (153)	*19% (207)*					
		2A.2. Lack of urgency among students for reading	2A.2. Provide students opportunities to work in multiple settings	2A.2. ELA Teachers	2A.2. Chunking/Peer evaluations	2A.2. Student conferences	
		2A.3. Distractions	2A.3. Model fluent reading habits	2A.3. ELA Teachers	2A.3.. Prompt analysis Relevancy writing	2A.3. Formative and Summative assessments based on the standards.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Reading Goal #2B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N	*N*					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	3.A.1. Students are embarrassed by their low levels of performance.	3.A.1. Provide students opportunities to work in multiple settings.	3.A.1. Intensive Reading Teachers	3.A.1. Guided and shared reading, Independent Literacy Exploration (ILE), creation of personal audio for books.	3.A.1. Paired Reading, PodCasts.		

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

Reading Goal #3A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
Robert E. Lee High School will increase the percentage of students showing reading gains from that of 56% as shown on the 2012 FCAT to our target of 61% on the 2013 FCAT.						
	56% (436)	*61% (567)*				
		3.A.2. Stamina	3.A.2. Chunking text	3.A.2. Intensive Reading Teachers	3.A.2. Expert groups jigsaw, power strategies, THIEVES.	3.A.2. Graphic organizers, presentations
		3.A.3. Distractions	3.A.3. Provide high-interest texts and student choice in reading materials.	3.A.3. Intensive Reading Teacher	3.A.3. Independent Reading Guides	3.A.3. Written evaluation of benchmarks

3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
Reading Goal #3B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N	*N*					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4.A.1 Cycle of defeat	4.A.1. Allow students to use different learning modalities to demonstrate knowledge.	4.A.1. Intensive Reading Teachers	4.A.1. Observation	4.A.1. Product		

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

Reading Goal #4A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Robert E. Lee High School will increase the percentage of students achieving within the lowest 25% from that of 57% as shown on the 2012 FCAT to that of 62% as shown on the 2013 FCAT							
	57% (169)	*62% (184)*					
		4.A.2. Low attendance rates	4.A.2. Contact parents of absentees. Refer excessive absences to the Truancy Office for follow-up	4.A.2. Intensive Reading Teachers, Attendance Administrator	4.A.2. Phone logs, observation of student presence.	4.A.2. Attendance contract and attendance records.	
		4.A.3 Discipline	4.A.3.Teach character and behavior.	4.A.3. Intensive Reading Teachers	4.A.3. Observations	4.A.3. Student contracts	

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

4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.**	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	
Reading Goal #4B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	N	*N*				
		4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	
		4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data** **2010-2011**						
Reading Goal #5A:							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5.B.1. Lack of support at home	5.B.1. Provide additional school support and tutoring; seek to involve/ inform parents in the intensive reading class.	5.B.1. Intensive Reading Teachers, tutors, guidance counselors.	5.B.1. Feedback from tutors	5.B.1. AVID, portfolios		

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

Reading Goal #5B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	White: 58% (143)	White: 68% (161)					
	Black: 24% (152)	Black: 34% (239)					
	Hispanic: N	Hispanic: N					
	Asian: N	Asian: N					
	American Indian: N	American Indian: N					
		5B.2. Separation of Groups	5B.2. Build community in the classroom	5B.2. Intensive Reading Teachers	5B..2. observation of behavior in different student groupings; team building activites (Minute to Win It)	5B.2. Adherence to classroom rules, respect for one another.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5.C.1. Lack of support at home	5.C.1. Provide additional school support and tutoring; seek to involve/ inform parents in the intensive reading class.	5C.1. Intensive Reading Teachers, tutors, guidance counselors.	5C.1. Feedback from tutors	5C.1. AVID, portfolios		
Reading Goal #5C: Robert E. Lee High School will increase the percentage of students achieving from that of 5% as shown for 2012 to 10% for year 2013	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	5% (2)	10%(4)				
		5C.2. Separation of Groups	5C.2. Build community in the classroom	5C.2. Intensive Reading Teachers	5C..2. observation of behavior in different student groupings; team building activities (Minute to Win It)	5C.2. Adherence to classroom rules, respect for one another.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5.D.1. Lack of support at home	5.D.1. Provide additional school support and tutoring; seek to involve/ inform parents in the intensive reading class.	5D.1. Intensive Reading Teachers, tutors, guidance counselors.	5D.1. Feedback from tutors	5D.1. AVID, portfolios		

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

Reading Goal #5D: Robert E. Lee High School will increase the percentage of students achieving from that of 20% as shown for 2012 to 25% for year 2013	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	20% (27)	25%(33)				
		5D.2. Separation of Groups	5D.2. Build community in the classroom	5D.2. Intensive Reading Teachers	5D..2. observation of behavior in different student groupings; team building activities (Minute to Win It)	5D.2. Adherence to classroom rules, respect for one another
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5E.1.	5E.1.We will target all students throughout the year for these subgroups: Words and Phrases, Compare and Contrast, Main Idea and Reference and Research	5E.1.Monitoring Team, PLC Team, Leaders and Department Head	5E.1Each PLC will develop focus lessons/mini lessons and modify as needed. The targeted benchmarks will be selected based on noted progress on student work, assessments, and other relevant datum.	5E.1District Benchmark, FAIR, formative and summative assessments.		
Reading Goal #5E: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	26% *(316)*	*31%* *(376)*					
		5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	
		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	

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

<u>**Reading Professional Development**</u>

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
Building Community within the classroom	9-12	Literacy Coach, Reading Dept Chair	PLC members	Early Dismissal	Share best practices at subsequent meetings; classroom observations Collaboration during PLC Faculty Meetings	Literacy Coach, Reading Department Chair
Collaborative planning with other schools	9-12	Reading Dept Chair Reading Coach	Reading Teachers/PLC members	Nov, 2012 January 2013 March 2013	Share best practices at subsequent meetings; classroom observations Collaboration during PLC Faculty Meetings	Literacy Coach, Reading Department Chair

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

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	Available Amount
Provide students with choice in reading materials.	Additional titles for classroom libraries	Internal	$1000.00
Subtotal:$1000.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Build fluency through assisted reading.	Read Aloud, CD's/Audio-books and headphones	internal	$500.00
Subtotal:$500.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Building community within our community.	Solution Tree Resources	Internal	$200.00
Subtotal:$200.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Grand Total:$1700.00			

End of Reading Goals

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

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

CELLA Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition					
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.	1.1. Lack of cultural references to make language connections	1.1. Link to known language to new terms: Rosetta Stone and language emersion courses in Reading.	1.1. ELL Support team	1.1.fluency and written tracking of words and phrases	1.1. Fluency tracker	
CELLA Goal #1:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					
Progress to written control of the English language and expression of complex ideas required in modern text analysis.						
	45%(35)					
		1.2. Isolation in peer groups in unknown customs and peer groups	1.2. Seasonal and regional reading material; provide and create relevant reading materials	1.2. Reading/ ELL support teams	1.2. formative sharing	1.2. project based compare/ contrast
		1.3.unfamilar materials, rituals and routines.	1.3. Alternative connection activities in a variety of performance assessments.	1.3. Reading Coach, ELL Administrator, ELL paraprofessionals.	1.3. A lessened dependence on phonetically spelled words.	1.3.Student engagement in English language and informal chatter

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

Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.	2.1. Lack of confidence in written forms of expression in complex text in the English language.	2.1. Scaffolded exercises in writing and a comparison of literature of the native language to the new material	2.1. ELL Support Team, Admin.	2.1. Student data chats, tutoring sessions, abbreviated work with targeted paragraphs of concern.	2.1. essays and analyzed text	
CELLA Goal #2: *Fully integration into honors courses and challenging coursework in the English courses.*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:					
	9%(7)					
		2.2. Lack of cultural knowledge and making the connections found in embedded ELA courses.	2.2. Non-fiction immersion to build background knowledge of periods of study for greater writing proficiency.	2.2. Ell Support, Team, paraprofessionals, Reading teachers and administrator	2.2. Student writes about newly integrated material with cultural connection for support and comparison/contrast.	2.2.Student creates his own KWL chart and adds to his own knowledge and expresses that in relevant comparisons and anecdotes in written matieral.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	
CELLA Goal #3: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
	14%(11)					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

<u>Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals</u>

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

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

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

	N	*N*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.**	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Mathematics Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N	*N*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.		
Mathematics Goal #3: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N	*N*					
		3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	
		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

4. **Florida Alternate Assessment:** **Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.**	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.		
Mathematics Goal #4: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N	*N*					
		4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	
		4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.	1. Lack of prerequisite knowledge.	1.1. Focus Lessons to begin each day based on strands.	1.1. Math Coach, Principal.	1.1. Classroom Observations, focused walks.	1.1. Progress on Mini-Assessments		

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

Algebra 1 Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
Robert E. Lee High School will increase the percentage of students showing proficiency in mathematics from that of 62% as shown on the 2012 Algebra I State EOC to that of 67% as shown on the 2013 Algebra I State EOC						
	62% (111)	*76% (135)*				
		2. Lack specialized instruction.	1.2. Mini assessments administered after each focus lesson cycle to determine specific areas of concern.	1.2. Math Coach, Principal.	1.2. Classroom Observations, focused walks.	1.2. Progress on Mini-Assessments

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

		3. Lack of specialized instruction.	1.3. Mini-lessons to review specific areas of weakness.	1.3. Math Coach, Principal.	1.3. Classroom Observations, focused walks.	1.3. Classroom Observations	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.	2.Lack of prerequisite knowledge.	2.1. Focus Lessons to begin each day based on strands.	2.1. Math Coach, Principal.	2.1. Classroom Observations, focused walks.	2.1. Progress on Mini-Assessments		

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

Algebra Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
Robert E. Lee High School will increase the percentage of students showing proficiency in mathematics from that of 62% as shown on the 2012 Algebra I State EOC to that of 67% as shown on the 2013 Algebra I State EOC						
	6% *(25)*	*20%* *(36)*				
		2.2. Lack specialized instruction.	2.2. Mini assessments administered after each focus lesson cycle to determine specific areas of concern.	2.2. Math Coach, Principal.	2.2 Classroom Observations, focused walks.	2.2. . Progress on Mini-Assessments

		2.3. Lack of specialized instruction.	2.3. Mini-lessons to review specific areas of weakness.	2.3. Math Coach, Principal.	2.3. Classroom Observations, focused walks.	2.3. Classroom Observations	

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**						
Algebra 1 Goal #3A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.**	3B.1. Lack of student motivation.	3B.1. Develop an incentives program to promote 3 and above student performance .	3B.1. Math coach Principal	3B.1. Offer students who meet the standards an incentive (may be an honor roll, luncheon, name in yearbook) in honor of their achievements.	3B.1. Benchmarks, mini assessments data, Algebra I data

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

Algebra 1 Goal #3B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Robert E. Lee High School will increase the percentage of students making that of 2012 Current Level of Performance as shown on the 2012 Algebra I State EOC to that of 2013 Current Level of Performance as shown on the 2013 Algebra I State EOC.							
	White:26%(19) Black:60%(44) Hispanic:4%(3) Asian:5%(4) American Indian:2%(1)	White:31% (22) Black:65%(47) Hispanic:9%(7) Asian:10%(8) American Indian:7%(5)					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3C.1. Unfamiliarity with the verbs and the ability to identify the verbs – which leads to confusion in answering the word problem questions.	3C.1. Teaching the words needed for operations and explaining the part of speech – with repetition and practice.	3C.1. Math department teachers, math coach, principal.	3C.1. Evaluation of student understanding through a variety of tests and vocabulary probing as evidenced on the TDL.	3C.1. TDL		
Algebra 1 Goal #3C: **To increase the cross-cultural proficiency of ELL students to understand the words, used in math and in other courses, and apply those words accordingly to achieve the desired operations and results, particularly action verbs in math.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	93% *(64)*	*98%* *(68)*					

		3C.2. Lack of math skill in the basic skills.	3C.2. Reinforcement of basic skills through intensive math, hand's on practice and computer-aided practice.	3C.2. Math department teachers, math coach, principal.	3C.2. Lab work, teacher summative and formative assessments, data chats	3C.2. mini-assessment, TDL	
		3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3D.1. Mainstreaming Math Anxiety Lack of Pre-Req	3D.1. Computerized and workbook practice	3D.1. Math Department Teachers Math Coach Principal	3D.1 Mini Assessments Lab work	3D.1 Data Chats Progress Monitoring Tool Peer to Peer Feedback		
Algebra 1 Goal #3D: _Enter narrative for the goal in this box._	2012 Current Level of Performance:* _Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box._	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* _Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box._					
		3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3E.1. Unfamiliarity with concepts and Pre-Re	3E.1.Computerized and workbook practice	3E.1. Math Department Teachers Math Coach Principal	3E.1.Mini Assessments Lab work	3E.1.Progress monitoring tool Progress reports		
Algebra 1 Goal #3E: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	26% *(21)*	*31%* *(25)*					
		3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	
		3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

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

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

Geometry EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.	1. Lack of prerequisite knowledge.	1.1. Focus Lessons to begin each day based on strands.	1.1. Math Coach, Principal.	1.1. Classroom Observations, focused walks.	1.1. Progress on Mini-Assessments		

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

Geometry Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
Robert E. Lee High School will increase the percentage of students showing proficiency in mathematics from that of 62% as shown on the 2012 Geometry State EOC to that of 67% as shown on the 2013 Geometry State EOC	*62%* *(313)*	*76%* *(385)*				

		2. Lack specialized instruction.	1.2. Mini assessments administered after each focus lesson cycle to determine specific areas of concern.	1.2. Math Coach, Principal.	1.2. Classroom Observations, focused walks.	1.2. Progress on Mini-Assessments	
		3. Lack of specialized instruction.	1.3. Mini-lessons to review specific areas of weakness.	1.3. Math Coach, Principal.	1.3. Classroom Observations, focused walks.	1.3. Classroom Observations	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.	4. Lack of prereq uisite knowle dge.	1.4 Focus Lessons based on strands and areas of concern.	1.4 Math Coach, Principal.	1.4. Classroom Observations, focused walks.	1.4.. Progress on Mini-Assessments		
Geometry Goal #2: Robert E. Lee High School will increase the percentage of students showing proficiency in mathematics from that of 62% as shown on the 2012 Geometry State EOC to that of 67% as shown on the 2013 Geometry State EOC	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	34% (151)	*40% (203)*					

		1.5 Lack specialized instruction with rigor	1.5 Mini assessments administered after each focus lesson cycle to determine specific areas of concern.	1.5 . Math Coach, Principal.	1.5 Classroom Observations, focused walks.	1.5. Progress on Mini-Assessments	
		1.6 Lack of specialized instruction	1.6 Mini-lessons to review specific areas of weakness.	1.6 Math Coach, Principal.	1.6 Classroom Observations, focused walks.	1.6 Classroom Observations	

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017		
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2011-2012**						
Geometry Goal #3A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.**	3A.1. Lack of prerequisite knowledge.	3A.1.. Focus Lessons to begin each day based on strands.	3A.1. Math Coach, Principal.	3A.1.. Classroom Observations, focused walks.	3A.1.. Progress on Mini-Assessments		
Geometry Goal #3B: Robert E. Lee High School will increase the percentage of students meeting the Geometry State EOC from that of 62% as shown on the 2012 Geometry State EOC to that of 67% on the 2013 Geometry State EOC. The other subgroups are non-reported.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: 5%(22) Black: 93%(409)) Hispanic:2%(8) Asian: American Indian:	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White:10%(44) Black:98%(432)5 Hispanic:7%(31) Asian: American Indian:				
			3B.2. Mini assessments administered after each focus lesson cycle to determine specific areas of concern.	3B.2. Math Coach, Principal.	3B.2. Classroom Observations, focused walks.	3B.2. Progress on Mini-Assessments
			3B.3. Mini-lessons to review specific areas of weakness.	3B.3. Math Coach, Principal.	3B.3. Classroom Observations, focused walks.	3B.3. Classroom Observations

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3C.1. Lack of prerequisite knowledge.	3C.1.. Focus Lessons to begin each day based on strands.	3C.1. Math Coach, Principal.	3C.1.. Classroom Observations, focused walks.	3C.1.. Progress on Mini-Assessments		
Geometry Goal #3C:

Students will improve their proficiency level by learning key English vocabulary that will bridge the language gap. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | *80%*

(55) | *85%*

(59) | | | | | |

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

		3C.2. Mini assessments administered after each focus lesson cycle to determine specific areas of concern.	3C.2. Math Coach, Principal.	3C.2. Classroom Observations, focused walks.	3C.2. Progress on Mini-Assessments	3C.2.	
		3C.3. Mini-lessons to review specific areas of weakness.	3C.3. Math Coach, Principal.	3C.3. Classroom Observations, focused walks.	3C.3. Classroom Observations	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. Lack of prerequisite knowledge.	3D.1.. Focus Lessons to begin each day based on strands.	3D.1. Math Coach, Principal.	3D.1.. Classroom Observations, focused walks.	3D.1.. Progress on Mini-Assessments		

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

Geometry Goal #3D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
Students will work with their ESE support teachers to learn key skills in learning strategies to overcoming barriers and will use those classes to practice skills and seek individual support.						
	89% *(150)*	*94%* *(159)*				
		3D.2	3D.2. . Mini assessments administered after each focus lesson cycle to determine specific areas of concern.	3D.2. Math Coach, Principal	3D.2. Classroom Observations, focused walks.	3D.2. . Progress on Mini-Assessments
		3D.3.	3D.3. Mini-lessons to review specific areas of weakness.	3D.3. Math Coach, Principal.	3D.3. Classroom Observations, focused walks.	3D.3. Classroom Observations

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.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.		
Geometry Goal #3E: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	80% *(351)*	*85%* *(374)*					
		3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	
		3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional

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

Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Algebra I Data Analysis, Development of Focus Calendar	Algebra I	Math Coach	Algebra I PLC	PLC meetings each Tuesday/Wednesday	Meeting minutes/ class data/ lesson plans/classroom observations	Math Coach, Math Department Chair, Principal
Targeted Strand Instruction	Algebra I	Math Coach	Algebra I PLC	PLC meetings each Tuesday/Wednesday	Meeting minutes/ Model Lessons/Classroom Observations	Math Coach, Math Department Chair, Principal
Algebra I and Geometry I Instructional Planning Workshop	Algebra I/Geometry	Math Coach	Both PLCs (Algebra and Geometry)	One day per quarter	Meeting minutes/ Model Lessons/Classroom Observations	Math Coach, Math Department Chair, Principal

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

<u>Mathematics Budget</u> (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	Available Amount
Subtotal: $0.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Teacher to teacher observations	TDE	Internal	TBD
Subtotal: $0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Grand Total			

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

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

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

	N	*N*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Science Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N	*N*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

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

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

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

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.	1. Inadequate labs for hands on activities due to temporary housing situation with portables.	1.1 Develop a plan to share formal lab space between biology classes	1. Instructional Coach	1. All classes getting to share in use of formal lab space	1.1. Lab summaries		

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

Biology 1 Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
Robert E. Lee High School will increase the percentage of students showing proficiency in science from that of 35% as shown on the 2012 FCAT to that of 40% as shown on the 2013 State Biology I EOC.						
	35% *(213)*	*40% (244)*				
		1.2. Require more expendable lab materials	1.2. Order necessary materials	1.2 Biology teachers, department chair	1.2. Hands-on activities with students	1.2. Lab summaries.	

		1.3 Limited content knowledge.	1.3. Instructional focus lessons.	1.3. Instructional coach	1.3 Exit slips, cohort teacher meetings, PLC collaboration	1.3. Tests, benchmarks (or equivalent), common assessments, formative testing	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		

Biology 1 Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N	*N*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

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

Science Professional Development

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Data analysis	9-12 Science PLC	Instructional Coach TFA colleagues District coach	Science PLC	*Early Dismissal *Biology TDE days	Weekly and quarterly PLC meetings	Instructional coach and PLC administration
Reading Strategies (across content areas)	9- 12 Science	Instructional Coach	Science PLC	Early release	Weekly classroom visits	Instructional coach and SLC administration
Content focus lessons	Biology Teachers	Instructional coach	Biology science teachers	Early Dismissal Days	Weekly classroom visits	Instructional coach

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district			

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Lab materials	Expendable lab materials	Internal	$2000
Functional equipment	Microscope repair	District	
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Research paper evaluation for plagiarism and grammar check	"Turn-It-In"	Internal	
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Instructional Days for biology teachers	TDE for biology teachers	SAI	
Increase content knowledge	AP Workshops (for all prospective AP teachers)		
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
JU Science & Math Engineering Day and science related field trips	Provide Buses for participating students	Internal	$400.00
Grand Total: $400.00			

End of Science Goals

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

Writing Goals

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

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

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

1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.	1A.1.With changes to the FCAT Writes evaluation system, we anticipate grammar, spelling, and mechanic errors will cost some students a full score level.	1A.1.ELA will pilot new writing process strategies to raise student awareness of common grammatical, spelling, and mechanical errors. (mini-lessons and heuristics on homophone errors.)	1A.1.ELA Department Chair during PLCs.	1A 1.Evaluation of student performance for common grammatical, spelling, and mechanical errors.	1A.1.District/Lee Writes, ELA PLC		

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

Writing Goal #1A: Robert E. Lee High School will increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency in writing from that of 89% scoring 4.0 and above on the 2012 FCAT Writes to that of 94% scoring 4.0 and above on the 2013 FCAT Writes.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	89% *(501)*	*94%* *(530)*					

		1. 1A.2. Transitions: The FCAT Writes rubric differentiates scores of 1, 2, and 3 from 4 through the effective and	1A.2. Mini-lessons and common assessments that intentionally reward students for the effective use of transitions.	1A.2. Social Studies, Science, and ELA Department Chairs	1A.2. Transitions positively affects writing scores in all kinds of writing. Therefore, a full implementation of strategy may be executed. Results should show improvement across disciplines in social studies, sciences, and English.	1A.2. Cross-curricular (cross PLC) sharing of student writing to allow social studies/science faculty. ELA writing assignments that double as science/social studies assignment.	

		1A.3	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
		Elaboration: The skill of elaborative support is most heavily weighted in FCAT Writes essay scoring (Focus = 1 point; Organization = 1 point; Conventions = 1 point; Support = 3 points)	Anchor sets allow students to examine and to score high-performing and low-performing essays; students should work at grading anchor sets as well as improving individual supporting paragraphs of anchor sets. Both ELA and Social Studies have a vested interest in training students	PLC leaders	Teachers will grade Support as a separate category apart from an overall score of each essay. We will monitor scores for improvement.	Cross-curricular (cross PLC) sharing of student writing to allow social studies/science faculty. ELA writing assignments that double as science/social studies assignment.	

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

1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Writing Goal #1B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N	*N*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Word Walls/ Vocabulary Lessons	9-10/ELA	Instructional Coach	School-wide faculty	Faculty Meetings	Classroom Walk-Throughs	Design Team
Teaching Transitions	9-10/ELA	PLC Leaders ELA Dept Teachers Instructional Coach	ELA and Social Studies Teachers	Instructional Days-- November	Classroom Walk-Throughs	Design Team