Florida Department of Education

DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Hardee Junior High School	District Name: Hardee
Principal: Douglas Herron	Superintendent: David D. Durastanti
SAC Chair: Sam Rivera	Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

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

Administrators

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

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

Principal	Douglas Herron	BA and MEd/ School Principal (All Levels); Economics (6-12); Math (5-9)	23	8	2004-2005: School Grade of C; 48% of students met high standards in reading; 56% of students met high standards in math; 84% of students met high standards in wrting; 54% of students made learning gains in reading; 64% of students made learning gains in math; 66% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; AYP not met. 2005-2006: School Grade of B; 51% of students met high standards in reading; 59% of students met high standards in math; 75% of students met high standards in writing; 63% of students made learning gains in reading; 69% of students made learning gains in math; 69% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; AYP not met. 2006-2007: School Grade of C; 54% of students met high standards in reading; 54% of students met high standards in math; 77% of students met high standards in writing; 28% of students met high standards in science; 59% of students made learning gains in reading; 66% of students made learning gains in math; 63% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 67% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math; AYP not met. 2007-2008: School Grade of B; 58% of students met high standards in reading; 65% of students met high standards in math; 88% of students met high standards in writing; 36% of students met high standards in science; 60% of students made learning gains in reading; 73% of student made learning gains in math; 66% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 65% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math; AYP not met. 2008-2009: School Grade of C; 59% of students met high standards in reading; 61% of students met high standards in math; 84% of students met high standards in writing; 25% of students met high standards in science; 61% of students made learning gains in reading; 63% of students made learning gains in math; 72% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 65% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math; AYP not met. 2009-2010: School Grade B; 62% of students met high standards in reading; 62% of students met high standards in math; 78% of students met high standards in writing; 41% of students met high standards in science; 59% of students made learning gains in reading; 65% of students made learing gains in math; 68% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 60% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math; AYP not met.

					2010-2011: School Grade C; 59% of students met high standards in reading; 61% of students met high standards in math; 74% of students met high standards in writing; 38% of students met high standards in science; 61% of students made learning gains in reading; 63% of students made learning gains in math; 68% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 67% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math; AYP not met. 2011-2012: School Grade D; 44% of students met high standards in reading; 43% of students met high standards in math; 62% of students met high standards in writing; and 29% of students met high standards in science. 59% of students made learning gains in reading; 55% of students made learning gains in math. 61% of students in the lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 51% of students in the lowest quartile made learning gains in math.

Assistant Principal	Beverly Cornelius	BA and MEd/ School Principal (All Levels); Elementary Education (1-6); Reading Endorsement (All Levels)	11	7.5	2004-2005: School Grade of C; 48% of students met high standards in reading; 56% of students met high standards in math; 84% of students met high standards in writing; 54% of students made learning gains in reading; 64% of students made learning gains in math; 66% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; AYP not met. 2005-2006: School Grade of B; 51% of students met high standards in reading; 59% of students met high standards in math; 75% of students met high standards in writing; 63% of students made learning gains in reading; 69% of students made learning gains in math; 69% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; AYP not met. 2006-2007: School Grade of C; 54% of students met high standards in reading; 54% of students met high standards in math; 77% of students met high standards in writing; 28% of students met high standards in science; 59% of students made learning gains in reading; 66% of students made learning gains in math; 63% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 67% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math; AYP not met. 2007-2008: School Grade of B; 58% of students met high standards in reading; 65% of students met high standards in math; 88% of students met high standards in writing; 36% of students met high standards in science; 60% of students made learning gains in reading; 73% of student made learning gains in math; 66% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 65% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math; AYP not met. 2008-2009: School Grade of C; 59% of students met high standards in reading; 61% of students met high standards in math; 84% of students met high standards in writing; 25% of students met high standards in science; 61% of students made learning gains in reading; 63% of students made learning gains in math; 72% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 65% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math; AYP not met. 2009-2010: School Grade B; 62% of students met high standards in reading; 62% of students met high standards in math; 78% of students met high standards in writing; 41% of students met high standards in science; 59% of students made learning gains in reading; 65% of students made learning gains in math; 68% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 60% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math; AYP not met.

					2010-2011: School Grade C; 59% of students met high standards in reading; 61% of students met high standards in math; 74% of students met high standards in writing; 38% of students met high standards in science; 61% of students made learning gains in reading; 63% of students made learing gains in math; 68% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 67% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math; AYP not met. 2011-2012: School Grade D; 44% of students met high standards in reading; 43% of students met high standards in math; 62% of students met high standards in writing; and 29% of students met high standards in science. 59% of students made learning gains in reading; 55% of students made learning gains in math. 61% of students in the lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 51% of students in the lowest quartile made learning gains in math.

Assistant Principal	Meredith Durastanti	BA and MEd/ Educational Leadership (All Levels); ESE (K-12); ESOL Endorsement	11	5	2007-2008: School Grade of B; 58% of students met high standards in reading; 65% of students met high standards in math; 88% of students met high standards in writing; 36% of students met high standards in science; 60% of students made learning gains in reading; 73% of student made learning gains in math; 66% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 65% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math; AYP not met. 2008-2009: School Grade of C; 59% of students met high standards in reading; 61% of students met high standards in math; 84% of students met high standards in writing; 25% of students met high standards in science; 61% of students made learning gains in reading; 63% of students made learning gains in math; 72% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 65% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math; AYP not met. 2009-2010: School Grade B; 62% of students met high standards in reading; 62% of students met high standards in math; 78% of students met high standards in writing; 41% of students met high standards in science; 59% of students made learning gains in reading; 65% of students made learning gains in math; 68% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 60% of lowest

					quartile made learning gains in math; AYP not met. 2010-2011: School Grade C; 59% of students met high standards in reading; 61% of students met high standards in math; 74% of students met high standards in writing; 38% of students met high standards in science; 61% of students made learning gains in reading; 63% of students made learning gains in math; 68% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 67% of lowest quartile made learning gains in math; AYP not met. 2011-2012: School Grade D; 44% of students met high standards in reading; 43% of students met high standards in math; 62% of students met high standards in writing; and 29% of students met high standards in science. 59% of students made learning gains in reading; 55% of students made learning gains in math. 61% of students in the lowest quartile made learning gains in reading; 51% of students in the lowest quartile made learning gains in math.

Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Literacy	Bradley Warren	BS and MA/ Michigan Certification: Educational Leadership (All Levels); K-8 (All Subjects); Psychology and Reading (9th Grade); Reading Specialist. *Florida Certification Applied for.*	0	0	Mr. Warren is new to Florida and has been out of education for the past few years. No data for past three years.

Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Participation in the Great Florida Teach-In	Douglas Herron, Principal	Summer 2013
2. New Teacher Signing Bonus (District)	Greg Harrelson, Director of Finance	Ongoing
3. District's Connections Program for beginning teachers. The district's Highly Qualified Facilitator collaborates with school instructional coaches to identify and address the individual needs of participating beginning teachers.	Jan McKibben, District Highly Qualified Facilitator Bradley Warren, Literacy Coach	Ongoing Annually Ongoing Monthly

4.	Pairing of new teachers with a highly qualified, experienced, and proven educator in a mentor/mentee relationship.	Bradley Warren, Literacy Coach District Resource Teacher	June 2013

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
Instructional Staff Non-HQ: 4 Paraprofessional Staff Non-HQ: 0	Non-HQ instructional staff participate in the district's Great Beginnings Program, which is required to be highly qualified.

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
76	5.3% (4)	26.3% (20)	19.7% (15)	48.7% (37)	11.8% (9)	94.7% (72)	11.8% (9)	0% (0)	94.7% (72)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Bradley Warren	Paul Chandler, Katherine Landress, Sonya Rivera, Ben Murphy, Emily Tala'a	Mr. Warren's experience and expertise make him an obvious choice as a mentor for beginning teachers.	EPI/Great Beginnings Program, School Based Mentoring Sessions, Classroom visitations of select teachers to observe best practices in action.

Sherri Kouns	Caitlyn Bliss, Alecia Robinson, Debra Kelly	Mrs. Kouns' experience and expertise make her an obvious choice as a mentor for beginning teachers.	EPI/Great Beginnings Program, School Based Mentoring Sessions, Classroom visitations of select teachers to observe best practices in action.

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

Title I, Part A Title I funding will provide funds to all district schools, in a school wide project format, to target academic assistance to all students, professional development for teachers and parent involvement activities. This grant is also the funding source for implementing the requirements of NCLB.
Title I, Part C- Migrant Provides services to migrant students (PreK-12th grade) and their families. The primary goal of the Migrant program is to improve academic performance of migrant students, and provide health and guidance services to them. Parent involvement and education is an integral part of the Migrant Program.
Title I, Part D N/A
Title II Title II, Part A: Provides for teacher professional development and supports all teachers and paraprofessionals to be highly qualified.
Title III Supports activities to assist students in becoming proficient in English, supports teacher professional development in ELL strategies and parent involvement and education.
Title X- Homeless
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school for Level 1 readers.
Violence Prevention Programs Red Ribbon Week is done school wide in October to promote safe and healthy habits.

Nutrition Programs The School Breakfast Program offers a nutritious breakfast for full pay students, as well as those participating in the free/reduced meal program. Such meals play an important part in supporting student achievement, as well as teaching students the elements of good nutrition. The National School Lunch Program provides a nutritious lunch for both full-pay and free/reduced students. Healthy food supports academic achievement by providing the necessary nutrients to student growth and development. The Summer Food Service Program provides a no-cost breakfast and lunch to community children age 18 and younger.
Housing Programs N/A
Head Start N/A
Adult Education The District's Adult and Community Education Program provides instruction not only to those adults seeking a GED, but for those wanting to learn English as well. This is a vital service to our community, which has a large migrant population. Parents of students attending Hardee Junior High School often attend these ELL classes in an effort to learn English, so that they may better help their children with homework and communicate with their teacher.
Career and Technical Education Pursuant to Department of Education guidelines, a class in career education is offered to all 8th grade students at Hardee Junior High School.
Job Training N/A
Other

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. Principal & Assistant Principals (Herron, Cornelius, Durastanti): Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making. Insures that the school-based team is implementing RTI. Conducts assessment of RTI skills of school staff. Insures implementation of intervention support and documentation. Insures adequate professional development to support RTI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RTI plans and activities. General Education Teachers: Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Literacy Coach (Warren): Develops, leads and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/ behavior assessment and intervention approaches. She also identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assists in the design and implementation of progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support assessment and implementation monitoring. Provides Guidance on K-12 Reading plan. Guidance Counselor (Courtney Andersen) and School Psychologist (Alicia Jefferson) and provide technical and professional expertise and assistance. Ms. Jefferson also offers an outside presence on the team, providing a more objective voice in the process. Dean of Students (Carlton): Provides services and expertise on behavioral issues and intervention procedures with individual students. In addition, attempts are made to link community agencies to schools and families, to help support each child's academic, emotional, behavioral and social success.

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 leadership team will focus meetings around one question: How do we develop and maintain a problem-solving system to bring out the best in our school, our teachers, and our students?

The team will meet frequently throughout the year to engage in the following activities: Review screening data and link to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at grade level and classroom level. Based on the data, the team will identify professional development and resources needed.

The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practice, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new process and skills.

The team will also facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?
Our MTSS team consists of Curriculum Leadership Team members. The team provides data on Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets; academic and social/emotional areas that need to be addressed; set expectations for instruction; facilitate the development of a systemic approach to teaching; and aligned processes and procedures.

MTSS Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior. Baseline Data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), FCAT, Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), School-wide Writing assessments, STAR math, discipline, and attendance data Mid-year Data: FAIR, School-wide Writing assessments, STAR math, discipline, attendance data End-of-Year Data: FAIR, FCAT, School-wide Writing assessments, STAR math, discipline, attendance data Data will be reviewed monthly
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. Professional development will be ongoing during faculty meeting best practice sessions, student early release days training sessions, and during PLC common collaborative planning time.
Describe the plan to support MTSS. Administration will support the MTSS plan by providing a common collaborative planning time for core-academic teachers. Additionally, administration will insure that professional development offerings support the instructional staff's ability to implement the MTSS plan effectively.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Principal – Douglas Herron Assistant Principal – Beverly Cornelius Assistant Principal – Meredith Durastanti Literacy Coach – Bradley Warren Language Arts/Reading PLC Leader – Kathryn Maddox Mathematics PLC Co-Leader – Marie Price Mathematics PLC Co-Leader – Marie Lambert Science PLC Leader – Leslie Moon Social Studies PLC Leader – Holly Nicholas ESE Department Leader – Barbara Kelly Electives PLC Leader – April Rogers Media Specialist – Louisse Jones

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) meets one morning per month from 7:30 a.m. - 8:30 a.m. The principal, Douglas Herron, sets the agenda and leads the meetings. Assistant Principal, Meredith Durastanti, assures that all members sign-in, keeping track of sign-in sheets and agendas for Title I documentation. The Literacy Leadership Team will analyze student achievement data as it becomes available. This data analysis will assist the team in goal setting throughout the school year
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? ● Monitor the school-wide grading policy (A.S.A.P.) ● Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTTS) and Positive Behavior Supports (PBS) oversight ● Lesson Study oversight ● Interdisciplinary Learning Initiative: Develop and encourage interdisciplinary lessons and units of study, ensuring that literacy, with rigor and relevance, is integrated and embedded into the curriculum of each of the core-academic disciplines. ● Literacy Leadership Team will insure compliance with all components of the district's K-12 Reading Plan that pertain the middle school level.

Public School Choice

- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**
  Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.

Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

Grades 6-12 Only Sec. 1003.413 (2)(b) F.S

For schools with grades 6-12, how does the school ensure that every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student?

Hardee Junior High School's Literacy Leadership Team will continue implementation of our Interdisciplinary Learning Initiative. The goal of this initiative is to deepen the teaching of literacy/reading skills in every discipline (core-academic and related/elective). The literacy coach will be working closely with teachers, providing professional development and modeling to teachers in all disciplines, at all levels. The principal, assistant principals, and literacy coach will conduct visits of all classrooms, looking specifically for the use of literacy strategies in all academic and related/elective classrooms.

Additionally, a one-time stipend will be offered to all math, science, and social studies teachers who complete CAR-PD training.

High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.	1A.1. Lack of explicit instruction in prefixes, suffixes, and roots to improve student academic vocabulary.	1A.1. Explicit instruction in vocabulary acquisition through prefixes, suffixes, and roots, utilizing content specific grade level vocabulary utilized cross curriculum.	1A.1. Teachers Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	1A.1. Classroom observation Ongoing monitoring of formative assessments Teacher observation Collaborative planning cross curriculum.	1A.1. FAIR District made Benchmark Assessments Progress Monitoring		

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

Reading Goal #1A: *Hardee Junior High had 26 % scoring at grade-level (proficient) on the 2011-2012 FCAT. The goal is for students scoring at grade-level (proficient) on the 2012-2013 FCAT to increase to 34 %.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	26%(292)	*34%(385)*					
	Data Source: 2012 School Grade Report	1A.2. Lack of high level critical thinking skills.	1A.2. Utilize Kagan Strategies, Text Marking, Webb's Depth of Knowledge Questioning.	1A.2. All Teachers Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	1A.2. Monitoring of lesson plans Informal class observations Collaboration in PLC meetings	1A.2. FAIR District made Benchmark Assessments Progress Monitoring	
		1A.3. Many students have not met high standards in reading.	1A.3. Create Instructional Focus Calendar for Reading/LA to be implemented school-wide.	1A.3. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	1A.3. Monitoring of lesson plans Informal class observations Collaboration in PLC meetings.	1A.3. FAIR District made Benchmark Assessments Progress Monitoring	
		1A.4. Instructional time continues to be diminished by poor and inconsistent attendance.	1A.4. Continue to analyze attendance data to identify trends and find solutions to poor attendance.	**1A.4.** Principal Assistant Principal Attendance Clerk Truancy Coordinator	1A.4. Monitoring of attendance data	1 A.4. Attendance data will indicate an improved attendance rate	

		1A.5. Student lack of interest/apathy for reading	1A.5. Implement the "Step it Up" book club. This club will encourage and support students reading outside the school day. Reading logs will be utilized as monitoring tools and the grade level with most books read will receive a reward. Competition will also occur between each class for most books read.	**1A.5.** Classroom teachers Media Specialist Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	1A.5. Teacher observation Media Center Usage Book Club Data (Number of Books Read)	1A.5. "Step it Up" Monthly Book Reward FAIR Progress Monitoring	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.	1B.1. Many students have not met high standards in reading.	1B.1. Create Instructional Focus Calendar for Reading/ LA to be implemented school-wide.	1B.1. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	1B.1. Monitoring of lesson plans Informal class observations Collaboration in PLC meetings.	1B.1. FAIR; District Benchmark Assessments; and 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment.		
Reading Goal #1B: *45% of alternatively assessed students will score at level 4, 5, or 6 on the reading portion of the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment administration.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	36.4% (4)	*45% (5)*					
	Data Source: 2012 School Grade Report	1B.2. Instructional time continues to be diminished by poor and inconsistent attendance.	1B.2. Continue to analyze attendance data to identify trends and find solutions to poor attendance.	1B.2. Principal Assistant Principal Attendance Clerk Truancy Coordinator	1B.2. Monitoring of attendance data	1B.2. Attendance data will indicate an improved attendance rate	
		1B.3. Student lack of interest in reading	1B.3. Daily in class reading of high interest material, along with engaging activities to encourage reading.	1B.3. Principal Assistant Principal	1B.3. Teacher observation Media Center Usage Informal Administrator observation	1B.3. FAIR District made Benchmark Assessments Progress Monitoring	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.	2A.1. Due to shortened class schedule, teachers lack an efficient amount of time to adequately deliver curriculum, therefore scaffolding and support across content areas are not being incorporated into the classroom.	2A.1. Teachers will provide scaffolding and support through a variety of research based reading strategies. The Gradual Release Model will be used for instruction.	2A.1. All Teachers Principal Assistant Principal Literary Coach	2A.1. Classroom observation Ongoing monitoring of formative assessments Teacher observation Collaborative planning cross curriculum.	2A.1. FAIR District made Benchmark Assessments Progress Monitoring		
Reading Goal #2A: ***Hardee Junior High had 13 % scoring above the proficiency level on the 2011-2012 FCAT. The goal is for students scoring above the proficiency level on the 2012-2013 FCAT to increase to 20% .***	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *13% (147)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *20% (227)*					

	Data Source: 2012 School Grade Report	2A.2. Many higher level academic courses do not explicitly teach reading comprehension skills.	2A.2. Content area teachers are given specific reading strategies to use with content area reading.	2A.2. All Teachers Principal Assistant Principal Literary Coach	2A.2. Classroom observation Ongoing monitoring of formative assessments Teacher observation Collaborative planning cross curriculum.	2A.2. FAIR District made Benchmark Assessments Progress Monitoring	
		2A.3. Students lack of motivation to extend beyond proficiency performance.	2A.3. Teachers plan and execute engaging, challenging and research based activities to increase rigor. Implementation of Kagan Structures.	2A.3. Principal Assistant Principal Literary Coach	2A.3. Informal Administrator observation Data Chats during PLCs	2A.3. FAIR District made Benchmark Assessments Progress Monitoring	
		2A.4. Content area vocabulary and nonfiction reading can still be a stumbling block for students in advanced courses.	2A.4 Teachers of advanced Social Studies and Science will collaborate with language arts teachers to implement explicit instruction of vocabulary and reading strategies.	2A.4. Teachers Principal Assistant Principal Literary Coach	2A.4. Informal Administrator observation Data Chats during PLCs	2A.4. FAIR District made Benchmark Assessments Progress Monitoring	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.	2B.1. Many students have not met high standards in reading.	2B.1. Create Instructional Focus Calendar for Reading/ LA to be implemented school-wide.	2B.1. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	2B.1. Monitoring of lesson plans Informal class observations Collaboration in PLC meetings.	2B.1. FAIR; District Benchmark Assessments; and 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment.		
Reading Goal #2B: *27% of alternatively assessed students will score at level 7 on the reading portion of the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment administration*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	18.2% (2)	*27% (3)*					
	Data Source: 2012 School Grade Report	2B.2. Instructional time continues to be diminished by poor and inconsistent attendance.	2B.2. Continue to analyze attendance data to identify trends and find solutions to poor attendance.	2B.2. Principal Assistant Principal Attendance Clerk Truancy Coordinator	2B.2. Monitoring of attendance data	2B.2. Attendance data will indicate an improved attendance rate	
		2B.3. Student lack of interest in reading	2B.3. Daily in class reading of high interest material, along with engaging activities to encourage reading.	2B.3. Principal Assistant Principal	2B.3. Teacher observation Media Center Usage Informal Administrator observation	2B.3. FAIR District made Benchmark Assessments Progress Monitoring	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	3A.1. Lack of rigor in curriculum.	3A.1. Provide more opportunities for higher level questioning using Webb's Depth of Knowledge questioning. Implementation of Standards 1 and 10 of the Common Core State Standards.	3A.1 All Teachers Principal Assistant Principal Literary Coach.	3A.1. Informal Administrator observation Data Chats during PLCs	3A.1. FAIR District made Benchmark Assessments Progress Monitoring		
Reading Goal #3A: 43% (487) of Hardee Junior High students made learning gains in reading during the 2011-2012 school year The goal is for 50%(567) of the students at HJH to make learning gains in reading during the 2012-2013 school year.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	43%(487)	*50%(567)*					

	Data Source: 2012 School Grade Report	3A.2. Cross content reading instruction rarely includes explicit instruction in prefixes, suffixes, and roots to improve student word analysis skills.	3A.2. Tier 1 Language Arts, Social Studies, Math, and Science teachers provide direct, explicit instruction in prefixes, suffixes and roots utilizing content specific, grade level vocabulary.	3A.2. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach District AYP Facilitator	3A.2. Informal Administrator observation Teacher observation Teacher will review data in RtI meetings Teachers will review data during collaborative in the afternoons	3A.2. FAIR District made Benchmark Assessments Progress Monitoring	
		3A.3. Lack of explicit instruction in fluency, vocabulary, and reading strategies.	3A.3. Instructional Focus Calendar for Reading/LA	3A.3. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach District AYP Facilitator	3A.3. Informal Administrator observation Teacher observation Teacher will review data in RtI meetings Teachers will review data during collaborative in the afternoons	3A.3. FAIR District made Benchmark Assessments Progress Monitoring	
		3A.4. Students lack of interest/apathy in reading.	3A.4. Implement the "Step it Up" Book Club. This club will encourage and support students reading outside of the school day. Reading logs will be utilized as monitoring tools and the grade level with most books read will receive a reward. Competition will also occur between each class for most books read.	3A.4. Classroom Teachers Media Specialist Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	3A.4. Teacher Observation Media Center Usage Book Club Data (Number of Books Read)	3A.4. "Step it Up Monthly Book Reward FAIR Progress Monitoring	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	3B.1. Many students have not met high standards in reading.	3B.1. Create Instructional Focus Calendar for Reading/ LA to be implemented school-wide.	3B.1. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	3B.1. Monitoring of lesson plans Informal class observations Collaboration in PLC meetings.	3B.1. FAIR; District Benchmark Assessments; and 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment.		

Reading Goal #3B: *A sufficient number of alternatively assessed students will demonstrate learning gains on the reading portion of the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment to meet Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO's)*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Data Pending	*Data Pending*					
	Data Source: 2012 School Grade Report	3B.2. Instructional time continues to be diminished by poor and inconsistent attendance.	3B.2. Continue to analyze attendance data to identify trends and find solutions to poor attendance.	3B.2. Principal Assistant Principal Attendance Clerk Truancy Coordinator	3B.2. Monitoring of attendance data	3B.2. Attendance data will indicate an improved attendance rate	
		3B.3. Student lack of interest in reading	3B.3. Daily in class reading of high interest material, along with engaging activities to encourage reading.	3B.3. Principal Assistant Principal	3B.3. Teacher observation Media Center Usage Informal Administrator observation	3B.3. FAIR District made Benchmark Assessments Progress Monitoring	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4A.1. Poor attendance causes the loss of valuable instruction time.	4A.1. Analyze attendance data and develop a plan to increase daily attendance.	4A.1. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach Attendance Clerk Truancy Clerk	4A.1. Monitor and analyze attendance data.	4A.1. Increased attendance rate.		
Reading Goal #4A: 61% of students in lowest 25% made learning gains in reading in the 2011-2012 school year at Hardee Junior High. The goal is for 65% of students in the lowest 25% to make learning gains in reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	61%	*65%*					
	Data Source: 2012 School Grade Report	4A.2. Monies to fund PBS program .	4A.2. PBS, the behavior system of RtI encourages regular attendance.	4A.2. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach Attendance Clerk Truancy Clerk	4A.2. Monitor and analyze attendance and PBS data.	4A.2. Increased attendance rate correlated to PBS data.	

		4A.3. Teachers teaching students in the lowest 25% have difficulty infusing rigor into the curriculum while utilizing remediation strategies to improve areas of deficiency.	4A.3. Increase explicit instruction using gradual release model and Webb's Depth of Knowledge questioning.	4A.3. Classroom Teachers Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach Attendance Clerk Truancy Clerk	4A.3. Classroom Teachers Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	4A.3. FAIR Benchmark Assessments Progress Monitoring	
		4A.4. Students lack of stamina to complete FCAT style passages.	4A.4. Build stamina by gradually increasing passages of longer lengths and daily fluency practice.	4A.4. Classroom Teachers Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	4A.4. Classroom Teachers Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	4A.4. FAIR Benchmark Assessments Progress Monitoring	
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4B.1. Many students have not met high standards in reading.	4B.1. Create Instructional Focus Calendar for Reading/ LA to be implemented school-wide.	4B.1. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	4B.1. Monitoring of lesson plans Informal class observations Collaboration in PLC meetings.	4B.1. FAIR; District Benchmark Assessments; and 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment.		
Reading Goal #4B: *A sufficient number of alternatively assessed students in the lowest 25% will demonstrate learning gains on the reading portion of the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment to meet Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO's)*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	Data Pending	*Data Pending*					
	Data Source: 2012 School Grade Report	4B.2. Instructional time continues to be diminished by poor and inconsistent attendance.	4B.2. Continue to analyze attendance data to identify trends and find solutions to poor attendance.	4B.2. Principal Assistant Principal Attendance Clerk Truancy Coordinator	4B.2. Monitoring of attendance data	4B.2. Attendance data will indicate an improved attendance rate	
		4B.3. Student lack of interest in reading	4B.3. Daily in class reading of high interest material, along with engaging activities to encourage reading.	4B.3. Principal Assistant Principal	4B.3. Teacher observation Media Center Usage Informal Administrator observation	4B.3. FAIR District made Benchmark Assessments Progress Monitoring	

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**	Percentage of Students in each student demographic subgroup scoring at the proficiency level or higher (level 3): White – 53% Hispanic – 39% SWD – 8% ED – 40%	Percentage of Students in each student demographic subgroup scoring at the proficiency level or higher (level 3): White – 66% Hispanic – 48% SWD – 31% ED – 49%	Percentage of Students in each student demographic subgroup scoring at the proficiency level or higher (level 3): White – 69% Hispanic – 53% SWD – 38% ED – 54%	Percentage of Students in each student demographic subgroup scoring at the proficiency level or higher (level 3): White – 73% Hispanic – 58% SWD – 45% ED – 59%	Percentage of Students in each student demographic subgroup scoring at the proficiency level or higher (level 3): White – 76% Hispanic – 63% SWD – 52% ED – 64%	Percentage of Students in each student demographic subgroup scoring at the proficiency level or higher (level 3): White – 80% Hispanic – 69% SWD – 59% ED – 70%
Reading Goal #5A: ***Over the next 6 years, HJH will reduce the achievement gap among the existing student demographic subgroups by at least 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 subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: Students' inability to adequately utilize reading strategies.	5B.1. Teachers will utilize strategies such as pre-reading, during reading, and after reading activities (i.e. making predictions, marking the text, and summarizing)	5B.1. Classroom teachers Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	5B.1. Informal Observations Teacher monitoring progress through use of small groups. Discussion of data during common collaborative planning in the afternoons	5B.1. FAIR Benchmark Assessments Formative Assessments Progress Monitoring		
Reading Goal #5B: ***A sufficient percentage of students in the ethnic subgroups will show growth on the reading portion of the 2013 FCAT to satisfy Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO's)***	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Data Pending White: 53 Black: 32 Hispanic: 39 Asian: 45 American Indian: NA	*Data Pending* White: 58 Black: 39 Hispanic: 45 Asian: 51 American Indian: NA					
		5B.2. Students have limited vocabulary and background knowledge .	5B.2. Explicit teaching of academic vocabulary within content area reading and use of vocabulary workbooks. Promote listening, reading, and writing across all content areas.	5B.2. Classroom teachers Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	5B.2. Informal Observaions Teacher monitoring progress through use of small groups. Discussion of data during common collaborative planning in the afternoons	5B.2. FAIR Benchmark Assessments Formative Assessments Progress Monitoring	

		5B.3. Poor attendance results in loss of instructional time.	5B.3. Analyze attendance rate of subgroups not making AMO's and develop a plan to improve attendance.	5B.3. Principal Assistant Principal Truancy Clerk	5B.3. Monitor and analyze attendance rates of those subgroups not making AMO's.	5B.3. Increased attendance rate for those subgroups not making AMO's.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5C.1. Students with limited English skills lack fundamental reading skills.	5C.1. Tier 2: Address specific weaknesses in phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary, and fluency English in a Flash program	5C.1. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	5C.1. Data Chat in PLC meetings. RtI meetings Informal Observations FAIR Tool Kit	5C.1. FAIR Benchmark Assessments FCAT		
Reading Goal #5C: *A sufficient percentage of students in the ELL subgroup will show growth on the reading portion of the 2013 FCAT to satisfy Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO's)* .	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *No Data*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *No 2012 Data*					
		5C.2. Small group instruction is not being utilized properly to meet the needs o the students	5C.2. Using FAIR/FCAT data to determine placement in small groups to address student needs through RtI process.	5C.2. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	5C.2. Teachers review progress during RtI meeting. Informal Observations Teachers discuss strategies and review data during common collaborative planning in the afternoons. Teacher observations.	5C.2. FAIR Benchmark Assessments FCAT	

		5C.3. Poor attendance results in loss of instructional time.	5C.3. Analyze attendance data and develop a plan to encourage students to come to school regularly.	5C.3. Principal Assistant Principal Attendance Clerk Truancy Clerk	5C.3. Monitor and analyze attendance data of students in the SWD subgroup	5C.3. Increased attendance rates for those students in the SWD subgroup.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5D.1. Students with disabilities lack fundamental reading skills.	5D.1. Tier 2: Address specific weaknesses in phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary, and fluency.	5D.1. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	5D.1. Data Chat in PLC meetings. RtI meetings Informal Observations FAIR Tool Kit	5D.1. FAIR Benchmark Assessments FCAT		
Reading Goal #5D: ***A sufficient percentage of students in the SWD subgroup will show growth on the reading portion of the 2013 FCAT to satisfy Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO's)***	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	8%	*17% (Safe Harbor)*					

		5D.2. Small group instruction is not being utilized properly to meet the needs o the students	5D.2. Using FAIR/FCAT data to determine placement in small groups to address student needs through RtI process.	5D.2. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	5D.2. Teachers review progress during RtI meeting. Informal Observations Teachers discuss strategies and review data during common collaborative planning in the afternoons. Teacher observations.	5D.2. FAIR Benchmark Assessments FCAT	
		5D.3. Poor attendance results in loss of instructional time.	5D.3. Analyze attendance data and develop a plan to encourage students to come to school regularly.	5D.3. Principal Assistant Principal Attendance Clerk Truancy Clerk	5D.3. Monitor and analyze attendance data of students in the SWD subgroup	5D.3. Increased attendance rates for those students in the SWD subgroup.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5E.1. Students lack ability to read on level in content area classes.	5E.1. Reading and content area teachers will provide explicit instruction using core curriculum components.	5E.1. Teachers Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	5E.1. Review FAIR data and FCAT Scores Observations Formative Assessments Teachers will discuss strategies and data during common collaborative planning	5E.1. FAIR FCAT Benchmarks		
Reading Goal #5E: ***A sufficient percentage of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup will show growth on the reading portion of the 2013 FCAT to satisfy Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO's)***	2012 Current Level of Performance:* ***40%***	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* ***46% (Safe Harbor)***					
		5E.2. Students lack of interest/apathy for reading.	5E.2. Implement the "Step it Up" Book Club. This club will encourage and support students reading outside the school day. Reading logs will be utilized as monitoring tools and the grade level with most books read will receive a reward. Competition will also occur between each class for most books read.	5E.2. Classroom Teachers Media Specialist Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	5E.2. Teacher observation Media Center Usage Book Club Data (Number of Books Read)	5E.2. "Step it Up" Monthly Book Reward FAIR Progress Monitoring	

		5E.3. Poor attendance results in loss of instructional time.	5E.3. Analyze attendance data and develop a plan to encourage students to come to school regularly.	5E.3. . Principal Assistant Principal Attendance Clerk Truancy Clerk	5E.3. . Monitor and analyze attendance data of students in the ED subgroup	5E.3. Increased attendance rates for those students in the ED subgroup.	

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Kagan Structures	6-8	Kagan Facilitator	All Core-Academic Teachers at all Grade Levels	8/14/12	Follow-up ongoing during PLC common collaborative planning time, facilitated by the PLC leader with assistance from the Literacy Coach.	PLC Leaders Principal Assistant Principals Literacy Coach
Common Core State Standards (CCSS) Training	6-8	Sandra Baker, Green River Regional Educational Cooperative	All Core-Academic Teachers at all Grade Levels	10/12/12	Follow-up ongoing during PLC common collaborative planning time, facilitated by the PLC leader with assistance from the Literacy Coach.	PLC Leaders Principal Assistant Principals Literacy Coach
Rigor and Text Complexity	6-8	Bradley Warren, Literacy Coach	Language Arts/Reading Teachers at all Grade Levels	PLC Common Planning Sessions and		

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/ materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Progress Monitoring	Rally Program	Title I Funds	$6,931.75
Subtotal: $6,931.75			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Remediation/Enrichment; Diagnostic; Differentiated Instruction; and Progress Monitoring	i-Ready Program	Federal School Improvement Grant Funds	$12,827.50
Subtotal: $12,827.50			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Creating Engaging and Effective Teaching Strategies.	Kagan Structures Professional Development	District Funds	$2,500.00
Subtotal: $2500.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Adding Rigor to the Curriculum	Common Core Training	District Funds	$6,434.49
Subtotal: $6,434.49			
Total: $28,693.74			

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition**					
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.	1.1. No home support for speaking, reading, or writing in the English language.	1.1. Use of English in a Flash software to reinforce the speaking, reading, and writing of the English language	1.1.Principal Assistant Principals Literacy Coach Guidance Counselor	1.1. Monitoring of success on English in a Flash	1.1. 2013 CELLA	
CELLA Goal #1: 52.6% (10) of students will score at the proficiency level in listening/speaking on the 2013 CELLA.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: *42.1% (8)*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.	2.1. No home support for speaking, reading, or writing in the English language.	2.1. Use of English in a Flash software to reinforce the speaking, reading, and writing of the English language	2.1. Principal Assistant Principals Literacy Coach Guidance Counselor	2.1. Monitoring of success on English in a Flash	2.1. 2013 CELLA	

CELLA Goal #2: 15.8% (3) of students will score at the proficiency level in reading on the 2013 CELLA.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: *5.3% (1)*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.	2.1. No home support for speaking, reading, or writing in the English language.	2.1. Use of English in a Flash software to reinforce the speaking, reading, and writing of the English language	2.1. Principal Assistant Principals Literacy Coach Guidance Counselor	2.1. Monitoring of success on English in a Flash	2.1. 2013 CELLA	
CELLA Goal #3: 26.3% (5) of students will score at the proficiency level in writing on the 2013 CELLA.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : *15.8% (3)*					
		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
Lack of home support for speaking, reading, and writing in the English language.	English in a Flash Program	Title III	
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #1B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #1B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.		
Mathematics Goal #2A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		

Mathematics Goal #2B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

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

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

Mathematics Goal #3B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.		
Mathematics Goal #4A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	
		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.		

Mathematics Goal #4B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	
		4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	

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

Mathematics Goal #5B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5C: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5D: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5E: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	
		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.	1A.1. Indifference of students toward academic improvement.	1A.1. Real world applications to be used by instructors. Strategies for solving word problems, and use of manipulatives will be incorporated in instruction. Other strategies to engage students in their learning: Kagan, Differentiated Instruction, Thinking Maps, vocabulary in content. Use of higher order thinking questions. Tier I of school RtI implementation plan.	1A.1. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	1A.1. Disaggregation of baseline testing data (FCAT and District BM) and ongoing monitoring of student progress. Teacher made tests; alternative assessments. Remediation strategies. Computer based programs such as IXL and Study Island.	1A.1. District BM assessments and 2013 FCAT Math assessment.		
Mathematics Goal #1A: *37% of students will achieve Level 3 on the Spring 2013 FCAT Math*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	28%	*37%*					

		1A.2. Hesitancy by some teachers to implement effective teaching strategies.	1A.2. Professional development. Modeling and coaching by literacy coach and administration	1A.2. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	1A.2. Follow-up on professional development. Administrative walk-throughs and observations. Lesson Plans.	1A.2. Classroom walk-through and observation logs.	
		1A.3. Students lack of reading proficiency. Most of the FCAT for mathematics involves reading "real life" problems and judging what steps to take to solve said problems.	1A.3. Practice real life problems using FCAT examples from Wylie's warm-up, FCAT Test Maker, and Study Island. Vocabulary and STEM questions.	1A.3. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	1A.3. Administrative observations, lesson plans, and student progress demonstrated on district benchmark assessments.	1A.3. District BM assessments and 2013 FCAT Math assessment. Classroom walk-through and observation logs.	

1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	1B.1. Indifference of students toward academic improvement.	1B.1. Real world applications to be used by instructors. Strategies for solving word problems, and use of manipulatives will be incorporated in instruction. Other strategies to engage students in their learning: Kagan, Differentiated Instruction, Thinking Maps, vocabulary in content. Use of higher order thinking questions. Tier I of school RtI implementation plan.	1B.1. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach Guidance Counselors	1B.1. Disaggregation of baseline testing data (Florida Alternative Assessment) and ongoing monitoring of student progress. Teacher made tests; alternative assessments. Remediation strategies.	1B.1. 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment		
Mathematics Goal #1B: *45.5% (5) of alternatively assessed students will score at levels 4, 5, and 6 on the math portion of the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	36.4% (4)	*45.5% (5)*					

		1B.2. Hesitancy by some teachers to implement effective teaching strategies.	1B.2. Professional development. Modeling and coaching by literacy coach and administration	1B.2. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach Guidance Counselors	1B.2. Follow-up on professional development. Administrative walk-throughs and observations. Lesson Plans.	1B.2. Classroom walk-through and observation logs.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.	2A.1. Indifference of students toward academic improvement.	2A.1. Real world applications to be used by instructors. Strategies for solving word problems, and use of manipulatives will be incorporated in instruction. Other strategies to engage students in their learning: Kagan, Differentiated Instruction, Thinking Maps, vocabulary in content. Use of higher order thinking questions. Tier I of school RtI implementation plan.	2A.1. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	2A.1. Disaggregation of baseline testing data (FCAT and District BM) and ongoing monitoring of student progress. Teacher made tests; alternative assessments. Remediation strategies. Computer bases programs such as IXL and Study Island.	2A.1. District BM assessments and 2013 FCAT Math assessment.		
Mathematics Goal #2A: *24% of Students will score at levels 4 and 5 on the 2013 Math FCAT.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	15%	*24%*					
		2A.2. Hesitancy by some teachers to implement effective teaching strategies.	2A.2. Professional development. Modeling and coaching by literacy coach and administration	2A.2. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	2A.2. Follow-up on professional development. Administrative walk-throughs and observations. Lesson Plans.	2A.2. Classroom walk-through and observation logs.	
		2A.3. Students lack of reading proficiency. Most of the FCAT for mathematics involves reading "real life" problems and judging what steps to take to solve said problems.	2A.3. Practice real life problems using FCAT examples from Wylie's warm-up, FCAT Test Maker, and Study Island. Vocabulary and STEM questions.	2A.3. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	2A.3. Administrative observations, lesson plans, and student progress demonstrated on district benchmark assessments.	2A.3. District BM assessments and 2013 FCAT Math assessment. Classroom walk-through and observation logs.	

2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	2B.1. Indifference of students toward academic improvement.	2B.1. Real world applications to be used by instructors. Strategies for solving word problems, and use of manipulatives will be incorporated in instruction. Other strategies to engage students in their learning: Kagan, Differentiated Instruction, Thinking Maps, vocabulary in content. Use of higher order thinking questions. Tier I of school RtI implementation plan.	2B.1. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach Guidance Counselors	2B.1. Disaggregation of baseline testing data (2012 Florida Alternative Assessment) and ongoing monitoring of student progress. Teacher made tests; alternative assessments. Remediation strategies.	2B.1. 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment.		
Mathematics Goal #2B: *18% (2) of alternatively assessed students will score at level 7 on the math portion of the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	0% (0)	*18% (2)*					
		2B.2	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	

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

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

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

3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3A.1. Students don't have strong basic math skills and require remediation.	3A.1. Remediation strategies to increase the percentage of students making learning gains in math. These strategies include IXL, Study Island, Wylie's Warm-Ups, and FCAT Benchmark programs. Other strategies to engage students in their learning to include Kagan, Differentiated Instruction, Thinking Maps, Collaborative Pairs, Vocabulary in Content, Extended Thinking, and Higher Order Thinking Skills. Use of math manipulatives, Tier 1 of school wide RtI implementation plan. Title I Math Resource Teacher, Amie Gough, pull-outs on Fridays. In classrooms with lowest quartile math students 2 times	3A.1. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach Title I Math Resource Teacher	3A.1. Disaggregation of baseline testing data (FCAT and District BM) and ongoing monitoring of student progress. Teacher made tests; alternative assessments. Remediation strategies. Computer bases programs such as IXL and Study Island.	3A.1. District BM assessments and 2013 FCAT Math assessment.		

		per week.					
Mathematics Goal #3A: *60% of students will demonstrate learning gains on the mathematics portion of the 2013 FCAT*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	55%	*60%*					
		3A.2. Lack of test taking strategies and lack of FCAT vocabulary knowledge.	3A.2. Provide strategies to master content strands of the FCAT test. In particular, FCAT stem questions and vocabulary will be stressed and practiced. Also, test taking strategies to include working within the time constraints of the test, eliminating wrong answer choices in a given problem, and checking the reasonableness of answers.	3A.2. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	3A.2. District BM assessments administered 3 times per year and individual teacher designed formative assessments.	3A.2. District BM assessments and 2013 FCAT Math assessment.	
		3A.3. Student behavior.	3A.3. Revision and implementation of school wide Positive Behavior Support (PBS) system. School wide expectations developed and taught. School wide reward system. School wide RtI implementation plan.	3A.3. Principal Assistant Principal PBS Team	3A.3. Disaggregation of discipline data.	3A.3. School wide discipline data.	

3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3B.1. Indifference of students toward academic improvement	3B.1. Real world applications to be used by instructors. Strategies for solving word problems, and use of manipulatives will be incorporated in instruction. Other strategies to engage students in their learning: Kagan, Differentiated Instruction, Thinking Maps, vocabulary in content. Use of higher order thinking questions. Tier I of school RtI implementation plan.	3B.1. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach Guidance Counselors	3B.1. Disaggregation of baseline testing data (2012 Florida Alternative Assessment) and ongoing monitoring of student progress. Teacher made tests; alternative assessments. Remediation strategies.	3B.1. 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment.		
Mathematics Goal #3B: *A sufficient number of alternatively assessed students will demonstrate learning gains on the math portion of the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment to satisfy Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO's)*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Data Pending	*Data Pending*					

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

		3B.2. Hesitancy by some teachers to implement effective teaching strategies.	3B.2. Professional development. Modeling and coaching by literacy coach and administration	3B.2. . Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach Guidance Counselors	3B.2. Follow-up on professional development. Administrative walk-throughs and observations. Lesson Plans.	3B.2. Classroom walk-through and observation logs.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4A.1. Students don't have strong basic math skills and require remediation.	4A.1. Remediation strategies to increase the percentage of students making learning gains in math. These strategies include IXL, Study Island, Wylie's Warm-Ups, and FCAT Benchmark programs. Other strategies to engage students in their learning to include Kagan, Differentiated Instruction, Thinking Maps, Collaborative Pairs, Vocabulary in Content, Extended Thinking, and Higher Order Thinking Skills. Use of math manipulatives, Tier 1 of school wide RtI implementation plan. Title I Math Resource Teacher, Amie Gough, pull-outs on Fridays. In classrooms with lowest quartile math students 2 times	4A.1. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach Title I Math Resource Teacher	4A.1. Disaggregation of baseline testing data (FCAT and District BM) and ongoing monitoring of student progress. Teacher made tests; alternative assessments. Remediation strategies. Computer bases programs such as IXL and Study Island.	4A.1. District BM assessments and 2013 FCAT Math assessment.		

		per week.					
Mathematics Goal #4A: ***56% of students in the lowest 25% will demonstrate learning gains on the mathematics portion of the 2013 FCAT.***	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *51%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *56%*					
		4A.2. Lack of test taking strategies and lack of FCAT vocabulary knowledge.	4A.2. Provide strategies to master content strands of the FCAT test. In particular, FCAT stem questions and vocabulary will be stressed and practiced. Also, test taking strategies to include working within the time constraints of the test, eliminating wrong answer choices in a given problem, and checking the reasonableness of answers	4A.2. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	4A.2. District BM assessments administered 3 times per year and individual teacher designed formative assessmen	4A.2. District BM assessments and 2013 FCAT Math assessment.	
		4A.3. Student behavior.	4A.3. Revision and implementation of school wide Positive Behavior Support (PBS) system. School wide expectations developed and taught. School wide reward system. School wide RtI implementation plan.	4A.3. Principal Assistant Principal PBS Team	4A.3. Disaggregation of discipline data.	4A.3. School wide discipline data.	

4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4B.1. Indifference of students toward academic improvement	4B.1. Real world applications to be used by instructors. Strategies for solving word problems, and use of manipulatives will be incorporated in instruction. Other strategies to engage students in their learning: Kagan, Differentiated Instruction, Thinking Maps, vocabulary in content. Use of higher order thinking questions. Tier I of school RtI implementation plan.	4B.1. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach Guidance Counselors	4B.1. Disaggregation of baseline testing data (2012 Florida Alternative Assessment) and ongoing monitoring of student progress. Teacher made tests; alternative assessments. Remediation strategies.	4B.1. 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment.		
Mathematics Goal #4B: *A sufficient number of alternatively assessed students in the lowest 25% will demonstrate learning gains on the math portion of the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment to satisfy Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO's)*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Data Pending	*Data Pending*					

		4B.2. Hesitancy by some teachers to implement effective teaching strategies.	4B.2. Professional development. Modeling and coaching by literacy coach and administration	4B.2. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach Guidance Counselors	4B.2. Follow-up on professional development. Administrative walk-throughs and observations.	4B.2. Classroom walk-through and observation logs.	
		4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**	Percentage of Students in each student demographic subgroup scoring at the proficiency level or higher (level 3): White – 49% Hispanic – 40% SWD – 17% ED – 40%	Percentage of Students in each student demographic subgroup scoring at the proficiency level or higher (level 3): White – 63% Hispanic – 51% SWD – 33% ED – 53%	Percentage of Students in each student demographic subgroup scoring at the proficiency level or higher (level 3): White – 66% Hispanic – 63% SWD – 39% ED – 57%	Percentage of Students in each student demographic subgroup scoring at the proficiency level or higher (level 3): White – 70% Hispanic – 61% SWD – 46% ED – 62%	Percentage of Students in each student demographic subgroup scoring at the proficiency level or higher (level 3): White – 74% Hispanic – 66% SWD – 53% ED – 67%	Percentage of Students in each student demographic subgroup scoring at the proficiency level or higher (level 3): White – 78% Hispanic – 71% SWD – 60% ED – 72%
Mathematics Goal #5A: ***Over the next 6 years, HJH will reduce the achievement gap among the existing student demographic subgroups by at least 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 subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: Indifference of students toward academic improvement.	5B.1. Real world applications to be used by instructors. Strategies for solving word problems, and use of manipulatives will be incorporated in instruction. Other strategies to engage students in their learning: Kagan, Differentiated Instruction, Thinking Maps, vocabulary in content. Use of higher order thinking questions. Tier I of school RtI implementation plan.	5B.1. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	5B.1. Disaggregation of baseline testing data (FCAT and District BM) and ongoing monitoring of student progress. Teacher made tests; alternative assessments. Remediation strategies. Computer bases programs such as IXL and Study Island.	5B.1. District BM assessments and 2013 FCAT Math assessment.		
Mathematics Goal #5B: *A sufficient percentage of students in the ethnic subgroups will show growth on the math portion of the 2013 FCAT to satisfy Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO's)*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	White: 49% Black: 32% Hispanic: 40% Asian: 82% American Indian: NA	White: 54% Black: 39% Hispanic: 46% Asian: 83% American Indian: NA					
		5B.2. Hesitancy by some teachers to implement effective teaching strategies.	5B.2. Professional development. Modeling and coaching by literacy coach and administration	5B.2. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	5B.2. Follow-up on professional development. Administrative walk-throughs and observations. Lesson Plans.	5B.2. Classroom walk-through and observation logs.	
		5B.3. Students lack of reading proficiency. Most of the FCAT for mathematics involves reading "real life" problems and judging what steps to take to solve said problems.	5B.3. Practice real life problems using FCAT examples from Wylie's warm-up, FCAT Test Maker, and Study Island. Vocabulary and STEM questions.	5B.3. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	5B.3. Administrative observations, lesson plans, and student progress demonstrated on district benchmark assessments.	5B.3. District BM assessments and 2013 FCAT Math assessment. Classroom walk-through and observation logs.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5C.1. Indifference of students toward academic improvement.	5C.1. Real world applications to be used by instructors. Strategies for solving word problems, and use of manipulatives will be incorporated in instruction. Other strategies to engage students in their learning: Kagan, Differentiated Instruction, Thinking Maps, vocabulary in content. Use of higher order thinking questions. Tier I of school RtI implementation plan.	5C.1. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	5C.1. Disaggregation of baseline testing data (FCAT and District BM) and ongoing monitoring of student progress. Teacher made tests; alternative assessments. Remediation strategies. Computer bases programs such as IXL and Study Island.	5C.1. District BM assessments and 2013 FCAT Math assessment.		

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

Mathematics Goal #5C: *A sufficient percentage of students in the ELL subgroup will show growth on the math portion of the 2013 FCAT to satisfy Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO's) by the Safe Harbor calculation*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	10%	*19%*					
		5C.2. Hesitancy by some teachers to implement effective teaching strategies.	5C.2. Professional development. Modeling and coaching by literacy coach and administration	5C.2. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	5C.2. Administrative observations, lesson plans, and student progress demonstrated on district benchmark assessments.	5C.2. District BM assessments and 2013 FCAT Math assessment. Classroom walk-through and observation logs.	
		5C.3. Students lack of reading proficiency. Most of the FCAT for mathematics involves reading "real life" problems and judging what steps to take to solve said problems.	5C.3. Practice real life problems using FCAT examples from Wylie's warm-up, FCAT Test Maker, and Study Island. Vocabulary and STEM questions.	5C.3. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	5C.3. Administrative observations, lesson plans, and student progress demonstrated on district benchmark assessments.	5C.3. District BM assessments and 2013 FCAT Math assessment. Classroom walk-through and observation logs.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5D.1. Indifference of students toward academic improvement.	5D.1. Real world applications to be used by instructors. Strategies for solving word problems, and use of manipulatives will be incorporated in instruction. Other strategies to engage students in their learning: Kagan, Differentiated Instruction, Thinking Maps, vocabulary in content. Use of higher order thinking questions. Tier I of school RtI implementation plan.	5D.1. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	5D.1. Disaggregation of baseline testing data (FCAT and District BM) and ongoing monitoring of student progress. Teacher made tests; alternative assessments. Remediation strategies. Computer bases programs such as IXL and Study Island.	5D.1. District BM assessments and 2013 FCAT Math assessment.		
Mathematics Goal #5D: ***A sufficient percentage of students in the SWD subgroup will show growth on the math portion of the 2013 FCAT to satisfy Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO's) by the Safe Harbor calculation.***	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	17%	*25%*					

		5D.2. Hesitancy by some teachers to implement effective teaching strategies.	5D.2. Professional development. Modeling and coaching by literacy coach and administration	5D.2. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	5D.2. Administrative observations, lesson plans, and student progress demonstrated on district benchmark assessments.	5D.2. District BM assessments and 2013 FCAT Math assessment. Classroom walk-through and observation logs.	
		5D.3. Students lack of reading proficiency. Most of the FCAT for mathematics involves reading "real life" problems and judging what steps to take to solve said problems.	5D.3. Practice real life problems using FCAT examples from Wylie's warm-up, FCAT Test Maker, and Study Island. Vocabulary and STEM questions	5D.3. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	5D.3. Administrative observations, lesson plans, and student progress demonstrated on district benchmark assessments.	5D.3. District BM assessments and 2013 FCAT Math assessment. Classroom walk-through and observation logs.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5E.1. Indifference of students toward academic improvement.	5E.1. Real world applications to be used by instructors. Strategies for solving word problems, and use of manipulatives will be incorporated in instruction. Other strategies to engage students in their learning: Kagan, Differentiated Instruction, Thinking Maps, vocabulary in content. Use of higher order thinking questions. Tier I of school RtI implementation plan.	5E.1. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	5E.1. Disaggregation of baseline testing data (FCAT and District BM) and ongoing monitoring of student progress. Teacher made tests; alternative assessments. Remediation strategies. Computer bases programs such as IXL and Study Island.	5E.1. District BM assessments and 2013 FCAT Math assessment.		

Mathematics Goal #5E: *A sufficient percentage of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup will show growth on the math portion of the 2013 FCAT to satisfy Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO's)*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	40%	*46%*					
		5E.2. Hesitancy by some teachers to implement effective teaching strategies.	5E.2. Professional development. Modeling and coaching by literacy coach and administration	5E.2. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	5E.2. Administrative observations, lesson plans, and student progress demonstrated on district benchmark assessments.	5E.2. District BM assessments and 2013 FCAT Math assessment. Classroom walk-through and observation logs.	
		5E.3. Students lack of reading proficiency. Most of the FCAT for mathematics involves reading "real life" problems and judging what steps to take to solve said problems.	5E.3. Practice real life problems using FCAT examples from Wylie's warm-up, FCAT Test Maker, and Study Island. Vocabulary and STEM questions	5E.3. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	5E.3. Administrative observations, lesson plans, and student progress demonstrated on district benchmark assessments.	5E.3. District BM assessments and 2013 FCAT Math assessment. Classroom walk-through and observation logs.	

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

gh School Mathemat Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Mathematics Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

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

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

4. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.		
Mathematics Goal #4: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		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

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

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.	1.1. Recruiting students who have the ability to successfully complete Algebra I and pass the End-of-Course Assessment	1.1. Look at alternative screening assessments, such as the College Board's ReadiStep Exam, to determine student aptitude for algebra.	1.1. Principal Assistant Principal Guidance Counselor	1.1. District Algebra BM assessments	1.1. 2013 Algebra End-of-Course Assessment.		
Algebra 1 Goal #1: 100% of students enrolled in Algebra I will pass the end of course assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	44.7% (34)	*50% (38)*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	

		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.	2.1. Recruiting students who have the ability to successfully complete Algebra I and pass the End-of-Course Assessment	2.1. Look at alternative screening assessments, such as the College Board's ReadiStep Exam, to determine student aptitude for algebra.	2.1. Principal Assistant Principal Guidance Counselor	2.1. District Algebra BM assessments	2.1. 2013 Algebra End-of-Course Assessment.		
Algebra Goal #2: 100% of students enrolled in Algebra I will pass the end of course assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	55.3% (42)	*60% (46)*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**						
Algebra 1 Goal #3A: ***No achievement gap among ethnic groups in our Algebra I classes.***							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.**	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: Recruiting students who have the ability to successfully complete Algebra I and pass the End-of-Course Assessment	3B.1. Look at alternative screening assessments, such as the College Board's ReadiStep Exam, to determine student aptitude for algebra.	3B.1. Principal Assistant Principal Guidance Counselor	3B.1. District Algebra BM assessments	3B.1. 2013 Algebra End-of-Course Assessment.		

Algebra 1 Goal #3B: *100% of students in the various ethnic subgroups enrolled in Algebra I will pass the End-of-Course Assessment.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Data Pending White: 100% Black: 100% Hispanic: 100% Asian: 100% American Indian: NA	*Data Pending* White: 100% Black: 100% Hispanic: 100% Asian: 100% American Indian: NA					
		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		
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3C.1. Recruiting students who have the ability to successfully complete Algebra I and pass the End-of-Course Assessment	3C.1. Look at alternative screening assessments, such as the College Board's ReadiStep Exam, to determine student aptitude for algebra.	3C.1. Principal Assistant Principal Guidance Counselor	3C.1. District Algebra BM assessments	3C.1. 2013 Algebra End-of-Course Assessment.		
Algebra 1 Goal #3C: ***100% of students in the ELL subgroup enrolled in Algebra I will pass the End-of-Course Assessment.***	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	100%	*100%*					
		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		
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.		
Algebra 1 Goal #3D: *No SWD Subgroup*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	NA	*NA*					
		3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3E.1. Recruiting students who have the ability to successfully complete Algebra I and pass the End-of-Course Assessment	3E.1. Look at alternative screening assessments, such as the College Board's ReadiStep Exam, to determine student aptitude for algebra.	3E.1. Principal Assistant Principal Guidance Counselor	3E.1. District Algebra BM assessments	3E.1. 2013 Algebra End-of-Course Assessment.		
Algebra 1 Goal #3E: *100% of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup enrolled in Algebra I will pass the End-of-Course Assessment.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	100%	*100%*					
		3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	
		3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

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

Geometry EOC Goals	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Geometry Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Geometry Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		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), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017		
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2011-2012**						
Geometry Goal #3A: ***Enter narrative for the goal in this box.***							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.**	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		

Geometry Goal #3B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.		
Geometry Goal #3C: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	
		3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.		
Geometry Goal #3D: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.		
Geometry Goal #3E: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	
		3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional						

Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Kagan Structures	All	Kagan Facilitator	Core-Academic Teachers at All Grade Levels.	8/14/12	Follow-Up ongoing during PLC Common Collaborative Planning Time.	Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach PLC Leader
Collaborative Planning/PLC	All	PLC Leader	Math PLC Members at all Grade Levels	1-2 Times per Month	Ongoing during PLC Common Collaborative Planning T ime	Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach PLC Leader
Positive Behavior Supports (PBS)	All	PBS Team	School-Wide	8/15/12	Follow-Up during PLC Common Collaborative Planning Time and During Monthly PBS Meetings	PBS Team Principal Assistant Principal PLC Leaders

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
Engaging and Effective Teaching	IXL	Title I	$8,000.00
Subtotal: $8,000.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Continue to Increase Technological Capabilities in the Classroom	PolyVision Interactive Smart Boards	Title I Funds	$20,000.00
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Engaging and Effective Teaching	Kagan Structures	District Budget	$2,500.00
Common Collaborative Planning for each Core PLC Group	Funding for Common Collaborative Planning Time After Regular School Hours	Race to the Top (RTTP) Grant Funding	$12,000.00
Subtotal: $14,500.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total: $42,500.00			

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.	1A.1. Students lack the necessary background knowledge (science vocabulary) needed to be successful in science.	1A.1. During common collaborative planning time, science teachers will discuss science vocabulary that is needed for success in their classrooms. Elective teachers will be asked to incorporate essential science vocabulary words into their daily lessons. Literacy Professional Development	1A.1. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	1A.1. Common planning time documentation and discussions	1A.1. Benchmark Data and 2013 FCAT Science Data		

Science Goal #1A: ***The percentage of students at Hardee Junior High School scoring level three on the 2013 Science FCAT will increase from 29%(102) to 37%(131).***	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	29%(102)	***37%(131)***					
		1A.2. Differentiated instructions are not being consistently used to meet the varying needs of students.	1A.2. During common collaborative planning time, science teachers will analyze data to determine student placement in RTI groups (remediation/enrichment)	1A.2. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	1A.2. Mini-assessments. Common assessments, Benchmarks	1A.2. Benchmark Data and 2013 FCAT Science Data	
		1A.3. Students struggle with content area reading comprehension.	1A.3. Literacy Professional Development Increase reading comprehension by utilizing reading strategies in weekly lesson plans	1A.3. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	1A.3. Benchmark Data and 2013 FCAT Science Data	1A.3. Benchmark Data and 2013 FCAT Science Data	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.**	1B.1. Differentiated instructions are not being consistently used to meet the varying needs of students.	1B.1. During common collaborative planning time, science teachers will analyze data to determine student placement in RTI groups (remediation/ enrichment)	1B.1. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	1B.1. Common Classroom Assessments.	1B.1. 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment (Science)		

Science Goal #1B: *80% of alternatively assessed students will score at level 4, 5, or 6 on the science portion of the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	60% (3)	*80% (4)*					
		1B.2. Students lack the necessary background knowledge (science vocabulary) needed to be successful in science.	1B.2. During common collaborative planning time, science teachers will discuss science vocabulary that is needed for success in their classrooms. Elective teachers will be asked to incorporate essential science vocabulary words into their daily lessons. Literacy Professional Development	1B.2 Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	1B.2. Common planning time documentation and discussions	1B.2. Benchmark Data and 2013 FCAT Science Data	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.	2A.1. Lack of higher order questions on assignments and assessments	2A.1. Unpack standards during common collaborative planning time. Analyze benchmarks and common assessments. Incorporate more moderate and high cognitive complexity questions on assessments and during classroom activities. Incorporate higher order question and discourse in lesson plans, FCIM, assignments. Scaffolding to build to higher cognition. Lesson Study	2A.1. .Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	2A.1. Analyze benchmarks, FCIM Data (mini-assessments), and common assessments. Administration and Literacy Coach walkthroughs. Analyze benchmark and FCIM data, PLC discussions.	2A.1. Benchmark Data and 2013 FCAT Science Data		

Science Goal #2A: ***The percentage of students at Hardee Junior High School scoring a level 4 or 5 on the 2013 Science FCAT will increase from 4%(14) to 12% (42)***	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	4%(14)	***12% (42)***.					
		2A.2. Lack of interest and motivation.	2A.2. Provide enrichment and stimulating activities through hands-on labs and computer programs (study island)	2A.2. .Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	2A.2. Analyze benchmarks, FCIM Data(mini-assessments), and common assessments	2A.2. Benchmark Data and 2013 FCAT Science Data	
		2A.3. Deficiencies in basic math and reading skills prevent students from applying science process skills at a higher level of achievement.	2A.3. Integration of math and reading skills into the implantation of the science curriculum with an emphasis on higher order thinking skills. Student participation in the school and district science fair.	2A.3. .Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	2A.3. Analyze benchmarks, FCIM Data(mini-assessments), and common assessments	2A.3. Benchmark Data and 2013 FCAT Science Data	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.	2B.1. Differentiated instructions are not being consistently used to meet the varying needs of students.	2B.1. During common collaborative planning time, science teachers will analyze data to determine student placement in RTI groups (remediation/ enrichment)	2B.1. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	2B.1. Common Classroom Assessments.	2B.1. 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment (Science)		

Science Goal #2B: *20% of alternatively assessed students will score at level 7 on the science portion of the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	0% (0)	*20% (1)*					
		2B.2. Students struggle with content area reading comprehension.	2B.2. Literacy Professional Development Increase reading comprehension by utilizing reading strategies in weekly lesson plans	2B.2. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	2B.2. 2013 Alternative Assessment Science Data	2B.2. 2013 Alternative Assessment Science Data	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

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

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

Biology 1 EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem						

	ent						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Biology 1 Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		

Biology 1 Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Kagan Structures	All	Kagan Facilitator	Core-Academic Teachers at All Grade-Levels	8/14/12	Follow-Up ongoing during PLC Common Collaborative Planning sessions.	Prinicipal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach PLC Leader
Content Area Literacy	All	Literacy Coach	Science Department	8/6/12 – 8/7/12	Monitoring of Lesson Plans; Classroom Walk-Throughs; Observations. Follow-Up ongoing during PLC Common Collaborative Planning Sessions.	Prinicipal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach PLC Leader

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

Improve Reading Comprehension in the Content Area	Science Weekly	Title I Funds	$1,000.00
Improved Reading Comprehension in the Content Area	National Geographic	Title I Funds	$1,500.00
Subtotal: $2,500.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Continue to Increase Technological Capabilities in the Classrooms	PolyVision Interactive Smart Boards	Title I Funds	$20,000.00
Subtotal: $20,000.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Effective and Engaging Instruction	Kagan Structures PD	District Budget	$2,500.00
Subtotal: $2,500.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total: $25,000.00			

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.	1A.1. Inclusion of writing conventions in the grading process.	1A.1. An increased focus on the teaching and inclusion of writing conventions in the writing process.	1A.1. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach Language Arts Teachers	1A.1. District Writing Benchmarks	1A.1. District Writing Benchmarks; and 2013 FCAT Writes.		
Writing Goal #1A: *66% of students will score at level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	62%	*66%*					
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	

1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.	1B.1. Lack of strategies for teaching writing to special needs students.	1B.1. Modeling of Differentiated Instruction by Literacy Coach and ESE Specialist.	1B.1. Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach Guidance Counselor	1B.1. Teacher created Practice Assessments	1B.1. 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment		
Writing Goal #1B: *75% of alternatively assessed students will score at level 4 or higher on the writing portion of the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	75% (3)	*75% (3)*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

Writing Professional Development

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

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

End of Writing Goals

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

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

Civics EOC Goals	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Civics Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Civics Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

Civics Professional Development

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

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

End of Civics Goals

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
U.S. History Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		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

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

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
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

End of U.S. History Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance						
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Attendance	1.1. Indifference by some students and parents toward school attendance.	1.1. A more proactive approach to attendance/ truancy enforcement. Our truancy coordinator will contact parents after 3 absences, to identify possible reasons for low attendance, tardies, signing out, etc.	1.1. Principal Assistant Principals Truancy Coordinator Attendance Clerk	1.1. Monitoring of attendance and tardies.	1.1. Attendance and tardy data.		

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

Attendance Goal #1: *For 2012-2013, Hardee Junior High will decrease the attendance rate, number of students with 10 or more absences, and number of students with 10 or more tardies by at least 10%.*	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
	96%	*98%*					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	225	*202*					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	40	*36*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Attendance Professional Development

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

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)	**Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension**						
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Suspension	1. Lack of effective classroom management strategies on the part of some instructional staff.	1.1. Positive Behavior Supports (PBS) Refresher Training	1.1. Principal Assistant Principals Dean PBS Team	1.1. Classroom walk-throughs; observations; monitoring discipline data.	1.1. Discipline/ Suspension Data.		
Suspension Goal #1: *HJH will decrease suspension rates by at least 10%.*	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions					
	1761	*1585*					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					
	1585	*1426*					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	409	*368*					

	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	378	*340*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PBS Training	All	PBS Team	All Instructional Staff	8/15/12	Ongoing, with monthly refreshers	PBS Team

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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)).

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

	Enter numerical data for graduation rate in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected graduation rate in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Upload Option-For schools completing the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) please include a copy for this section.
Online Template- For schools completing the PIP a link will be provided that will direct you to this plan.

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)	**Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement**						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Parent Involvement	1.1. Parents work schedule is often inflexible with scheduled school meetings.	1.1. Flexible scheduling for parent events. When possible, two events will be held for the same purpose. One event will be during the school day (mid-morning) and the other event in the early evening.	1.1. Principal Assistant Principals	1.1. Monitoring attendance rates at parent events.	1.1. Attendance rate at parent events for 2012-2013.		

Parent Involvement Goal #1: *HJH will increase parent participation/attendance at non-athletic events by at least 10%.* **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*					
	26%	*34%*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

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
Increase parent involvement by providing access to our parent resource center outside the school day.	Parent Involvement Funds to pay for staffing of the parent resource center	Title I	$6,000
Subtotal: $6,000.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total: $6,000.00			

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: *Integration of Math and Science with other disciplines will be increased during the 2012-2013 school year.*	1.1. Lack of knowledge of strategies for integrating math and/or science into the curriculum of other disciplines.	1.1. Professional development for one science and one agriculture teacher to learn strategies for integrating the two subject areas. Work on scheduling students from the agriculture class into the class of the science teacher trained in integration practices.	1.1. Principal Assistant Principal Science Teacher Agriculture Teacher	1.1. Classroom Walk-Throughs Observations Lesson Plans	1.1. 2013 FCAT Science scores for those students participating in the integrated classes.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

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

or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Science Integration	8th	PD Facilitator	8th Grade Science Teacher/ Agriculture Teacher	Spring 2012 and Spring 2013	Monitoring of Instruction, Lessons, etc.	Principal Assistant Principal

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
Increasing the teachers ability to present real-life, hands-on agriculture and science projects	Greenhouse	Business Partner Donations and General Budget funding	$4,000.00
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total: $4,000.00			

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
CTE Goal #1: HJH will provide demographically appropriate opportunities for career exploration and workforce preparation through offering CTE courses in the relevant field of Agriculture.	1.1. Procuring adequate funding for class materials, additional instructors, hands-on learning opportunities via field trips, etc. that comprise rigorous and engaging course curricula.	1.1. Effectively use Perkins IV funding to supplement cost as well as continued exploration of other funding sources available.	1.1. Administration will hire and place additional teachers as necessary. Guidance counselors will appropriately schedule students in CTE courses.	1.1. Monitoring students' acquisition of knowledge and skills taught in the course curricula.	1.1. The FDOE Curriculum Framework and Student Performance Standards for each course.

	1.2. Incorporating additional CTE courses into an already abounding school/class schedule.	1.2. Utilize creative scheduling tactics (i.e. block scheduling) to allow for efficient placement of students in CTE courses.	1.2. After gathering teacher/student input, school Leadership Team will discuss and problem solve regarding cohesiveness of school schedule.	1.2. Review of reported scheduling conflicts as well as student attendance data (pattern of tardies, absences, and withdrawals from course).	1.2. Qualitative data: surveys and discussion. Quantitative data: attendance data per student database (Genesis).
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
CTE Academic Integration Workshop	HJH's 7th/ 8th grd. CTE teacher and Science Dept. Chair.	FL DOE and participating schools.	Middle and High School teachers of CTE, Science, or Math in the Heartland Region.	2-day workshop in mid-May.	Continuous coordination and crosswalk of the CTE Student Performance Standards and the new Common Core Standards in Science and Math in order to develop lesson plans that integrate and streamline the knowledge objectives.	Teachers/administration.

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Additional Goal	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Additional Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Additional Goals Professional Development

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.
Reading Budget
Total: $28,693.74
CELLA Budget
Total:
Mathematics Budget
Total: $42,500.00
Science Budget
Total: $25,000.00
Writing Budget
Total:
Civics Budget
Total:
U.S. History Budget
Total:
Attendance Budget
Total:
Suspension Budget
Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget
Total:
Parent Involvement Budget
Total: $6,000.00
STEM Budget
Total: $4,000.00
CTE Budget
Total:
Additional Goals
Total:

Grand Total: $106,193.74

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance
Please choose the school's DA Status. (To activate the checkbox: 1. Double click the desired box; 2.When the menu pops up, select *Checked* under "Default value" header; 3. Select *OK,* this will place an "x" in the box.)

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
☐Priority	☐Focus	☐Prevent

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance
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.
Monitoring of the School Improvement Plan Monitoring of the Parent Involvement Plan Advise the Principal and administration on matters related to parent involvement

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Parent Involvement Activities	$6,000