

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



Horizon Middle School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013
September 10, 2012

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Horizon Middle School	District Name: Osceola County
Principal: Dywayne B. Hinds	Superintendent: Melba Luciano
SAC Chair: Dywayne B. Hinds & Michelle Henninger	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

[High School Feedback Report](#)

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

Administrators

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Dywayne B. Hinds	Ed.S. in Educational Leadership; Master of Science Degree in Varying Exceptionalities; Bachelor of Science Degree in Emotionally Handicapped, School Principal	4	8	2008 - School Grade of C - 77% AYP 2009 - School Grade of A - 85% AYP 2010 - School Grade of A - 69% AYP 2011- School Grade of A – 64% AYP 2012 – School Grade of B
Assistant Principal	Michelle Henninger	Ed.S. in Educational Leadership; Master of Science in Varying Exceptionalities; Bachelor of Science Degree in Women's Studies, School Principal	12	8	2008 - School Grade of B - 77% AYP 2009 - School Grade of A - 85% AYP 2010 - School Grade of A - 69% AYP 2011- School Grade of A – 64% AYP 2012 – School Grade of B

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading Coach	Beth Davis	BS in English Education M.Ed. in Curriculum & Instruction	11	7	2011-2012: School Grade of B 2010-2011: School Grade of A – 64% AYP 2009-2010: School Grade of A - 69% AYP 2008/09: Grade A, Reading mastery: 65%, Learning Gains: 69%; Lowest 25% Gains: 76%. Black subgroup did not make AYP in Reading, all other subgroups made AYP. 2007-2008: Grade B, Reading Mastery: 63%, Learning Gains: 63%, Lowest 25% Gains: 65%. Black, Hispanic, SED, ELL did not make AYP in Reading. 2006/07 Grade: B, Reading mastery 63%, Learning Gains: 62%, Lowest 25% Gains: 62%. Hispanic, SED, did not make AYP in Reading. Total made AYP in Reading. 2005/06 Grade: A; Reading mastery 65% Learning Gains: 66%, Lowest 25% Gains: 75%. ELL and SWD did not make AYP in Reading. Total made AYP in Reading.

Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Regular meetings of new teachers with Principal and New Teacher Mentor Team	School Administration	Ongoing (Weekly Mtgs)
2. Partnering new teachers with veteran teachers	Mentoring team and Assistant Principal	Ongoing
3. District Office requiring Reading Teachers to have the Reading Endorsement Prior to filling a Reading position	District Office	Ongoing
4. Recruitment via Job Fair	School Administration	Ongoing
5. Mentor Program for first year teachers and new teachers to HMS	Heather Miller & Beth Davis	Ongoing (Weekly meetings)

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).
 *When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
12 Teachers out of field (working on endorsements in the following areas: ESOL, Reading, Gifted & Autism). No teachers received a less than effective rating.	All 12 teachers are currently enrolled in endorsements courses to comply with the area they are out of field in.

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	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
74	6/7% (5)	29.7% (22)	39% (29)	24.3% (18)	27% (20)		20.3% (15)	2.7% (2)	6.7% (5)

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
Rebekah Wardwell	Nicholars Ahlers	Grade Level Subject Content Counter part	Weekly PLC & planning meetings PLCs on Mondays & Planning meetings on Tuesdays during conference periods
Leah Torres	Kristin Bartee	Grade Level Subject Content Counter part	Weekly PLC & planning meetings PLCs on Mondays & Planning meetings on Tuesdays during conference periods
	Melinda Fisher	Grade Level Subject Content Counter part	Weekly PLC & planning meetings PLCs on Mondays & Planning meetings on Tuesdays during conference periods

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

Katie Hiltunen	Christina Haber	Grade Level Subject Content Counter part	Weekly PLC & planning meetings PLCs on Mondays & Planning meetings on Tuesdays during conference periods
Dietrich Vasquez	Timothy Hainsworth	Grade Level Subject Content Counter part	Weekly PLC & planning meetings PLCs on Mondays & Planning meetings on Tuesdays during conference periods
Janine Bracco	Alexandria Lovegrove	Grade Level Subject Content Counter part	Weekly PLC & planning meetings PLCs on Mondays & Planning meetings on Tuesdays during conference periods
Amanda Blain	Amanda MacKenzie	Grade Level Subject Content Counter part	Weekly PLC & planning meetings PLCs on Mondays & Planning meetings on Tuesdays during conference periods
Deanna Hebbler	Amanda McNeally	Grade Level Subject Content Counter part	Weekly PLC & planning meetings PLCs on Mondays & Planning meetings on Tuesdays during conference periods
Deanna Hebbler	Andrea Nonaka	Grade Level Subject Content Counter part	Weekly PLC & planning meetings PLCs on Mondays & Planning meetings on Tuesdays during conference periods
	Richard Troche	Grade Level Subject Content Counter part	Weekly PLC & planning meetings PLCs on Mondays & Planning meetings on Tuesdays during conference periods
Kathy Graffam	Kristine McKenna	Grade Level Subject Content Counter part	Weekly PLC & planning meetings PLCs on Mondays & Planning meetings on Tuesdays during conference periods

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

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Dywayne Hinds, Principal

Michelle Henninger, Assistant Principal

Shirhonda Matthews, RtI Chair / Guidance Counselor

Jilda Adrover, PSY

Gary Dunn, PBS Team Leader / 6th grade Dean of Students

Lucile Schneider, Dean of Students (8th grade)

Sarah Lackey, 6th grade Social Studies

Dianne Matthews, 7th grade Math / PBS Team Member

Stephanie Feiermuth, 7th grade Math

Meredith Keyes, 8th grade Reading

Denna Hebbler, Dean of Students / PBS Team Member

Beth Davis, Reading Coach

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 purpose of the RtI team in our school is to provide high quality instruction/intervention matched with student needs and using performance and learning rate over time to make important education decisions to guide instruction. The RtI team functions to address the progress of low performing students help meet AYP and help students stay in a regular education setting and improve long term outcomes. The team uses a problem solving model and all decisions are made with data. We have also implemented PBS (Positive Behavioral Support) within the school. During the summer of 2010 a total of 10 members from the faculty were trained on the PBS model and the program was introduced to the teachers during our pre-planning training. Our RtI Team will serve as the main leadership team of the school. We will meet once a month (1st Wednesdays of the month) to:

1. Use the RtI problem solving model
2. Oversee a multi-tiered model of service delivery (Core/Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier3)
3. Determine scheduling needs, curriculum and intervention resources
4. Review/interpret student data (Academic and Behavior)

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

5. Organize and support systematic data collection.
6. Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction
7. Through the implementation of PLCs
8. Plan, implement and oversee the supplemental and intensive interventions for student progression in Tier 2 and Tier 3
9. Monitor interventions and data assessment in Tier 2 and Tier 3
10. Work collaboratively with other working committees such as the Reading Leadership Team
11. Coordinate/collaborate with other working committees such as the Reading Leadership Team
Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? The RTI Team takes an active role in generating the SIP. School data, concerns, informal assessments/observations will be discussed and major issues will be examined utilizing the problem solving process.
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. ODMS FAIR Reports, Teen Biz Reports, Formative Assessments, FCAT Information
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. The RtI process is reviewed with faculty and staff during the preplanning session and is continually reviewed throughout the school year.
Describe the plan to support MTSS. Specific time for the team to meet and discuss school concerns is made a priority. Supporting the multi-teared system is an everyday ongoing endeavor at HMS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

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

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Dywayne Hinds, Principal

Michelle Henninger, Assistant Principal

Shirhonda Matthews, RtI Chair / Guidance Counselor

Jilda Adrover, PSY

Gary Dunn, PBS Team Leader/ Dean of Students (6th grade)

Lucile Schneider, Dean of Students (8th grade)

Sarah Lackey, 6th grade Social Studies

Dianne Matthews, 7th grade Math / PBS Team Member

Brooke Rogers, 7th grade Reading

Rebekah Wardwell, 8th grade History

Denna Hebbler, Dean of Students / PBS Team Member

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

The purpose of the RtI team in our school is to provide high quality instruction/intervention matched with student needs and using performance and learning rate over time to make important education decisions to guide instruction. The RtI team functions to address the progress of low performing students help meet AYP and help students stay in a regular education setting and improve long term outcomes. The team uses a problem solving model and all decisions are made with data. We have also implemented PBS (Positive Behavioral Support) within the school. During the summer of 2010 a total of 10 members from the faculty were trained on the PBS model and the program was introduced to the teachers during our pre-planning training. Our RtI Team will serve as the main leadership team of the school. We will meet once a month (1st Wednesdays of the month) to:

1. Use the RtI problem solving model
2. Oversee a multi-tiered model of service delivery (Core/Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier3)
3. Determine scheduling needs, curriculum and intervention resources
4. Review/interpret student data (Academic and Behavior)
5. Organize and support systematic data collection.
6. Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

7. Through the implementation of PLCs
8. Plan, implement and oversee the supplemental and intensive interventions for student progression in Tier 2 and Tier 3
9. Monitor interventions and data assessment in Tier 2 and Tier 3
10. Work collaboratively with other working committees such as the Reading Leadership Team
11. Coordinate/collaborate with other working committees such as the Reading Leadership Team
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?
Mentoring student achievement data and working with teachers to improve academic instruction.
School-wide Word of the Week
Battle of the Books
Promotion of Sunshine State Books
Increase in Media Center collection
Young Authors and Poets Night
Author Visit

***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?

All teachers will participate in on-going, school-based professional development to include reading best practices (AVID, CRISS, Marzano) and integrate the reading strategies into the curriculum. An author visit is planned for October 2012 (Sharon Draper) following the reading of a novel, complete with a professional development session. Posters of faculty/staff engaged in reading will be located throughout our campus to model life-long reading for our students. Grade level lesson study will be implemented in PLC's. CWT's will be utilized to monitor compliance. Implementation of our school wide Book Club – this club meets weekly on Thursdays.
--

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

2012- 2013 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. Student attendance (including health, vacation, ISS, nurse, etc) Limited technology, limited curriculum materials	1A.1. Cornell notes, Vocabulary strategies, AVID strategies, conferencing with students, small group instruction, Socratic seminars, Teenbiz, interactive smartboard lessons	1A.1. Content area teachers, Reading Coach, Administrative Team	1A.1. Participation in professional development, Student portfolios, tutoring sessions	1A.1. Formative and Summative Assessment Data (both formal and informal)
Reading Goal #1A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>66% (734) of standard curriculum students will score a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment.</i>	<i>57% of standard curriculum students scored at a Level 3 or higher on the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment.</i>	<i>66% (734) of standard curriculum students will score at a Level 3 or higher on the 2013FCAT Reading Assessment.</i>					
<i>Goal to improve from 57% to 66%.</i>							
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.			1B.1. Student’s Attendance to School. Working with ‘new’ ASD classroom teachers.	1B.1. Usage of the following curriculums within the classroom: Bridges SRA Corrective Reading PCI 1 & 2 (PCI Comprehension Kit and magnetic cards to be used on Card Reader) STAR (pre academic skills such as letter identifications)	1B.1. ASD Classroom Teachers Administrative Team	1B.1. Classroom visits, student portfolios	1B.1. Formal / informal assessments of student progress
Reading Goal #1B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>3 students out of 24 students assessed scored at Levels 4, 5, 6 in reading (13%)</i>	<i>3 out of 24 students</i>	<i>20% of students assessed will show increase in performance.</i>					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.			2A.1. Available technology, student attendance, Availability of informational text, Consistency of rigor in instruction	2A.1. Costa's level of questions, Learning Essential Questions, higher level questioning, philosophical chairs, text complexity, close reading, lesson study	2A.1. Content Area teachers, Reading Coach, Administrative Team	2A.1. Participation in Professional Development, student portfolios, tutoring sessions	2A.1. Formative and Summative Assessment Data (both formal and informal)
Reading Goal #2A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
28% of all curriculum students will score a Level 4 or higher on the 2013FCAT Reading Assessment	28% of all curriculum students will score a Level 4 or higher on the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment	40% of all curriculum students will score a Level 4 or higher on the 2013FCAT Reading Assessment					
Goal to increase from 28% to 40%.			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.			2B.1. Student's Attendance to School. Working with 'new' ASD classroom teachers.	2B.1. Usage of the following curriculums within the classroom: Bridges SRA Corrective Reading PCI 1 & 2 (PCI Comprehension Kit and magnetic cards to be used on Card Reader) STAR (pre academic skills such as letter identifications)	2B.1. ASD Classroom Teachers Administrative Team	2B.1. Classroom visits, student portfolios	2B.1. Formal / informal assessments of student progress
Reading Goal #2B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
16 out of 24 students assessed scored at or above Level 7 in reading (67%)	16 out of 24 students 67%	Increase to 73%	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 reading.			3A.1. Availability of technology, student attendance, limited resources for informational text	3A.1. Classroom libraries, silent sustained reading, before and after school tutoring, FCAT CIM lessons, FCAT style questions, Socratic seminars, DBQs, frontloading information, FCAT style questioning, FCIM bellwork and progress monitoring	3A.1. Content Area teachers, Reading Coach, Administrative Team	3A.1. Participation in professional development, student portfolios, tutoring sessions	3A.1. Formative and Summative assessment data (both formal and informal)
Reading Goal #3A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>72% (833) of our students will make learning gains in Reading on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment.</i>	<i>66% of our students made learning gains in Reading on the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment this was the same as the 2011 data.</i>	<i>72% (833) of our students will make learning gains in Reading on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment.</i>					
<i>Goal to increase from 66% to 72%.</i>			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 reading.			3B.1. Student's Attendance to School. Working with 'new' ASD classroom teachers.	3B.1. Usage of the following curriculums within the classroom: Bridges SRA Corrective Reading PCI 1 & 2 (PCI Comprehension Kit and magnetic cards to be used on Card Reader) STAR (pre academic skills such as letter identifications)	3B.1. ASD Classroom Teachers Administrative Team	3B.1. Classroom visits, student portfolios	3B.1. Formal / informal assessments of student progress
Reading Goal #3B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			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
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4A.1. Limited access to paper/copies. Limited TeenBiz licenses, student attendance, lack of support for students from home, lack of adequate informational text materials	4A.1. Hard copy notes, graphic organizers, essential learning experiences on grade level, closed notes, text mapping, highlighting and text marking, READ 180, Plugged In To Reading, Tutoring	4A.1. Content area teachers, Reading Coach, Administrative Team	4A.1. Participation in professional development, student portfolios, tutoring sessions	4A.1. Formative and Summative assessment data (both formal and informal)
Reading Goal #4: <i>73% (845) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment</i> Goal to increase from 64% to 73%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>64% of our lowest 25% of students made learning gains on the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment. This was a 6% decrease over the 2011 data.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>73% (845) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment</i>					
			4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.

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

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%. Reading Goal #5A: <i>Students performing at proficiency level will increase 5% annually.</i>	Baseline data 2010-2011 62%		67%	72%	77%	82%	87%	
	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. Reading Goal #5B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: 65% Black: 55% Hispanic: 51% Asian: 90% American Indian: 50%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: 70% Black: 70% Hispanic: 70% Asian: 95% American Indian: 60%	5B.1. Attendance to school. Home Resources (technological, financial), Parental support, language barrier, student attendance, lack of background knowledge, limited availability of informational text	5B.1. Differentiated instruction, ESOL strategies, audio, culturally diverse materials, guided notes, Cornell notes, cooperative learning groups, tutoring	5B.1. Content area teachers, Reading Coach, Administrative Team	5B.1. Participation in professional development, student portfolios, tutoring sessions	5B.1. Formative and Summative assessment data (both formal and informal)	
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

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. Reading Goal #5C: <i>50% of ELL students will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment.</i> <i>Goal to increase from 32% to 50%.</i>			5C.1. Language barriers, available technology, student attendance to school	5C.1. ESOL strategies, graphic organizers, Journeys Reading Program, guided notes, A+Rise strategies, cooperative learning groups, frontloading, tutoring	5C.1. Content area teachers, Reading Coach, Administrative Team	5C.1. Participation in professional development, student portfolios, tutoring sessions	5C.1. Formative and Summative assessment data (both formal and informal)					
			<table border="1"> <tr> <td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td> <td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>32% of ELL students made AYP on the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment .</td> <td>50% of ELL students will make AYP on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment.</td> </tr> </table>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	32% of ELL students made AYP on the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment .	50% of ELL students will make AYP on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment.	5C.2. Schoolwide Implementation	5C.2. All teachers will be trained and will appropriately implement effective accommodations and modifications to ELL students.	5C.2. Administrative Team	5C.2. Formal and informal observations, Lesson Plans	5C.2. 2013 FCAT Data
			2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*								
32% of ELL students made AYP on the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment .	50% of ELL students will make AYP on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment.											
	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool					
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D: <i>64% of SWD will make satisfactory progress in reading on the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment.</i> <i>Goal to increase from 56% to 64%.</i>			5D.1. No Support Facilitation for Reading, not enough TeenBiz/READ 180 licenses, limited technology, student attendance to school	5D.1., Guided notes, Cornell notes, cooperative learning groups, small group instruction, tutoring	5D.1. Content area teachers, Reading Coach, Administrative Team	5D.1. Participation in professional development, student portfolios, tutoring sessions	5D.1. Formative and Summative Assessment data (both formal and informal)					
			<table border="1"> <tr> <td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td> <td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>56% of SWD made satisfactory progress on the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment.</td> <td>64% of SWD will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment.</td> </tr> </table>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	56% of SWD made satisfactory progress on the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment.	64% of SWD will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*								
56% of SWD made satisfactory progress on the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment.	64% of SWD will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment.											
	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool					

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5E.1. Lack of resources at home (financial and technological), parental involvement, lack of background knowledge, student attendance at school, limited vocabulary	5E.1. Parent night activities, more counseling resources, mentoring program, guided notes, Cornell notes, cooperative learning groups, small group instruction, authentic learning experiences	5E.1. Content area teachers, Reading Coach, Administrative Staff	5E.1. Participation in professional development, student portfolios, tutoring sessions	5E.1. Formative and Summative assessment data (both formal and informal)
Reading Goal #5E: <i>65% of our Economically Disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress on the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>65% of our Economically Disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress on the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>70% of our Economically Disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment.</i>					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

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
K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan	6-8	Reading Coach	School-wide	Early release	PLC Meeting Notes	Reading Coach and Admin
Cornell Notes	6-8	Heather Miller	School-wide	Early release	Teacher Feedback & Student work sample	Reading Coach and Admin
PLC Meetings	6-8	Grade Level Teams	Weekly (Every Tuesday)	Weekly	Notes from PLC Meetings	Admin Team and Reading Coach
CCSS	Grades 6-8, All subjects	Reading Coach	School-wide	TBA	Informal and formal observations	Administrators

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

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
Springboard ELA Curriculum	ELA Curriculum	District & School Funds	\$7,000.00
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Increased technology	100 used/new computers	Donations / fundraising	0
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
CRISS	Teachers will attend CRISS PD	School Discretionary Budget	300.00
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

End of Reading Goals

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

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.						
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.		1.1. No Support Facilitation for Reading, not enough	1.1. Guided notes, Cornell notes, cooperative learning groups, small group instruction, tutoring	1.1. Content area teachers, Reading Coach, Administrative Team	1.1. Participation in professional development, student portfolios, tutoring sessions	1.1. Formative and Summative Assessment data (both formal and informal)
CELLA Goal #1: In 2013 the percent of students scoring proficient in listening/speaking will increase from 59% to 64% or higher.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: In 2012 59% of students scored proficient in listening/speaking.	TeenBiz/READ 180 licenses, limited technology, student attendance to school				
		1.2 Lack of resources at home (financial and technological), parental involvement, lack of background knowledge, student attendance at school, limited vocabulary	1.2 Parent night activities, more counseling resources, mentoring program, guided notes, Cornell notes, cooperative learning groups, small group instruction, authentic learning experiences	1.2 Content area teachers, Reading Coach, Administrative Staff	1.2 Participation in professional development, student portfolios, tutoring sessions	1.2 Formative and Summative assessment data (both formal and informal)
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.						
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.		2.1. No Support Facilitation for Reading, not enough	2.1. Guided notes, Cornell notes, cooperative learning groups, small group instruction, tutoring	2.1. Content area teachers, Reading Coach, Administrative Team	2.1. Participation in professional development, student portfolios, tutoring sessions	2.1. Formative and Summative Assessment data (both formal and informal)
CELLA Goal #2: In 2013 the percent of students scoring proficient in reading will increase from 35% to 40% or higher.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: In 2012 35% of students scored proficient in reading.	TeenBiz/READ 180 licenses, limited technology, student attendance to school				
		2.2 Lack of resources at home (financial and technological), parental involvement, lack of background knowledge, student attendance at school, limited vocabulary	2.2 Parent night activities, more counseling resources, mentoring program, guided notes, Cornell notes, cooperative learning groups, small group instruction, authentic learning experiences	2.2 Content area teachers, Reading Coach, Administrative Staff	2.2 Participation in professional development, student portfolios, tutoring sessions	2.2 Formative and Summative assessment data (both formal and informal)

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
CELLA Goal #3: In 2013 the percent of students scoring proficient in writing will increase from 28% to 33% or higher.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
	In 2012 28% of students scored proficient in writing.					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Springboard ELA curriculum	ELA Curriculum Resource	District & School Funds	\$7,000.00
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
PDA writing	onsite training		
Springboard ELA Curriculum	Onsite training	None required	
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of CELLA Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School 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. Student attendance to school/class.	1A.1. Professional Development Tutoring. Usage of Cornell Notes Usage of Smart Boards in classes to make lessons more interactive. Continuation of a school-wide binder system Continuation of Costa's levels of questioning.	1A.1. Math Teachers Administrative Team.	1A.1. Participating in professional development Student binders/notebooks. Tutoring Sessions.	1A.1. Execution of the lessons planned and student performance results (class grades, test results, etc.)
Mathematics Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	Continued implementation of Next Generation Sunshine State Standards while Transitioning to Common Core Standards.				
<i>70% of standard curriculum will score a level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment. This is an 18% increase over 2012 data.</i>	<i>52% of standard curriculum students scored at a Level 3 or higher on the 2012 FCAT mathematics assessment.</i>	<i>70% of standard curriculum students will score a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics assessment. This is an 18% increase over 2012 data.</i>					
<i>Goal to increase from 52% to 70%.</i>			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1. Student's Attendance to School. Working with 'new' ASD classroom teachers.	1B.1. Usage of the following curriculums within the classroom: EQUALS Math Gen Education grade level materials	1B.1. ASD Classroom Teachers Administrative Team	1B.1. Classroom visits, student portfolios	1B.1. Formal / informal assessments of student progress
Mathematics Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>10 out of 24 students assessed scored at Levels 4, 5, and 6 (42%).</i>	<i>42%</i>	<i>50%</i>					
<i>Goal to increase from 42% to 50%.</i>			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.

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. Student’s Attendance to School. Working with ‘new’ ASD classroom teachers.	2A.1. Usage of the following curriculums within the classroom: EQUALS Math Gen Education grade level materials	2A.1. ASD Classroom Teachers Administrative Team	2A.1. Classroom visits, student portfolios	2A.1. Formal / informal assessments of student progress
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #2A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1. Student’s Attendance to School. Working with ‘new’ ASD classroom teachers.	2B.1. Usage of the following curriculums within the classroom: EQUALS Math Gen Education grade level materials	2B.1. ASD Classroom Teachers Administrative Team	2B.1. Classroom visits, student portfolios	2B.1. Formal / informal assessments of student progress
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #2B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>11 out of 24 students assessed scored at or above Level 7 (46%)</i>	46%	50%					
Goal to increase from 46% to 50%.			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.

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. Student attendance to school/class.	3A.1. Professional Development Tutoring. Usage of Cornell Notes Usage of Smart Boards in classes to make lessons more interactive. Continuation of a school-wide binder system Continuation of Costa's levels of questioning.	3A.1. Math Teachers Administrative Team.	3A.1. Participating in professional development Student binders/notebooks. Tutoring Sessions.	3A.1. Execution of the lessons planned and student performance results (class grades, test results, etc.)
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #3A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	Continued implementation of Next Generation Sunshine State Standards while Transitioning to Common Core Standards.				
<i>72% of our students will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT math assessment. This is a 12% increase over 2012 data.</i>	<i>60% of students made learning gains on the 2012 FCAT Math Assessment. This is a 12% decrease over 2012 data.</i>	<i>72% of our students will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math Assessment. This is a 12% increase over 2012 data.</i>					
<i>Goal to increase from 60% to 72%.</i>							
			3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1. Student's Attendance to School. Working with "new" ASD classroom teachers.	3B.1. Usage of the following curriculums within the classroom: EQUALS Math Gen Education grade level materials	3B.1. ASD Classroom Teachers Administrative Team	3B.1. Classroom visits, student portfolios	3B.1. Formal / informal assessments of student progress
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #3B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1. Student attendance to school/class.	4A.1. Professional Development Tutoring.	4A.1. Math Teachers Administrative Team.	4A.1. Participating in professional development Student binders/notebooks. Tutoring Sessions.	4A.1. Execution of the lessons planned and student performance results (class grades, test results, etc.)
Mathematics Goal #4: <i>72% of students in the bottom quartile will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math Assessment. This is a 15% increase over 2012 data.</i> <i>Goal to increase from 57% to 72%.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>57% of students in the bottom quartile made learning gains on the 2012 FCAT Math Assessment. This is a 15% decrease over 2011 data.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>72% of students in the bottom quartile will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT math Assessment. This is a 15% increase of 2012 data.</i>	Continued implementation of Next Generation Sunshine State Standards while Transitioning to Common Core Standards.	Usage of Cornell Notes Usage of Smart Boards in classes to make lessons more interactive. Continuation of a school-wide binder system Continuation of Costa's levels of questioning.			
			4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.

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

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 59%	62%	65%	68%	71%	74%	77%	
Mathematics Goal #5A: <i>Students performing at proficiency level will increase 3% annually.</i>								
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.	Mathematics Goal #5B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance: <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: 52% Black: 57% Hispanic: 44% Asian: 83% American Indian: 70%	2013 Expected Level of Performance: <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: 70% Black: 70% Hispanic: 70% Asian: 85% American Indian: 75%	5B.1. White: Professional Development Black: Tutoring. Hispanic: Usage of Cornell Notes American Indian: Usage of Smart Boards in classes to make lessons more interactive. Student attendance to school/class. Continued implementation of Next Generation Sunshine State Standards while Transitioning to Common Core Standards.	5B.1. Professional Development Tutoring. Usage of Smart Boards in classes to make lessons more interactive. Continuation of a school-wide binder system Continuation of Costa's levels of questioning.	5B.1. Math Teachers Administrative Team.	5B.1. Participating in professional development Student binders/notebooks. Tutoring Sessions.	5B.1. Execution of the lessons planned and student performance results (class grades, test results, etc.)
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1. Student attendance to school Support given to students in classes	5C.1. SOAR Program Attendance Incentives Professional Development of Teachers	5C.1. Math Teachers School Administration	5C.1. Student participating in the SOAR program Professional Development for the teachers	5C.1. Formative Assessments Teacher Pre/Post Assessments FCAT Scores End of Course Assessments
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5C:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
27% of the ELL students made satisfactory progress in mathematics	27%	40%					
Goal to increase from 27% to 40% making satisfactory progress in mathematics							
			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. Student attendance to school, support given to students in (SF classes), Student organization and teacher training	5D.1. SOAR /PBS Program, usage of the Cornell Note taking system, coasta's level of questioning, weekly professional development planning meeting for teachers, usage of a school wide binder system, usage of smart boards in math classes to make lessons more interactive	5D.1. Math Teachers and School Administration	5D.1. Student participating in the PBS/Soar program, professional development training for teachers, and informational meetings for parents.	5D.1. Formative Assessments Teacher Pre/Post Assessments FCAT Scores
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5D:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
27% of the SWD students made satisfactory progress in mathematics	27%	40%					
Goals to increase from 27% to 40% making satisfactory progress in math							

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 mathematics.			5E.1. Student attendance to school Support given to students in classes Student Organization	5E.1. SOAR Program Attendance Incentives Professional Development of Teachers	5E.1. Math Teachers School Administration	5E.1. Student participating in the SOAR program Professional Development for the teachers	5E.1. Formative Assessments Teacher Pre/Post Assessments FCAT Scores
Mathematics Goal #5E: <i>47% of Economically Disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress in math.</i> <i>Goals to increase from 47% to 55% making satisfactory progress.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 47%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 55%					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.			1.1. Student Attendance to school/class 1.2. Lack of technology	1.1. Professional Development 1.2. Tutoring 1.3. Usage of Cornell Notes & INB 1.4. Usage of Smart boards in classes to make lessons more interactive 1.5. Implementation of a school wide binder system 1.6. Implementation of Costa's levels of questions	1.1. Algebra Teachers 1.2. School Administration	1.1. Participating in professional development 1.2. Student binders/notebooks 1.3. Tutoring sessions 1.4. Practice EOC teacher made tests on the computer and scantron	1.1. Execution of the lessons plans and student performance results (class grades, test results, etc).
Algebra 1 Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
95% or more of students will maintain or exceed a level 3 on the EOC for the 2012-2013 school year.	95% of our students scored a 3 or better.	96% of our students will score at a level 3 or higher.					
Goal to increase from 95% to 96%.							
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. Student Attendance to school/class 2.2. Lack of technology	2.1. Professional Development Tutoring Usage of Cornell Notes & INB Usage of Smart boards in classes to make lessons more interactive Implementation of a school wide binder system Implementation of Costa's levels of questions	Algebra Teachers School Administration	Participating in professional development Student binders/notebooks Tutoring sessions Practice EOC teacher made tests on the computer and scantron	1.1. Execution of the lessons plans and student performance results (class grades, test results, etc).
Algebra Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
44% or more of the students will receive a level 4 or 5 on the EOC for the 2012-2013 school year.	40 % of our students scored at level 4 or 5	44% or more of the students will receive a level 4 or 5					
Goal to increase from 40% to 44%.							

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%. Algebra 1 Goal #3A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	Baseline data 2010-2011							
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. Algebra 1 Goal #3B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>			3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: Level of student engagement Student Attendance Classroom Resources	3B.1 Weekly PLCs for the purpose of planning, collaborating about student performance and creating common assessments SOAR program INB Usage of Cornell Notes Costa's Levels of Questions	3B.1. Algebra Teachers 3B.2 School Administration	3B.1. Student participating in the SOAR program 3B.2 Professional Development for the teachers 3B.3 Participating in professional development 3B.4 INB 3B.5 Tutoring sessions 3B. 6 Practice EOC teacher made tests on the computer and scantron	3B.1. Formative Assessments Teacher Pre/Post Assessments End of Course Assessments	
	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: 97% Black: 89% Hispanic: 96% Asian: 83% American Indian: 100%	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: 100% Black: 95% Hispanic: 100% Asian: 85% American Indian: 100%						

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3C.1. Level of student engagement Student Attendance Classroom Resources	3C.1. Weekly PLCs for the purpose of planning, collaborating about student performance and creating common assessments SOAR program INB Usage of Cornell Notes Costa's Levels of Questions Alternative work in their native language and peer tutoring.	3C.1. Algebra Teachers 3C.2 School Administration	3C.1. Student participating in the SOAR program 3C.2 Professional Development for the teachers 3C.3 Participating in professional development 3C.4 INB 3C.5 Peer tutoring 3C. 6 Practice EOC teacher made tests on the computer and scantron	3C.1. Formative Assessments Teacher Pre/Post Assessments End of Course Assessments
Algebra 1 Goal #3C:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	English language				
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
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.			Level of student engagement Student Attendance Classroom Resources	3D.1. Weekly PLCs for the purpose of planning, collaborating about student performance and creating common assessments SOAR program INB Usage of Cornell Notes Costa's Levels of Questions	3D.1. Algebra Teachers School Administration	3D.1. Student participating in the SOAR program Professional Development for the teacher Participating in professional development INB Tutoring sessions Practice EOC teacher made tests on the computer and scantron	3D.1. Formative Assessments Teacher Pre/Post Assessments End of Course Assessments
Algebra 1 Goal #3D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	Print of book Reading word problems Time				
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					

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

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. Level of student engagement Student Attendance Classroom Resources	3E.1. Weekly PLCs for the purpose of planning, collaborating about student performance and creating common assessments SOAR program INB Usage of Cornell Notes Costa's Levels of Questions	3E.1. Algebra Teachers School Administration	3E.1. Student participating in the SOAR program Professional Development for the teacher Participating in professional development INB Tutoring sessions Practice EOC teacher made tests on the computer and scantron	3E.1. Formative Assessments Teacher Pre/Post Assessments End of Course Assessments
Algebra 1 Goal #3E: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	Print of book Reading word problems Time Not being able to stay for after school tutoring Completion of work				
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

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
Weekly PLC	6, 7, 8	Hiltunen	All math teachers	Every Tuesday	Administrative Support	Math Teachers & Administration
Monthly PLC	6, 7, 8	Hiltunen	All math teachers	Once a month	Administrative Support	Math Teachers & Administration
Interactive Notebook Training	6, 7, 8	Hiltunen	All new math teachers	As needed	Grade level/Department PLC	Math Teachers & Administration

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Textbook Training	Math Curriculum & Resources	District Funds	\$0.00
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Smartboard Training	Technology Department	District Funds	\$0.00
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Common Core Training	District Curriculum Department	District Funds	\$0.00
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Mathematics Goals

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

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

2012-2013 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. Student attendance and mobility.	1A.1. PBS (Positive Behavior Support) utilization in all science classrooms.	1A.1. Science Teachers and Administration	1A.1. Attendance records, discipline records, positive pass attendance, PBS Celebration attendance.	1A.1. Pinnacle Grade book, Terms, & PBS Database
Science Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
49% of all 8th grade science students will score at a proficiency level of 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science test.	<i>42% of students scored a level 3 or higher on the 2012 FCAT Science Assessment.</i>	<i>49% of all 8th grade science students will score at a proficiency level of 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science test.</i>					
Goal to increase from 42% to 49%.			1A.2. Support given to students in class and at home.	1A.2. Use of Internet technologies such as Edmodo, Smart Boards, Net Books, ELMOS, Remind 101, Discovery Education, etc. Teachers will improve vocabulary and informational reading by implementing vocabulary games, indexes, foldable, thinking maps, informational text passages to their content instruction. The school will implement grade level and course specific PLCs (collaborative planning opportunities will be provided to all teachers). Each PLC Science team will create FCAT focus lessons (CIM) which will be closely monitored.	1A.2. Science Teachers, Parents, and Administration.	1A.2. FCAT Data, IPDP data, Common assessments, CIM Assessments, Collaborative meetings.	1A.2. FCAT Science Test 2013, Pre-Post Tests, CIM Assessments.

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

			1A.3. Student organization.	1A.3. Teachers will implement interactive science notebooks to promote organization. Teachers will model and use Cornell Notes to improve student organization.	1A.3. Science Teachers, Parents	1A.3. FCAT Data, IPDP data, Common assessments, CIM Assessments, Collaborative meetings, Notebook Checks.	1A.3. FCAT Science Test 2013, Pre-Post Tests, CIM Assessments.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			Student's Attendance to School. Working with "new" ASD classroom teachers.	Usage of the following curriculums within the classroom: Gen Education grade level materials Hands on labs within the classroom	ASD Classroom Teachers Administrative Team	Classroom visits, student portfolios	Formal / informal assessments of student progress
Science Goal #1B: <i>2 out of 7 students assessed scored at Levels 4, 5, and 6 (29%)</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	29%	35%					
			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 science.			2A.1. Student attendance and mobility.	2A.1. PBS (Positive Behavior Support) utilization in all science classrooms.	2A.1. Science Teachers and Administration	2A.1. Attendance records, discipline records, positive pass attendance, PBS Celebration attendance.	2A.1. Pinnacle Grade book, Terms, & PBS Database
Science Goal #2A: <i>12% of students will score a level 4 or 5 on the 2013 FCAT Science Test.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 8%	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 12%					
			2A.2. Support given to students in class and at home.	2A.2. Use of Internet technologies such as Edmodo, Smart Boards, Net Books, ELMOS, Remind 101, Discovery Education, etc. Teachers will improve vocabulary and informational reading by implementing vocabulary games, indexes, foldable, thinking maps, informational text passages to their content instruction. The school will implement grade level and course specific PLCs (collaborative planning opportunities will be provided to all teachers). Each PLC Science team will create FCAT focus lessons (CIM) which will be closely monitored.	2A.2. Science Teachers, Parents, and Administration.	2A.2. FCAT Data, IPDP data, Common assessments, CIM Assessments, Collaborative meetings.	2A.2. FCAT Science Test 2013, Pre-Post Tests, CIM Assessments.
			2A.3. Student organization.	2A.3. Teachers will implement interactive science notebooks to promote organization. Teachers will model and use Cornell Notes to improve student organization.	2A.3. Science Teachers, Parents	2A.3. FCAT Data, IPDP data, Common assessments, CIM Assessments, Collaborative meetings, Notebook Checks.	2A.3. FCAT Science Test 2013, Pre-Post Tests, CIM Assessments.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			Student's Attendance to School. Working with "new" ASD classroom teachers.	Usage of the following curriculums within the classroom: Gen Education grade level materials Hands on labs within the classroom	ASD Classroom Teachers Administrative Team	Classroom visits, student portfolios	Formal / informal assessments of student progress
Science Goal #2B: <i>3 out of 7 students assessed scored at or above Level 7 (43%)</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 43%	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 50%					

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Weekly PLC	6, 7, 8	Torres, Blain, Miller	All science teachers	Every Tuesday	Administrative Support	Science Teachers & Administration
Monthly PLC	6, 7, 8	Miller	All science teachers	Once a month	Administrative Support	Science Teachers & Administration
Interactive Notebook Training	6, 7, 8	Miller	All new science teachers	As needed	Grade level/Department PLC	Science Teachers & Administration
Various Workshops	6, 7, 8	Science Teacher	All Science Teachers	As needed	Grade level/Department PLC	Science Teachers & Administration

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
Flocabulary	Internet-based vocabulary and content related video/audio program.		
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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.Increased attention to detail; mechanics of writing; Professional development for teachers (FCAT 2.0); changes to writing process; learning the Springboard program; conventions	1A.1. FCAT writing tutorials; PLCs, common planning for teachers; use of AVID reading and writing strategies; begin implementation of Springboard and Common Core State Standards; data chats; student portfolios; Springboard writing workshops	1A.1. Language Arts teachers, department chair, reading coach, administrative team	1A.1. Formative assessments, using scales and rubrics in classroom, FCAT Writes 2.0 rubric, Springboard embedded assessments	1A.1.Formative and Summative assessments using Florida State Writing rubric and anchor papers; embedded writing assessments from Springboard
Writing Goal #1A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>90% of students will score a level 3.0 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writing Assessment</i>	<i>85% of students scored a 3.0 + on 2012 FCAT Writes 2.0</i>	<i>90% of students will score a 3.0 or higher on the 2013 FCAT.</i>					
			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.			Student’s Attendance to School. Working with ‘new’ ASD classroom teachers.	Usage of the following curriculums within the classroom: Gen Education grade level materials	ASD Classroom Teachers Administrative Team	Classroom visits, student portfolios	Formal / informal assessments of student progress
Writing Goal #1B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>5 out of 7 students assessed scored at 4 or higher in writing (71%)</i>	<i>71%</i>	<i>75%</i>					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Weekly PLC	6, 7, 8	Bracco, John, Graffam	All Language Arts Teacher	Every Tuesday	Administrative Support	Language Arts Teachers & Administration
Monthly PLC	6, 7, 8	Bracco	All Language Arts Teachers	Once a month	Administrative Support	Language Arts Teachers & Administration
PDA Writing PD	6, 7, 8	Chris Lewis	All Language Arts Teachers	Twice a Semester	Administrative / District Support	Language Arts Teachers and Administration

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
Increase academic rigor within the classrooms	Purchasing and usage of the Springboard ELA curriculum	District / School Funds	
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Increase the usage of technology within the classrooms	Purchasing of Smart boards	SAC / School Funds	
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Increase teachers awareness of Cooperative Learning Techniques	Kagan Cooperative Learning Strategies	SAC / School Funds	
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Writing Goals

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

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
I. Attendance			1.1. Communication with parents& students attitude towards school	1.1. Attendance incentive program (monthly attendance celebrations)	1.1. Attendance Clerk, School Administration	1.1. Daily, weekly and monthly attendance reports	1.1. Average Daily Attendance Rate calculated by the district.
Attendance Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Attendance Rate:* <i>Horizon Middle School continued to exceed the district attendance goal of 94%. HMS average goal was 96% each month of school.</i>	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* <i>Horizon Middle School will meet the district attendance goal of 94% or higher each month.</i>					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	10 to 20 students with 10 or more absences	Reduced number of students with 10 or more absences by 10%					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	10 students had an excessive number to tardies to school	Reduced number of students with 10 or more tardies by 10%					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Attendance Professional Development

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

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

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

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

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension			Student Attitudes	Positive Behavior Support Program Implementation	Administration Team	Weekly discipline reports from ODMS & Terms	School Wide Discipline Report Data from ODMS
Suspension Goal #1: <i>Our goal is to continue to decrease the number of disciplinary incidents on campus. In 2010-2011 we had a total of 1376 incidents on campus. In 2011-2012 we had a total of 1230 incidents on campus. This was a decrease of 146 incidents.</i> <i>The following were implemented to aid in this decrease (the usage of a school wide student management plan, Time to Teach program and positive behavior support program).</i>	2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions	Teachers effective usage of the Student Management Plan and the PBS program	Ongoing training on the usage of the School Wide Student Management Plan	RtI & PBS Team Support	Students involvement in the PBS program	
	475 In-School Suspensions	380 in-school suspensions	Support from parents	Usage of the ROTC program as an elective course offering to students		Grade Level Positive Pass (using the SOAR expectation as a guide)	
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School	Invite guest speaker into the school from the community and parent resource groups.				
	310 Out of School Suspensions	248 suspended out-of-school					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	511 students suspended out-of-school	408 suspended out-of-school					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School					
	306 students suspended out-of-school	244 suspended out-of-school					
			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

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
Positive behavior Support Team Training	Grades 6-8	District	PBS Team Members Dunn, Hinds, Schneider, Hebbler, Lee, Matthews, Wardwell, Lackey	Ongoing 2nd Wednesdays of the month at 7:30 a.m.	Feedback from teachers and discipline data reports	Admin Team PBS / RtI Team Members

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement			Inconsistent SAC attendance	Recruit SAC members at all school events	School Administration	Monthly SAC attendance	2011 Parent Survey
Parent Involvement Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*	Lack of SAC funds (unfunded mandates)	Increase communication with parents give incentives for meeting attendance	SAC Chair	Parent survey	Attendance Reports
Increase parental involvement in 2013 <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	Five Star School status achieved for 2012, meeting the requirements for gold and silver volunteer awards	Five Star School status will be achieved for 2013, exceeding the requirements for gold and silver volunteer awards					
			Participation	Monthly PTO and SAC meetings will be held.	SAC & PTO Chairs, Parent Liaison	Ongoing Monitoring and Observation	Summation of Volunteer Hours/FCAT and AYP Results

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget

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

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
CTE Goal #1: 80% of students enrolled in CTE courses will be technology proficient as measured by a teacher made pre and post test.	Time and teacher resources	Implement a multimedia research project	CTE Instructors	observations, assessments,	pre and post test
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

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

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

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal:

Technology

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal:

Professional Development

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal:

Other

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal:

Total:

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	Total:
CELLA Budget	Total:
Mathematics Budget	Total:
Science Budget	Total:
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:
STEM Budget	Total:
CTE Budget	Total:
Additional Goals	Total:
	Grand Total:

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

Please choose the school’s DA Status. (To activate the checkbox: 1. Double click the desired box; 2. When the menu pops up, select *Checked* under “Default value” header; 3. Select *OK*, this will place an “x” in the box.)

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	X Prevent

Are you reward school? Yes X No

(A reward school is any school that has improved their letter grade from the previous year or any A graded school.)

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

X Yes No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount