

# Florida Department of Education



# School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

2012-2013

## 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

### PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Marco Island Charter Middle School	District Name: Collier
Principal: George Abounader	Superintendent: Dr. Patton
SAC Chair: Tarik Ayasun	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)
----------	------	--------------------------------	--	---	---

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

Principal /CEO	George Abounader	B.A. Syracuse University M. Ed. Boston College	14	14	<p><b>FY12</b>  School Grade     A  Reading meeting standards   70% (285)  Math meeting standards       75% (307)  Writing meeting standards   91% (372)  Science meeting standards   69% (282)  Reading making gain         69% (282)  Math making gain             78% (319)  Reading Lowest 25% gain   52% (213)  Math Lowest 25% gain       68% (278)  Total Points                   659  AYP 95%</p> <p><b>FY11</b>  School Grade     A  Reading meeting standards   87% (318)  Math meeting standards       87% (318)  Writing meeting standards   97% (355)  Science meeting standards   77% (282)  Reading making gain         68% (249)  Math making gain             78% (285)  Reading Lowest 25% gain   70% (256)  Math Lowest 25% gain       71% (260)  Total Points                   635  AYP 95%</p> <p><b>FY10</b>  School Grade     A  Reading meeting standards   87%  Math meeting standards       86%  Writing meeting standards   97%  Science meeting standards   75%  Reading making gain         69%  Math making gain             79%  Reading Lowest 25% gain   72%  Math Lowest 25% gain       70%  Total Points                   635  Overall AYP: Yes</p> <p><b>FY09</b>  School Grade     A  Reading meeting standards   86%  Math meeting standards       89%  Writing meeting standards   100%  Science meeting standards   70%</p>
----------------	------------------	---	----	----	--

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

					<p>Reading making gain 74%</p> <p>Math making gain 80%</p> <p>Reading Lowest 25% gain 70%</p> <p>Math Lowest 25% gain 81%</p> <p>Total Points 650</p> <p>Overall AYP: Yes</p> <p><b>FY08</b></p> <p>School Grade A</p> <p>Reading meeting standards 83%</p> <p>Math meeting standards 89%</p> <p>Writing meeting standards 95%</p> <p>Science meeting standards 49%</p> <p>Reading making gain 71%</p> <p>Math making gain 82%</p> <p>Reading Lowest 25% gain 65%</p> <p>Math Lowest 25% gain 80%</p> <p>Total Points 614</p> <p>Overall AYP: Yes</p> <p><b>FY07</b></p> <p>School Grade A</p> <p>Reading meeting standards 76%</p> <p>Math meeting standards 84%</p> <p>Writing meeting standards 99%</p> <p>Science meeting standards 47%</p> <p>Reading making gain 62%</p> <p>Math making gain 75%</p> <p>Reading Lowest 25% gain 58%</p> <p>Math Lowest 25% gain 73%</p> <p>Total Points 574</p> <p>Overall AYP: Yes</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

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

Assistant Principal	Maureen Marcoux	B. S. University of Massachusetts MBA Anna Maria College CAGS Computer Science Anna Maria  MG Integrated 5-9 Business 6-12 English 6-12 Social Studies 6-12	14	14	
---------------------	-----------------	--	----	----	--

### 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)
	NONE				

### 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. Highly Qualified teachers are recruited through the interview process – we use various modes to advertise openings	Principal/Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
2. Structured Grade level teams made up of teachers and administrators	Principal/Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
3. New teachers attend an orientation at the district prior to pre-planning.	District	Ongoing	
4. Grade level teams provide mentoring and support	Grade Level Teams	Ongoing	

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

***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

***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 Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
25	8%	4%	68%	20%	36%	100%	16%	4%	28%

***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

**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.

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Title I, Part A
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
Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other

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

**School-Based MTSS/RtI Team**



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

Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.

The MTSS/RTI Leadership Team consists of the Administrative Team, ESE teacher, Teachers, and Gifted Coordinator.

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 MTSS team is the continuous improvement of the students and teachers. The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team ensures academic success for all students by providing high quality instruction and intervention matched to student needs. Through a data based problem solving process, a multi-tiered approach for addressing academic and behavior challenges is implemented. Ongoing examination and support is provided for all aspects of the school, including identifying methods and strategies to improve student achievement, school safety, school's culture, literacy, attendance, student social/emotional well-being, and prevention of student failure through interventions including ELO's, Instructional concern notices, homework club, Saturday school, etc.

The framework for implementation of MTSS/RtI provides a tiered-approach to instructional prevention and intervention that supports the utilization of all available resources to meet student needs. As students' needs increase in academic and behavior systems, the level of support (instruction and intervention) is intensified.

- All students in the general curriculum are included in the core instructional and behavior methodologies, practices and supports.
- Targeted students who need additional instructional and/or behavioral support are provided supplemental instruction and interventions in addition to and in alignment with the core curriculum utilizing best teaching practices, research-based interventions, and behavioral strategies.
- Students requiring intensive instructional and/or behavioral intervention to increase individual student's rate of progress will be provided intensive instruction and interventions aligned with the core curriculum. Individualized supplemental instruction and intervention will be based on ongoing evaluation to promote student growth as measured by benchmark and progress monitoring data, including FAIR testing.

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS 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 MTSS/RtI leadership team is responsible for determining the focus of our school improvement plan as we strive to make appropriate gains in all areas. The Leadership team facilitates trainings for the staff in areas such as Data Analysis, Differentiated Instruction, and PBS. The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team assists with the development of the plan and monitors the implementation.

### 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.

Data collection and data analysis will be utilized to design effective instructional teaching /learning practices and appropriate interventions to accelerate student achievement and determine appropriate interventions for all students. The process utilized is as follows:

- Ensure the effective delivery of the core instructional curriculum, including behavioral aspects, to meet student needs.
- Modify instructional methodology and delivery of instruction necessary to meet the needs of all students, including behavior management system.
- Revisit school-based resources to meet the needs of all students.
- Target professional development toward goals of meeting all students' needs.
- Monitor student growth to address and pinpoint areas of needs to increase individual student achievement academically and address behavioral needs.

We use Data Warehouse to enhance our data driven decision making in the problem solving MTSS/RtI process. For reading, the FAIR test is used for Universal Screening and weekly assessments are used to collect data; benchmark testing is also done in math, language arts, social studies and science. The 6-point rubric for writing will also be used to monitor the writing progress in 7th and 8th grade, while the new 4 point rubric will be used at 6th grade in preparation for the Common Core Standards. School-wide common assessments in all classes are also used.

Observations will be used to measure behavioral progress, as well as all data in the Student Pass System.

Students are expected to reach progress goals subsequent to quality instruction through differentiation and intervention strategies. Targeted skill populations are brought to the attention of the MTSS/RtI Leadership Team, and discussed at grade level team meetings. Progress is analyzed and those students who have not mastered the skills are considered for Tier 2 strategies. Online assessments and other data points are tracked on the charts and graphs in the Data Warehouse. In addition, any documentation provided by the teachers, recording benchmarks, other assessments and observations are shared.

Tier 3 interventions will be explored upon analysis of Tier 2 progression and Tier 3 interventions may result in a change line affecting the frequency of the intervention duration and grouping. Specific scientifically based research interventions will be implemented at all multi-levels of student support.

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

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

We have successfully utilized the Direct Steps online modules for RtI (now MTSS) training school wide. Continued training on Tier I strategies will accompany training on appropriate interventions. We will continue working with staff on technology, data analysis and strategies to differentiate instruction to better meet diverse learning needs. ANGEL is being used as an online facilitator for MTSS/RtI related documents, video clips, training materials and power points, research links, intervention tools, and has a district Problem Solving/Response to Intervention manual.

The grade level teams and department liaisons are charged with the responsibility to move MTSS/RtI practices at the school level. Teachers will meet weekly with their teams to discuss MTSS/RtI implementation at their grade level.

Describe plan to support MTSS.

The RTI/MTSS leadership group will meet regularly to analyze school academic and behavioral data and discuss areas of need as well as strengths. Using this data the team will identify school wide trends. This information will be used to drive weekly grade level team meetings so that teams can problem solve, develop and implement Tier 1 interventions. Grade level teams will determine the effectiveness of the interventions. Students in need of Tier 2 interventions will be identified. Grade level teams will record notes from these meetings and share this information with the MTSS Leadership team for review and evaluation. The intervention data will be monitored for student rate of progress and shared with the team.

Following the district model, we have adopted Marzano's comprehensive framework for effective instruction.

School-wide literacy initiatives will support Tier-I literacy and writing activities. The addition of an intensive math class for students scoring below proficiency will support Tier-I mathematics instruction.

Professional Development will be provided during in-service days, planning, and early release days. The MTSS/RTI team will also evaluate additional staff professional development needs during the RTI Leadership Team meetings.

### *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).

The Literacy Leadership Team will be comprised of three Reading teachers, three Language Arts teachers, the ELL teacher, the ESE Teacher, and the Administrative Team.

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

The Literacy Leadership Team functions by continuously diagnosing areas of student weakness, finding new ways to target low-achieving students, monitoring the successes and weaknesses of already existing strategies and implementations within the classroom, and developing increased communication and processes to ensure student participation in literacy.

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

- Support teachers in analyzing student assessment data.
- Increasing lesson rigor through the use of Webb's Depth of Knowledge.
- Focus on school wide PBS/MTSS and providing tiered interventions to insure the success of all students.

By utilizing the 3-Common Comprehension Strategies, Marzano vocabulary, team-authored focus calendars, and student data, literacy strategies will be a focus in all classrooms. Incorporating FCIM mini-lessons (PW Impact) in our Intensive Reading classes will be another initiative. Close Reading and Intertextual triads will be introduced in Language Arts, Social Studies and Science classrooms. The goal of the incorporation of such strategies is to increase the number of students scoring at or above level 3 on FCAT-Reading.

Across all ability levels, the LLT will focus upon the continued implementation of collaborative literacy strategies (THIEVES, Cornell Notes, and Student-generated higher-order thinking questions) along with the inclusion of close-reading strategies that will support the new Common Core Standards. The LLT will support the introduction of inter-textual triads across the content areas as well.

### ***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.

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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

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

Authentic and content specific literacy is the responsibility of all teachers. Although not every teacher is a reading teacher per se, all teachers are indeed comprehension teachers who convey information to their students via the written word. Of special emphasis are instructional strategies and professional development that ensure adequate scaffolding and student collaborative learning to support the goal of critical thinking. Students will receive direct and explicit instruction in pre-, during, and post reading comprehension strategies focused on helping them make meaningful connections with texts, including content area textbooks. Student peer-supported reading and independent reading complements the teacher's explicit instruction, with students accessing classroom collections of fiction and nonfiction books. In addition, students will be required to complete an extensive research unit on a topic of interest that will incorporate information literacy skills including technology and published products that will be shared in a pre-Laureate project.

Differentiated instruction can only truly occur if the teacher possesses a deep understanding of the reading process, and understanding of the strengths and needs of his/her students and the ability to teach responsively. All teachers have read Making Differentiation a Habit by Diane Heacox. They will use common planning time to examine student data and discuss what the data reveals about instructional practice. Two classroom sets of iPads were purchased over the summer. They will provide a way for teachers to provide each learner with activities suited to their learning needs. Teachers can use Dropbox to send documents and links to individual students' folders, which contain their individualized learning materials. They can also be used to provide extension activities for students who need higher-order thinking challenges. These can take the form of webquests, quizzes and polling, treasure hunts, and geocaching.

***\*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?

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

***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](#).

--

**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><b>1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.</b></p>	<p>1a.1. Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.</p>	<p>1a.1. Grade level teams will meet regularly for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions.  1b. Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.</p>	<p>1a.1. Administrative Team</p>	<p>1a.1. Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team.</p>	<p>1a.1. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Assessments</p>		
<p><b>Reading Goal #1a:</b>  Last year SY2012, at Marco Island Charter Middle School 70% (285) of our students achieved a level 3 on FCAT Reading. This year SY2013, 72% (323) will achieve a level 3 on FCAT.</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**

	70% (285) meeting high standards in Reading	72% (323) meeting high standards in Reading					
		1a.2. Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and non-fiction texts to build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	1a.2. Teachers will utilize a minimum of 50% non-fiction/informational text for instruction. Using the close reading model with intertextual triads, students will build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	1a.2. Administrative Team	1a.2. Teacher use of close reading and intertextual triads across all content will be monitored through class-room observations and study of lesson plans, monitor lesson plans to determine if teachers are planning for differentiated instruction, provide specific feedback and professional development as needed.	1a.2. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Assessments	
		1a.3. Students lack practice in utilizing informational text as it applies to gaining information from reading, applying the reading process, and interpreting information.	1a.3. Teachers will provide explicit instruction and practice in the use of text features to: locate information, compare details from informational sources, complete sequenced directions, and analyze information in graphs/charts.	1a.3. Administrative Team	1a.3. Progress monitoring data collected through Pre and Post-tests Benchmark Assessments Monitor lesson plans to determine if teachers are planning for differentiated instruction Provide specific feedback and professional development as needed	1a.3. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Assessments	
<b>1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.</b>	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.		



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

Reading Goal #1b: NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u> *	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u> *					
		1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	
		1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	
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><b>2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in reading.</b></p>	<p>2a.1. Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.</p>	<p>2a.1. Grade level teams will meet regularly for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions.  1b. Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.</p>	<p>2a.1. Administrative Team</p>	<p>2a.1. Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team.</p>	<p>2a.1. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Assessments</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #2a:</u>  Last year SY2012, at Marco Charter Middle School 39% (162) of our students achieved a level 4 or 5 on FCAT Reading. This year SY2013, 41% (167) will achieve a level 4 or 5 on FCAT.</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**

	39% (162) of our students achieved a level 4 or 5 on FCAT Reading.	41% (167) of our students will achieve a level 4 or 5 on FCAT Reading.					
		2a.2. Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and non-fiction texts to build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	2a.2. Teachers will utilize a minimum of 50% non-fiction/informational text for instruction. Using the close reading model with intertextual triads, students will build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	2a.2. Administrative Team	2a.2. Teacher use of close reading and intertextual triads across all content will be monitored through class-room observations and study of lesson plans, monitor lesson plans to determine if teachers are planning for differentiated instruction, provide specific feedback and professional development as needed.	2a.2. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Assessments	
		2a.3. Students lack practice in utilizing informational text as it applies to gaining information from reading, applying the reading process, and interpreting information.	2a.3. Teachers will provide explicit instruction and practice in the use of text features to: locate information, compare details from informational sources, complete sequenced directions, and analyze information in graphs/charts.	2a.3. Administrative Team	2a.3. Progress monitoring data collected through Pre and Post-tests Benchmark Assessments Monitor lesson plans to determine if teachers are planning for differentiated instruction Provide specific feedback and professional development as needed	2a.3. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Assessments	

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

<p><b>2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.</b></p>	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.		
<p>Reading Goal #2b: NA</p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p>					
		2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	
		2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.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><b>3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.</b></p>	<p>3a.1. Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.</p>	<p>3a.1. Grade level teams will meet regularly for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions.  Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.</p>	<p>3a.1. Administrative Team</p>	<p>3a.1. Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team.</p>	<p>3a.1. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Assessments</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #3a:</u>  Last year SY2012, at Marco Charter Middle School 69% (282) of our students made learning gains on FCAT Reading. This year SY2013, 71% (318) will make learning gains on FCAT Reading.</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**

	69% (282) of our students made learning gains on FCAT Reading.	71% (318) of our students will make learning gains on FCAT Reading.					
		3a.2. Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and non-fiction texts to build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	3a.2. Teachers will utilize a minimum of 50% non-fiction/informational text for instruction. Using the close reading model with intertextual triads, students will build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	3a.2. Administrative Team	3a.2. Teacher use of close reading and intertextual triads across all content will be monitored through class-room observations and study of lesson plans, monitor lesson plans to determine if teachers are planning for differentiated instruction, provide specific feedback and professional development as needed.	3a.2. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Assessments	
		3a.3. Students lack practice in utilizing informational text as it applies to gaining information from reading, applying the reading process, and interpreting information.	3a.3. Teachers will provide explicit instruction and practice in the use of text features to: locate information, compare details from informational sources, complete sequenced directions, and analyze information in graphs/charts.	3a.3. Administrative Team	3a.3. Progress monitoring data collected through Pre and Post-tests Benchmark Assessments Monitor lesson plans to determine if teachers are planning for differentiated instruction Provide specific feedback and professional development as needed	3a.3. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Assessments	

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

<b>3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.</b>	3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.		
Reading Goal #3b: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	
		3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p><b>4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b></p>	<p>4a.1. Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.</p>	<p>4a.1. Grade level teams will meet regularly for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions.  Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.</p>	<p>4a.1. Administrative Team</p>	<p>4a.1. Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team</p>	<p>4a.1. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Testing</p>		
<p><b>Reading Goal #4a:</b>  Last year SY2012, at Marco Charter Middle School 52% (47) of our lowest 25% students made learning gains on FCAT Reading. This year SY2013, 60% (67) will make learning gains on FCAT Reading.</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**

	52% (47) of our lowest 25% students made learning gains on FCAT Reading.	60% (67) of our lowest 25% students made learning gains on FCAT Reading.					
		4a.2. Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and non-fiction texts to build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	4a.2. Teachers will utilize a minimum of 50% non-fiction/informational text for instruction. Using the close reading model with intertextual triads, students will build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	4a.2. Administrative Team	4a.2. Teacher use of close reading and intertextual triads across all content will be monitored through class-room observations and study of lesson plans, monitor lesson plans to determine if teachers are planning for differentiated instruction, provide specific feedback and professional development as needed.	4a.2. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Assessments	
		4a.3. Students lack practice in utilizing informational text as it applies to gaining information from reading, applying the reading process, and interpreting information.	4a.3. Teachers will provide explicit instruction and practice in the use of text features to: locate information, compare details from informational sources, complete sequenced directions, and analyze information in graphs/charts.	4a.3. Administrative Team	4a.3. Progress monitoring data collected through Pre and Post-tests Benchmark Assessments Monitor lesson plans to determine if teachers are planning for differentiated instruction Provide specific feedback and professional development as needed	4a.3. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Assessments	

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

<p><b>4b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b></p>	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.		
<p>Reading Goal #4b: NA</p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p>					
		4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	
		4b.3	4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	
<p>Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target</p>	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	

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

<b>5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>	All 82% White 84% Black 85% Hispanic 75% Asian 80% Amer.Indian 78% ELL 88% SWD 100% Econ.Dis 73%	83% (47) White 85% Black 85% (19) Hispanic 89% Asian 80% Amer.Indian 78% (8) Asian 89% ELL 89% (9) Amer.Indian 100% ELL 62% (10) SWD 100% (45) Econ.Dis 75% (65)	All 85% White 87% Black 88% Hispanic 80% Asian 82% Amer.Indian 66% ELL 66% SWD 100% Econ.Dis 78%	All 87% White 88% Black 89% Hispanic 82% Asian 84% Amer.Indian 69% ELL 69% SWD 100% Econ.Dis 78%	All 88% White 90% Black 91% Hispanic 85% Asian 86% ELL 73% SWD 100% Econ.Dis 83%	All 90% White 91% Black 92% Hispanic 87% Asian 88% Amer.Indian 77% ELL 77% SWD 100% Econ.Dis 85%
	<b>Reading Goal #5A:</b>  In 6 years the achievement gap will be reduced by 50%.						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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><b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b></p>	<p>5B.1. Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.</p>	<p>5B.1. Grade level teams will meet regularly for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions.  Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.</p>	<p>5B.1. Administrative Team</p>	<p>5B.1. Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team</p>	<p>5B.1. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Testing</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #5B:</u>  The percent of students achieving level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT in reading in each ethnic subgroup will increase by 10% of the percentage not currently proficient. (See individual subgroups for specific current and expected percentages.)</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**

	<p>All 70%                  White 76%                  Black 67%                  Hispanic 51%                  Asian 78%</p>	<p>All 77%                  White 84%                  Black 74%                  Hispanic 56%                  Asian 86%</p>					
		<p>5B.2.                  Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and non-fiction texts to build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.</p>	<p>5B.2.                  Teachers will utilize a minimum of 50% non-fiction/informational text for instruction. Using the close reading model with intertextual triads, students will build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.</p>	<p>5B.2.                  Administrative Team</p>	<p>5B.2.                  Teacher use of close reading and intertextual triads across all content will be monitored through class-room observations and study of lesson plans, monitor lesson plans to determine if teachers are planning for differentiated instruction, provide specific feedback and professional development as needed.</p>	<p>5B.2.                  Progress Monitoring Benchmark Assessments</p>	
		<p>5B.3.                  Students lack practice in utilizing informational text as it applies to gaining information from reading, applying the reading process, and interpreting information.</p>	<p>5B.3.                  Teachers will provide explicit instruction and practice in the use of text features to: locate information, compare details from informational sources, complete sequenced directions, and analyze information in graphs/charts.</p>	<p>5B.3.                  Administrative Team</p>	<p>5B.3.                  Progress monitoring data collected through Pre and Post-tests Benchmark Assessments Monitor lesson plans to determine if teachers are planning for differentiated instruction Provide specific feedback and professional development as needed</p>	<p>5B.3.                  Progress Monitoring Benchmark Assessments</p>	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<p><b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b></p>	<p>5C.1. Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.</p>	<p>5C.1. Grade level teams will meet regularly for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions.</p> <p>Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.</p>	<p>5C.1. Administrative Team</p>	<p>5C.1. Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team</p>	<p>5C.1. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Testing</p>		

**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>					
Last year SY2012, at Marco Island Charter Middle School 48% of our English Language Learners achieved a level 3 or above on FCAT Reading. This year SY2013, 53% will achieve a level 3 or above on FCAT Reading.							
	ELL 48%	ELL 53%					
		5C.2. Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and non-fiction texts to build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	5C.2. Teachers will utilize a minimum of 50% non-fiction/informational text for instruction. Using the close reading model with intertextual triads, students will build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	5C.2. Administrative Team	5C.2. Teacher use of close reading and intertextual triads across all content will be monitored through class-room observations and study of lesson plans, monitor lesson plans to determine if teachers are planning for differentiated instruction, provide specific feedback and professional development as needed.	5C.2. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Assessments	

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

		5C.3. Students lack practice in utilizing informational text as it applies to gaining information from reading, applying the reading process, and interpreting information.	5C.3. Teachers will provide explicit instruction and practice in the use of text features to: locate information, compare details from informational sources, complete sequenced directions, and analyze information in graphs/charts.	5C.3. Administrative Team	5C.3. Progress monitoring data collected through Pre and Post-tests Benchmark Assessments Monitor lesson plans to determine if teachers are planning for differentiated instruction Provide specific feedback and professional development as needed	5C.3. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Assessments	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		



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

<p><b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b></p>	<p>5D.1. Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.</p>	<p>5D.1. Grade level teams will meet regularly for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions.  Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.</p>	<p>5D.1. Administrative Team</p>	<p>5D.1. Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team</p>	<p>5D.1. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Testing</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #5D:</u>  Last year SY2012, at Marco Island Charter Middle School 34% (16) of our Students with Disabilities achieved a level 3 or above on FCAT Reading. This year SY2013, 37% (17) will make achieve a 3 or above on FCAT Reading.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>SWD 34%</p>	<p>SWD 37%</p>					

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

		5D.2. Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and non-fiction texts to build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	5D.2. Teachers will utilize a minimum of 50% non-fiction/informational text for instruction. Using the close reading model with intertextual triads, students will build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	5D.2. Administrative Team	5D.2. Teacher use of close reading and intertextual triads across all content will be monitored through class-room observations and study of lesson plans, monitor lesson plans to determine if teachers are planning for differentiated instruction, provide specific feedback and professional development as needed.	5D.2. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Assessments	
		5D.3. Students lack practice in utilizing informational text as it applies to gaining information from reading, applying the reading process, and interpreting information.	5D.3. Teachers will provide explicit instruction and practice in the use of text features to: locate information, compare details from informational sources, complete sequenced directions, and analyze information in graphs/charts.	5D.3. Administrative Team	5D.3. Progress monitoring data collected through Pre and Post-tests Benchmark Assessments Monitor lesson plans to determine if teachers are planning for differentiated instruction Provide specific feedback and professional development as needed	5D.3. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Assessments	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p><b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b></p>	<p>5E.1. Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.</p>	<p>5E.1. Grade level teams will meet regularly for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions.  Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.</p>	<p>5E.1. Administrative Team</p>	<p>5E.1. Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team</p>	<p>5E.1. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Testing</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #5E:</u>  Last year SY2012, at Marco Island Charter Middle School 51% (44) of our Economically Disadvantaged Students achieved a level 3 or above on FCAT Reading. This year SY2013, 56% will make achieve a 3 or above on FCAT Reading.</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**

	Eco.Dis 51%	Eco.Dis 56%					
		5E.2. Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and non-fiction texts to build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	5E.2. Teachers will utilize a minimum of 50% non-fiction/informational text for instruction. Using the close reading model with intertextual triads, students will build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	5E.2. Administrative Team	5E.2. Teacher use of close reading and intertextual triads across all content will be monitored through class-room observations and study of lesson plans, monitor lesson plans to determine if teachers are planning for differentiated instruction, provide specific feedback and professional development as needed.	5E.2. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Assessments	
		5E.3. Students lack practice in utilizing informational text as it applies to gaining information from reading, applying the reading process, and interpreting information.	5E.3. Teachers will provide explicit instruction and practice in the use of text features to: locate information, compare details from informational sources, complete sequenced directions, and analyze information in graphs/charts.	5E.3. Administrative Team	5E.3. Progress monitoring data collected through Pre and Post-tests Benchmark Assessments Monitor lesson plans to determine if teachers are planning for differentiated instruction Provide specific feedback and professional development as needed	5E.3. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Assessments	

**Reading Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through</b>						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

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

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

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

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

*End of Reading Goals*

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

<b>CELLA Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition</b>					
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
<b>1. Students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking.</b>	1.1 Students have insufficient background knowledge of US cultural norms and content specific vocabulary to fully understand oral language.	1.1 Teachers will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations for participation in oral language opportunities.	1.1 ELL Specialist	1.1 Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Team meeting minutes documenting data analysis and its impact on instruction	1.1 Teacher made Pre/Post Tests Formative Assessments CELLA	

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

<p><b>CELLA Goal #1:</b></p> <p>The percentage of students scoring proficient in listening/speaking on the CELLA will increase from the current percent of 67% (4) to the expected 74% (4).</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</u></p>					
	<p>67% (4)</p>					
		<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>
		<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</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><b>2. Students scoring proficient in Reading.</b></p>	<p>2.1 ELL students experience delays in acquisition of reading skills due to limited vocabulary, limited experience to build background knowledge, limited English usage in the home and in many cases, illiteracy in the home.</p>	<p>2.1 Employ checks for understanding that include 1:1 questioning with the student or written responses to text dependent questions to determine student's level of understanding of what was read.</p>	<p>2.1 ELL Specialist</p>	<p>2.1 Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Team meeting minutes documenting data analysis and its impact on instruction</p>	<p>2.1 Teacher made Pre/Post Tests Formative Assessments CELLA</p>	

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

<p><u>CELLA Goal #2:</u></p> <p>The percentage of students scoring proficient in reading on the CELLA will increase from the current percent of 50% (3) to the expected 55% (3).</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :</u></p>					
	<p>50% (3)</p>					
		<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>
		<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>
<p>Students write in English at grade level 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><b>3. Students scoring proficient in Writing.</b></p>	<p>3.1. Students do not have opportunities for authentic conversations and evaluation of their own or others writing.</p>	<p>3.1. To develop strategic and extended thinking in regard to student writing, teachers will provide opportunities for peer evaluation of students' writing based on the writing rubric. Students will be accountable for defending their thinking based on specific examples from the writing and their understanding of expectations for quality writing, providing recommendations for improving the writing.</p>	<p>3.1 ELL Specialist</p>	<p>3.1 Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Team meeting minutes documenting data analysis and its impact on instruction</p>	<p>3.1 Teacher made Pre/Post Tests Formative Assessments CELLA</p>	



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

<b>CELLA Goal #3:</b> The percentage of students scoring proficient in writing on the CELLA will increase from the current percent of 83% (5) to the expected 91% (5).	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

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

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

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

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

*End of CELLA Goals*

**Mathematics Goals**

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

<b>Mathematics Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase</b>						
--------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

	<b>Student Achievement</b>						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.</b>	1a.1. Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	1a.1. Grade level teams will meet regularly for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions.  Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.	1a.1. Administrative Team	1a.1. Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team	1a.1. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Testing		

**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>					
The percentage of students scoring level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 75% (307) to 77% (346) scoring at proficient levels.							
	75% (307)	77% (346)					
		1a.2. Assessment data indicates that many students lack fluency in essential mathematics skills necessary to demonstrate mastery on FCAT 2.0 benchmarks.	1a.2. All students who score a level 1 or 2 on the math FCAT will be enrolled in an Intensive Math course in addition to their grade level math course to provide targeted interventions to increase student achievement and fluency in mathematics.	1a.2 Administrative Team	1a.2 Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team	1a.2 Progress Monitoring Benchmark Testing	
		1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.	
<b>1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</b>							

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

<u>Mathematics Goal #1b:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
NA							
	<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>					
		1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	
		1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p><b>2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>2a.1. Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.</p>	<p>2a.1. Grade level teams will meet regularly for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.</p>	<p>2a.1. Administrative Team</p>	<p>2a.1. Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team</p>	<p>2a.1. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Testing</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #2a:</u>  The percent of students scoring above proficiency (levels 4 and 5) on the 2013 FCAT in mathematics will increase from 37% (156) to 38% (170).</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>37% (156)</p>	<p>38% (170)</p>					

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

		2a.2. Students are not held accountable for giving critical, independent and creative responses to higher order questions.	2a.2. Teachers will maintain high expectations for students' responses to higher order questions, determining in advance of the lesson the level of response that demonstrates mastery of the standard/ benchmark cognitive complexity rating.	2a.2 Administrative Team	2a.2 Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team	2a.2 Progress Monitoring Benchmark Testing	
		2a.3	2a.3	2a.3	2a.3	2a.3	
<b>2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.</b>	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #2b:</u> NA	<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**

		2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	
		2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.</b>	3a.1. Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	3a.1. Grade level teams will meet regularly for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.	3a.1. Administrative Team	3a.1. Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team	3a.1. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Testing		



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

<u>Mathematics Goal #3a:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance-*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance-*</u>					
The percent of students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT in mathematics will increase from 78% (319) to 80% (359).							
	78% (319)	80% (359)					
		3a.2. Students are not held accountable for giving critical, independent and creative responses to higher order questions.	3a.2. Teachers will maintain high expectations for students' responses to higher order questions, determining in advance of the lesson the level of response that demonstrates mastery of the standard/ benchmark cognitive complexity rating.	3a.2 Administrative Team	3a.2 Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team	3a.2 Progress Monitoring Benchmark Testing	
		3a.3.	3a.3.	3a.3.	3a.3.	3a.3.	

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

<p><b>3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.</b></p>	3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #3b:</u> NA</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
		3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	
		3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.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>	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><b>4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>4a.1. Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.</p>	<p>4a.1. Grade level teams will meet regularly for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions.  Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.</p>	<p>4a.1. Administrative Team</p>	<p>4a.1. Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team</p>	<p>4a.1. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Testing</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #4a:</u> The percent of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT in mathematics will increase from 68% (278) to 70% (314).</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>68% (278)</p>	<p>70% (314)</p>					

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

		4a.2. Assessment data indicates that many students lack fluency in essential mathematics skills necessary to demonstrate mastery on FCAT 2.0 benchmarks.	4a.2. All students who score a level 1 or 2 on the math FCAT will be enrolled in an Intensive Math course in addition to their grade level math course to provide targeted interventions to increase student achievement and fluency in mathematics.	4a.2 Administrative Team	4a.2 Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team	4a.2 Progress Monitoring Benchmark Testing	
		4a.3	4a.3.	4a.3.	4a.3.	4a.3.	
<b>4b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b>	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#4b:</u>	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>					
NA							
		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**

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017		
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target								
<b>5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b> All White Black Hispanic Asian Amer.Indian ELL SWD Econ.Dis 73%	All White Black Hispanic Asian Amer.Indian ELL SWD Econ.Dis 75%	84% 85% 86% 80% 79% 82% 62% 58% 78%	85% 87% 86% 80% 79% 82% 62% 58% 78%	87% 88% 88% 82% 82% 66% 63% 80%	88% 89% 89% 84% 84% 69% 67% 82%	90% 91% 91% 86% 86% 73% 71% 85%	91% 92% 92% 88% 88% 77% 75% 87%
<u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u>  In 6 years the achievement gap will be reduced by 50%.								
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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><b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>5b.1. Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.</p>	<p>5b.1. Grade level teams will meet regularly for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions.  Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.</p>	<p>5b.1. Administrative Team</p>	<p>5b.1. Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team</p>	<p>5b.1. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Testing</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u> The percent of students achieving level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT in mathematics in each ethnic subgroup will increase by 10% of the percentage not currently proficient. (See individual subgroups for specific current and expected percentages.)</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: 78% Black: 67% Hispanic: 65% Asian: 89% American Indian:	White: 86% Black: 74% Hispanic: 72% Asian: 98% American Indian:					
		5b.2. Assessment data indicates that many students lack fluency in essential mathematics skills necessary to demonstrate mastery on FCAT 2.0 benchmarks.	5b.2. All students who score a level 1 or 2 on the math FCAT will be enrolled in an Intensive Math course in addition to their grade level math course to provide targeted interventions to increase student achievement and fluency in mathematics.	5b.2 Administrative Team	5b.2 Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team	5b.2 Progress Monitoring Benchmark Testing	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		



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

<p><b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>5c.1. Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.</p>	<p>5c.1. Grade level teams will meet regularly for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.</p>	<p>5c.1. Administrative Team</p>	<p>5c.1. Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team</p>	<p>5c.1. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Testing</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u>  The percent of English language learners (ELL) achieving level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT in mathematics will increase from 63% (3) to 69% (4).</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>63% (3)</p>	<p>69% (4)</p>					

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

		5c.2. Assessment data indicates that many students lack fluency in essential mathematics skills necessary to demonstrate mastery on FCAT 2.0 benchmarks.	5c.2. All students who score a level 1 or 2 on the math FCAT will be enrolled in an Intensive Math course in addition to their grade level math course to provide targeted interventions to increase student achievement and fluency in mathematics.	5c.2 Administrative Team	5c.2 Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team	5c.2 Progress Monitoring Benchmark Testing	
		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		

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

<p><b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>5d.1. Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.</p>	<p>5d.1. Grade level teams will meet regularly for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.</p>	<p>5d.1. Administrative Team</p>	<p>5d.1. Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team</p>	<p>5d.1. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Testing</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u>  The percent of students with disabilities (SWD) achieving level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT in mathematics will increase from 32% (15) to 35% (16).</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**

		5d.2. Assessment data indicates that many students lack fluency in essential mathematics skills necessary to demonstrate mastery on FCAT 2.0 benchmarks.	5d.2. All students who score a level 1 or 2 on the math FCAT will be enrolled in an Intensive Math course in addition to their grade level math course to provide targeted interventions to increase student achievement and fluency in mathematics.	5d.2 Administrative Team	5d.2 Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team	5d.2 Progress Monitoring Benchmark Testing	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p><b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>5e.1. Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.</p>	<p>5e.1. Grade level teams will meet regularly for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.</p>	<p>5e.1. Administrative Team</p>	<p>5e.1. Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team</p>	<p>5e.1. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Testing</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #5E:</u>  The percent of economically disadvantaged students achieving level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT in mathematics will increase from 55% to 61%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>55%</p>	<p>61%</p>					

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

		5e.2. Assessment data indicates that many students lack fluency in essential mathematics skills necessary to demonstrate mastery on FCAT 2.0 benchmarks.	5e.2. All students who score a level 1 or 2 on the math FCAT will be enrolled in an Intensive Math course in addition to their grade level math course to provide targeted interventions to increase student achievement and fluency in mathematics.	5e.2 Administrative Team	5e.2 Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team	5e.2 Progress Monitoring Benchmark Testing	
		5E.3	5E.3	5E.3	5E.3	5E.3	

**Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals**

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

		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		
<b>4. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b>	4.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.		
<b>Mathematics Goal #4:</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
NA							
		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 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals**

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

<b>Algebra EOC Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra.</b>	1.1. Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	1.1. Grade level teams will meet regularly for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions.  Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.	1.1. Administrative Team	1.1. Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team	1.1. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Testing		

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

<p><u>Algebra Goal #1:</u> On the 2013 Algebra End-of-Course Exam, the percentage of students scoring achievement level 3 or higher will be 100%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>100% (41)</p>	<p>100% (46)</p>					
		<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	
		<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</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><b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra.</b></p>	<p>2.1. Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.</p>	<p>2.1. Grade level teams will meet regularly for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions.  Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.</p>	<p>2.1. Administrative Team</p>	<p>2.1. Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team</p>	<p>2.1. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Testing</p>		

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

<u>Algebra Goal #2:</u> The number of students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in Algebra will increase from 88% to 90%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	88% (36)	90% (41)					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>	<b>2014-2015</b>	<b>2015-2016</b>	<b>2016-2017</b>	
<b>3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>						
<u>Algebra Goal #3A:</u> NA 100% of students were proficient							
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**

<b>3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.</b>	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
<b>Algebra Goal #3B:</b> NA 100% of students were proficient	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.</b>	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.		
<b>Algebra Goal #3C:</b> NA 100% of students were proficient	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
		3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	
		3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.</b>	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.		
<u>Algebra Goal #3D:</u> NA 100% of students were proficient	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
		3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.</b>	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.		
<u>Algebra Goal #3E:</u> NA 100% of students were proficient	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

		3E.2.	3E.2	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	
		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)).

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

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

<u>Geometry Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
NA							
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.</b>	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
<u>Geometry Goal #2:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
NA							
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>	<b>2014-2015</b>	<b>2015-2016</b>	<b>2016-2017</b>	
<b>3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>						



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

<u>Geometry Goal #3A:</u> NA							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.</b>	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
<u>Geometry Goal #3B:</u> NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.</b>	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.		

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

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

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

		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		
<b>3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.</b>	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.		
<u>Geometry Goal #3E:</u> NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
		3E.2.	3E.2	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	
		3E.3	3E.3	3E.3	3E.3	3E.3	

*End of Geometry EOC Goals*

**Mathematics Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional</b>							
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

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

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

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

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

*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)).

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

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

<p><b>1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.</b></p>	<p>1.1. Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.</p>	<p>1.1. Grade level teams will meet regularly for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions.  Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.</p>	<p>1.1. Administrative Team</p>	<p>1.1. Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team</p>	<p>1.1. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Testing</p>		
<p><u>Science Goal #1a:</u>  The percent of students scoring level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT in science will increase from the current level of performance 68% (86) to the expected level of performance 70% (104).</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>68% (86)</p>	<p>70% (104)</p>					

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

		1.2. Student lack of hands on scientific experience, scientific vocabulary and decoding scientific questions on FCAT 2.0 Assessment.	1.2. Provide hands-on experiences to all science students through lab experiments and interactive virtual labs. Provide technology, software, and iPads for student use in science classes.	1.2. Administrative Team	1.2. Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team	1.2. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Testing	
		1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.	
<b>1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Level 4, 5, and 6 in science.</b>	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.		
Science Goal #1b: NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
		1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	
		1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<p><b>2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.</b></p>	<p>2.1. Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.</p>	<p>2.1. Grade level teams will meet regularly for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions.</p> <p>Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.</p>	<p>2.1. Administrative Team</p>	<p>2.1. Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team</p>	<p>2.1. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Testing</p>		
<p><u>Science Goal #2a:</u> The percent of students scoring level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT in science will increase from the current level of performance 24% (30) to the expected level of performance 26% (39).</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**

	24% (30)	26% (39)					
		2.2. Student lack of hands on scientific experience, scientific vocabulary and decoding scientific questions on FCAT 2.0 Assessment.	2.2. Provide hands-on experiences to all science students through lab experiments and interactive virtual labs. Provide technology, software, and iPads for student use in science classes.	2.2. Administrative Team	2.2. Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team	2.2. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Testing	
		2a.3	2a.3	2a.3	2a.3	2a.3	
<b>2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.</b>	2b.1.	2b.1.	2.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.		
<u>Science Goal #2b:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
NA							
		2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	
		2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	

*End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals*

**Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals**

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

<b>High School Science Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving</b>						
----------------------------------	------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

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

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

<p><b>2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.</b></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>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	

*End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals*

**Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals**

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

<p><b>Biology EOC Goals</b></p>	<p><b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b></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**

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

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

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

*End of Biology EOC Goals*

**Science Professional Development**

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity <small>Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.</small>						
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

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

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

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

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

*End of Science Goals*

**Writing Goals**

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

<b>Writing Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**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><b>1a. FCAT:</b>  <b>Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.</b></p>	<p>1a.1. Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.</p>	<p>1a.1. Grade level teams will meet regularly for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions.</p> <p>1b. Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.</p>	<p>1a.1. Administrative Team</p>	<p>1a.1. Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team.</p>	<p>1a.1. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Assessments</p>		
<p><u>Writing Goal #1a:</u>            Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing will be 94% (140).</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>92% (119)</p>	<p>94% (140)</p>					

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

		1a.2. Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	1a.2. Students will be accountable for writing short and extended responses a minimum of once each week in all classes. Writing rubrics with detailed expectations for response writing will be displayed and used.	1a.2. Administrative Team	1a.2. Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team.	1a.2. Progress Monitoring Benchmark Assessments	
		1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.	
<b>1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.		
<u>Writing Goal #1b:</u> NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
		1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	
		1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	

**Writing Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> Please note that each Strategy does not require a							
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--



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

professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates 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 Budget (Insert rows as needed)**

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

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

<b>Total:</b>			
---------------	--	--	--

*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)).

<b>Civics EOC Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.</b>	1.1 Students need a fundamental understanding of the history and institutions of the American system of government and politics. It is a necessary qualification for citizenship.	1.1 Provide classroom activities which help students develop an understanding of the content specific vocabulary taught in government and civics.	1.1 Civics Teacher, Administrative Team	1.1 Classroom Walkthroughs Biweekly assessments	1.1 Teacher assessments 2013 Civics EOC simulation		

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

<p><u>Civics Goal #1:</u> 100% of students enrolled in Civics will earn middle school credit.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>No data</p>						
		<p>1.2. Increase understanding and knowledge in Civics while incorporating primary sources</p>	<p>1.2. Utilize District-published lesson plans with assessments aligned to tested End of Course Exam Benchmarks to maximize opportunities for students to master tested content</p>	<p>1.2 Civics Teacher, Administrative Team</p>	<p>1.2 Classroom Walkthroughs Biweekly assessments</p>	<p>1.2 Teacher assessments District Benchmarks 2013 Civics EOC simulation</p>	
		<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</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><b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.</b></p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1.</p>		

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

<u>Civics Goal #2:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	

**Civics Professional Development**

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

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

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

*End of Civics Goals*

**U.S. History End-of-Course (EOC) Goals**

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

<b>U.S. History EOC Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student</b>						
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

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

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

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

**U.S. History Professional Development**

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

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

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

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

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

*End of U.S. History Goals*

**Attendance Goal(s)**

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



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

<b>Attendance Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance</b>						
Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>1. Attendance</b>	1.1. Parent Involvement and Student Motivation	1.1. Provide continued parent communication regarding the importance of regular school attendance, arriving to school on time, and its effect on student achievement. Monitor daily and weekly attendance reports. Parent/School conferences held for identified students who have excessive absences or tardies.	1.1. Administrative Team	1.1. Analysis of attendance data on a weekly basis.	1.1. Attendance reports Student Pass Average Daily Attendance Reports		
<u>Attendance Goal #1:</u> Our goal is to improve the daily average attendance by .6%.	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					

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

	95.41%	96%					
	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Number of Students</u> <u>with Excessive</u> <u>Absences</u> <u>(10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Number of Students</u> <u>with Excessive</u> <u>Absences</u> <u>(10 or more)</u>					
	32%	30%					
	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Students with</u> <u>Excessive Tardies</u> <u>(10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Students with</u> <u>Excessive Tardies</u> <u>(10 or more)</u>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

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

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

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

*End of Attendance Goals*

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

**Suspension Goal(s)**

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

<b>Suspension Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension</b>						
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>1. Suspension</b>	1.1 Different discipline models being applied in classrooms and PBS team to motivate students to behave and stay in compliance with all of the school rules	1.1 The school will continue to grow the Positive Behavior Support System that will create motivation and rewards for good behavior targeting students of concern.  1.1a Increased use of district psychology services to enhance understanding by offending students.	Administration team	Continuous evaluation of infraction reports and referrals.	Terms and Student Pass Programs  School psychologist reports		

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

<p><u>Suspension Goal #1:</u> In the 2011-2012 School year 0% (0) of students were in school suspended. It is expected that 4% (16) will be in school suspended in 2012/2013.  In the 2011/2012 school year 0% (0) of students were out of school suspended. It is expected that 3% (12) of students will be out of school suspended in the 2012/2013 school year.</p>	<p><u>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u></p>					
	0% (0)	4% (16)					
	<p><u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u></p>					
	0% (0)	3% (12)					
	<p><u>2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u></p>					
	4% (18)	1% (4)					
	<p><u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u></p>					
	3% (13)	1% (3)					

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

		<p>1.2 There is a lack of awareness of the affects and consequences of harassing and bullying behaviors.</p>	<p>1.2 Teachers will start to implement and instruct PBS expectations and utilize PBS incentive processes in their classrooms.</p> <p>1.2b Teachers will utilize Infraction reports and student pass to record and track behavior modifications within the classroom.</p> <p>1.2c Teachers will reteach classroom expectations and social norms.</p> <p>1.2d. Grade level bullying presentations by YRD.</p>	Administrative Team	CTEM observations, Professional development to implement differentiated instruction.	CTEM observations, Terms and Student Pass Programs	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

**Suspension Professional Development**

<p><b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b></p> <p>Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or</p>							
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

PLC activity. PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates 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
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:</b>			

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

*End of Suspension Goals*

**Dropout Prevention Goal(s)**

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

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

<b>Dropout Prevention Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention</b>						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>1. Dropout Prevention</b> <u>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</u> <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Dropout Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for dropout rate in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected dropout rate in this box.</i>					
	<u>2012 Current Graduation Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*</u>					



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

	<i>Enter numerical data for graduation rate in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected graduation rate in this box.</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

**Dropout Prevention Professional Development**

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

**Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)**

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

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

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

*End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)*

**Parent Involvement Goal(s)**

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

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

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)).

<b>Parent Involvement Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement</b>						
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		
<p><b>1. Parent Involvement</b>  <u>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</u>                      Parent involvement is traditionally high at Marco Island Charter Middle School. The tracking of volunteers and volunteer hours allows for an objective way to track improvement. The goal is to increase the number of volunteers working in our school as well as the hours served.</p>	<p>1.1. Current economic situations require a two spouse income forcing both parents into the work force leaving limited time for one or both parents to volunteer for school events.</p>	<p>1.1. Keeping all parents better informed of volunteer opportunities through the school website, the automatic dial system, and the Parents/ Principal Get Together Nights.</p>	<p>1.1. Comptroller</p>	<p>1.1. Volunteer Sign in Sheets</p>	<p>1.1. Volunteer Sign in sheet totals</p>		
	<p><u>2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*</u></p>					
	<p>2467 hours</p>	<p>2590 hours</p>					
		<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	

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

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

**Parent Involvement Professional Development**

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

**Parent Involvement Budget**

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

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

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

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

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

\* 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

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

<p><u>STEM Goal #1:</u> 100% of grade level teams will participate in at least one subject-integrated STEM project in the 2012-2013 school year.</p>	<p>1.1. Many teachers do not understand the connection of STEM to a specific content and may be resistant to incorporating STEM skills and strategies into their content.</p>	<p>1.1. The administrative team will support continuous professional development. Our goal is to increase the number of students and teachers using smartboards, iPads, document cameras and Edmodo.</p>	<p>1.1. Administrative Team</p>	<p>1.1. Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team.</p>	<p>1.1. Lesson plans, learning outcomes, teacher/student products.</p>
	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>
	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>

**STEM Professional Development**

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

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

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

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

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

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

**Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)**

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

<b>CTE Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
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><u>CTE Goal #1:</u> Provide 100% of 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> graders a Career Planning Program that meets statutory requirements for middle school career planning including completion of a personalized academic and career plan.</p> <p>Investigate the possibility of establishing a career course in Information and Communications Technology to provide industry certification in Microsoft Office.</p>	1.1 Teachers are not certified with industry certification	1.1 Teachers attend professional development sessions for instruction in certification skills.	1.1 Administrative Team	1.1. Evidence of process will be lesson plans, student work, walkthroughs, grade level team minutes, and observations by Administrative Team.	1.1. Lesson plans, learning outcomes, teacher/student products.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

**CTE Professional Development**

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

*End of CTE Goal(s)*

**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						

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

	<b>Achievement</b>						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>1. Additional Goal</b>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
<u>Additional Goal #1:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box.</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

**Additional Goals Professional Development**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*End of Additional Goal(s)*

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

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
<b>Reading Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Mathematics Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Science Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Writing Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Attendance Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>

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

<b>Suspension Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Dropout Prevention Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Parent Involvement Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Additional Goals</b>	<b>Total:</b>
	<b>Grand Total:</b>

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.)

<b>School Differentiated Accountability Status</b>		
<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)**

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

*SAC Membership Compliance*

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

Yes       No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.
Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount