FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

2012-2013

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

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: 3761 James B Sanderlin PK-8	District Name: Pinellas County Schools
Principal: Dr. Denise T. Miller	Superintendent: John A. Stewart, Ed.D.
SAC Chair: Beate Hughes-Brown	Date of School Board Approval: Pending: October 9, 2012

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	Dr. Denise T. Miller	B.A. Emotionally Disturbed Education, M.A. Emotionally Disturbed Education, Ph.D. Curriculum & Instruction: Special Education	9	21	11-12 Grade B Reading: Mastery 53%, Learning Gains 66%, Lowest 25% Gains 56% Math: Mastery 44%, Learning Gains 76%, Lowest 25% Gains 68% Writing: Mastery 82% 10-11 Grade D Reading: Mastery 55%, Learning Gains 54%, Lowest 25% Gains 42%; Black, FRPL did not make AYP; Math: Mastery 45%, Learning Gains 47%, Lowest 25% Gains 67%; Black, FRPL, White did not make AYP; Writing: Mastery 75% 09-10 Grade C Reading: Mastery 60%, Learning Gains 61%, Lowest 25% Gains 65%; Black, FRPL, SWD did not make AYP; Math: Mastery 56%, Learning Gains 57%, Lowest 25% Gains 66% Black, FRPL, SWD did not make AYP; Writing: Mastery 79%
Assistant Principal	Mary Sue Cehi	Bachelor's Degree in Elementary Education, Master's Degree in Educational Leadership,	0	5	2011-12 Webster Elementary School, Assistant Principal School Grade – B 2010-11 Wildwood Elementary School Assistant Principal

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

		Certifications in Elementary Education 1-6, ESOL K-12, Educational Leadership K-12, and School Principal K-12			School Grade – A 85% AYP; Proficiency: R – 71%, M – 71%, W – 75%, S – 51% Learning Gains: R – 66%, M – 63%; Lowest Quartile: R – 68% (yes), M – 73% (yes) <u>2009-10</u> Wildwood Elementary School Assistant Principal School Grade – B 79% AYP; Proficiency: R – 74%, M – 78%, W – 84%, S – 59% Learning Gains: R – 56%, M – 64%; Lowest Quartile: R – 46% (no), M – 65% (yes)

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)

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. Interns from USF College of Education & St. Petersburg College	Principal	Ongoing
2. Sanderlin Amigo - Each new employee is assigned an experienced staff member to assist in the transition to the school	Principal	Ongoing
3. Partner new/new to grade level teachers with selected high performing teachers	Principal	Ongoing
4. International Baccalaureate authorization and professional development opportunities and experiences.	Principal	Ongoing

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
Data not yet available	N/A

Staff Demographics

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

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
39	0	23% (9)	56.41% (22)	20.51% (8)	64.10% (25)	Data not available yet	2.56% (1)	5.13% (2)	43.59% (17)

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
Lorrie Bennett	Elisabeth Can	2nd year teacher; continued assistance with blended PreK model, especially ESE systems	Observation of mentee's instruction and providing feedback; Planning lessons with mentee; Connecting lesson activities to content standards; Discussing student progress and analyzing student work; Modeling or co-teaching lessons

Additional Requirements
Mult-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) /Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. Denise Miller - Principal, Sue Cehi – Assistant Principal, Gerrianne Parker – Intervention Coordinator / School Counselor, Shannon Myron– School Psychologist, Robyn Royall – School Social Worker
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? -Facilitator – generates agenda and leads team discussions -Data Manager(s)/Data Coach(es) – assist team in accessing and interpreting (aggregating/disaggregating) the data -Technology Specialist – brokers technology necessary to manage and display data -Recorder/Note Taker – documents meeting content and disseminates to team members in a timely manner as well as storing a hard copy in a binder for all teachers to access -Time Keeper –helps team begin on time and ensures adherence to agreed upon agenda Meeting time: Weekly on Thursdays
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 role of the MTSS is to provide leadership to the work groups and identify the needs in order to align our efforts. PS/RtI is the process used to assure academic and behavioral success of all of our students.
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. At Tier One: Core/Differentiated instruction is measured by district wide assessments such as FAIR and Common Assessments. This data is accessed through PMRN and EDS, which provide comparisons to measure success and identify where additional intervention is needed. This data is reviewed after each testing cycle and effectiveness of core instruction is evaluated. In addition, students needing supplemental intervention are identified. Instructional coaches work with PLCs and teachers on formative assessment development and data analysis. For behavior, the Florida RtI B database is used to capture data on referrals.   This data is reviewed to determine the success of core behavioral instruction and to identify Tier 2 students. At Tier Two: For academics, small groups are selected based on skill deficit areas. Progress is monitored every other week, generally using appropriate and relevant formative assessment. For behavior, the Florida RtI B database is used to identify students needing supplemental support. These students are provided with appropriate interventions and progress monitoring at least every other week. At Tier Three: Upon review of progress monitoring from Tier 2 interventions, and through GAP analysis, students needing Intensive intervention are identified. They are scheduled for a Problem Solving Worksheet, and a plan is developed. Interventions are then implemented based on hypothesis formulated in the problem solving process. Progress is monitored weekly with AIMSweb, and after sufficient data is collected the plan is reviewed. For behavior, students needing intensive support are identified through the Florida RtI B database data and / or progress monitoring data from their supplemental intervention.   These students are scheduled for a PBIP or an FBA. Problem solving activities are used to identify and target appropriate interventions based on the function of the student's behavior.

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

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. As the MTSS Leadership team receives district training it is communicated to the staff on an ongoing basis. Staff members will be trained in a whole group setting and in PLCs. They will also be trained individually as they participate in problem solving with the MTSS Team.
Describe the plan to support MTSS. Follow-up professional development will occur during PLC's through practical application of presented skills with facilitation and support by SBIT.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT): Liz Can/Amanda Johnson, Kim Zielske, Nancy Aiello, Nicola Kuba, Velda Jordan, Gina Broadbear, Lilia Cagle, Becky Testa, Bill Barlow, Shirley Woods, Nora Branson, Denise Miller

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).
Literacy Leadership Teams create capacity of reading knowledge within the school by focusing on the following areas of literacy concern:
• Support for text complexity
• Support for instructional skills to improve reading comprehension
   • Ensuring that text complexity, along with close reading and rereading of texts, is central to lessons
   • Providing scaffolding that does not preempt or replace text reading by students
   • Developing and asking text dependent questions from a range of question types
   • Emphasizing students supporting their answers based upon evidence from the text
   • Providing extensive research and writing opportunities (claims and evidence)
• Support for implementation of Common Core State Standards for Literacy in Social Studies, Science, & Technical Subjects (a focus on text, task, & instruction).
The district will provide training and tools for Literacy Leadership Teams.
This leadership team meets once a month on a scheduled day and time. This team will be responsible for monitoring the SIP reading/writing goals and implementation of selected strategies.

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?
Support for text complexity
•   Support for instructional skills to improve reading comprehension
•   Support for implementation of Common Core State Standards for Literacy in Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects
   ➢ *Standards-based planning & data driven decision making using formative assessments*
   ➢ *Differentiated instruction*
   ➢ *Reading and writing with complex text*

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Elementary and Middle School Reading Goals

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

Elementary and Middle School 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. Reading Goal #1a: Decrease the percentage of students scoring level 1 & 2 from 45% to 35%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 22% (61)	2013Expected Level of Performance:* Decrease the percentage of students scoring level 1 & 2 from 45% to 35%.	1a.1. Determining the appropriate level of cognitive/text complexity as aligned to the demands of FCAT 2.0.	1a.1. Deepening understanding and precision of selecting appropriate level of cognitive/text complexity for the demands of FCAT 2.0/Common Core State Standards.	1a.1. Denise Miller	1a.1. PLC Minutes document time spent discussing and planning for cognitive/text complexity and demands of FCAT 2.0 PLC review of Tier 1 formative assessment data, as facilitated by an administrator and documented in PLC minutes	1a.1. Ongoing formative assessment
			1a.2. IB transdisciplinary and interdisciplinary planning has included few cognitively complex authentic writing activities across the curriculum, that aligns with the demands so FCAT 2.0.	1a.2. Increase cognitively complex authentic writing opportunities and purposes of writing.	1a.2. Denise Miller	1a.2. PLC review of Tier 1 formative assessment data, as facilitated by an administrator and documented in PLC minutes	1a.2. Ongoing formative assessments
2a.FCAT 2.0:Students scoring at or above AchievementLevels 4 and 5 in reading. Reading Goal #2a: Increase the percentage of	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*	2a.1. Determining the appropriate level of cognitive/text complexity as aligned to the	2a.1. Deepening understanding and precision of selecting appropriate level of cognitive/text	2a.1. Denise Miller	2a.1. PLC Minutes document time spent discussing and planning for cognitive/text complexity and demands of FCAT 2.0	2a.1. Ongoing formative assessment

percentage of students scoring level 4 & 5 from 33% to 38%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*	aligned to the demands of FCAT 2.0.	cognitive/text complexity for the demands of FCAT 2.0/Common Core State Standards.		PLC review of Tier 1 formative assessment data, as facilitated by an administrator and documented in PLC minutes	
	33% (92)	Increase level 4 and 5 by 5%					
			2a.2. IB transdisciplinary and interdisciplinary planning has included few cognitively complex authentic writing activities across the curriculum, that aligns with the demands so FCAT 2.0.	2a.2. Increase cognitively complex authentic writing opportunities and purposes of writing.	2a.2. Denise Miller	2a.2. PLC review of Tier 1 formative assessment data, as facilitated by an administrator and documented in PLC minutes	2a.2. Ongoing formative assessments
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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. Determining the appropriate level of cognitive/text complexity as aligned to the demands of FCAT 2.0.	3a.1. Deepening understanding and precision of selecting appropriate level of cognitive/text complexity for the demands of FCAT 2.0/Common Core State Standards.	3a.1. Denise Miller	3a.1. PLC Minutes document time spent discussing and planning for cognitive/text complexity and demands of FCAT 2.0 PLC review of Tier 1 formative assessment data, as facilitated by an administrator and documented in PLC minutes	3a.1. Ongoing formative assessment
Reading Goal #3a: Increase percentage of students making learning gains in reading from 62% to 100%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	62% (118)	100%					
			3a.2. IB transdisciplinary and interdisciplinary planning has included few	3a.2. Increase cognitively complex authentic writing opportunities and purposes of writing.	33a.2. Denise Miller	3a.2. PLC review of Tier 1 formative assessment data, as facilitated by an administrator and documented in PLC minutes	3a.2. Ongoing formative assessments

			complex authentic writing activities across the curriculum, that aligns with the demands so FCAT 2.0.				
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. Reading Goal #4a: Increase percentage of students in the lowest quartile making learning gains from 51% to 100%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 51% (25)	2013Expected Level of Performance:* 100%	4a.1. Determining the appropriate level of cognitive/text complexity as aligned to the demands of FCAT 2.0.	4a.1. Deepening understanding and precision of selecting appropriate level of cognitive/text complexity for the demands of FCAT 2.0/Common Core State Standards.	4a.1. Denise Miller	4a.1. PLC Minutes document time spent discussing and planning for cognitive/text complexity and demands of FCAT 2.0 PLC review of Tier 1 formative assessment data, as facilitated by an administrator and documented in PLC minutes	4a.1. Ongoing formative assessment
			4a.2. IB transdisciplinary and interdisciplinary planning has included few cognitively complex authentic writing activities across the curriculum, that aligns with the demands so FCAT 2.0.	4a.2. Increase cognitively complex authentic writing opportunities and purposes of writing.	4a.2. Denise Miller	4a.2. PLC review of Tier 1 formative assessment data, as facilitated by an administrator and documented in PLC minutes	4a.2. Ongoing formative assessments
			4a.3 Small group instruction not fully aligned to tested benchmarks at the appropriate	4a.3 Implement small groups that are fully aligned to tested benchmarks at the appropriate level of	4a.3 Denise Miller	4a.3 Teacher develops and maintains small group plans based on formative assessments of benchmarks	4a.3 Ongoing formative assessments and lesson plans

		4a.3 Small group instruction not fully aligned to tested benchmarks at the appropriate level of cognitive/text complexity and demands of FCAT 2.0.	4a.3 Implement small groups that are fully aligned to tested benchmarks at the appropriate level of cognitive/text complexity and demands of FCAT 2.0	4a.3 Denise Miller	4a.3 Teacher develops and maintains small group plans based on formative assessments of benchmarks	4a.3 Ongoing formative assessments and lesson plans	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target		**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs).	Baseline data 2010-2011 _52_	60	**68**	**76**	**84**	**92**	**100**
Reading Goal #5A: **In six years the school will reduce the achievement gap by 50%.**							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**		5b.1. Determining the appropriate level of cognitive/text complexity as aligned to the demands of FCAT	5b.1. Deepening understanding and precision of selecting appropriate level of cognitive/text complexity for the	5b.1. Denise Miller	5b.1. PLC Minutes document time spent discussing and planning for cognitive/text complexity and demands of FCAT 2.0 PLC review of Tier 1 formative	5b.1. Ongoing formative assessment	

Reading Goal #5B:
Increase percentage of student subgroups making learning gains to 100%.

5b.2.
IB transdisciplinary and interdisciplinary planning has included few cognitively complex authentic writing activities across the curriculum, that aligns with the

5b.2.
Increase cognitively complex authentic writing opportunities and purposes of writing.

5b.2.
PLC review of Tier 1 formative assessment data, as facilitated by an administrator and documented in PLC minutes

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

Reading Goal #5B: Increase percentage of student subgroups making learning gains to 100%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*	5b.2. IB transdisciplinary and interdisciplinary planning has included few cognitively complex authentic writing activities across the curriculum, that aligns with the demands so FCAT 2.0.	5b.2. Increase cognitively complex authentic writing opportunities and purposes of writing.	5b.2. Denise Miller	5b.2. PLC review of Tier 1 formative assessment data, as facilitated by an administrator and documented in PLC minutes	5b.2. Ongoing formative assessments
	White: 54% (83) Black: 25% (39) Hispanic: 9% (14) Asian: 2% (3) American Indian: 0% (0)	100% of all subgroups to make a learning gain Increase proficiency of all subgroups by 10%					
			5b.3. Small group instruction not fully aligned to tested benchmarks at the appropriate level of cognitive/text complexity and demands of FCAT 2.0.	5b.3. Implement small groups that are fully aligned to tested benchmarks at the appropriate level of cognitive/text complexity and demands of FCAT 2.0	5b.3. Denise Miller	5b.3. Teacher develops and maintains small group plans based on formative assessments of benchmarks	5b.3. Ongoing formative assessments and lesson plans
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5e.1. Determining the appropriate level of cognitive/text complexity as aligned to the demands of FCAT	5e.1. Deepening understanding and precision of selecting appropriate level of cognitive/text complexity for the	5e.1. Denise Miller	5e.1. PLC Minutes document time spent discussing and planning for cognitive/text complexity and demands of FCAT 2.0 PLC review of Tier 1 formative	5e.1. Ongoing formative assessment
Reading Goal #5E: Increase percentage of economically disadvantaged	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5e.1. Determining the appropriate level of	5e.1. Deepening understanding and	5e.1. Denise Miller	5e.1. PLC Minutes document time spent discussing and planning for	5e.1. Ongoing formative assessment
Reading Goal #5E: Increase percentage of economically disadvantaged students making learning gains from 39% to 100%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	39% (75)	100% of economically disadvantaged students will make a learning gain and increase proficiency in reading by 10%					
			5e.2. IB transdisciplinary and interdisciplinary planning has included few cognitively complex authentic writing activities across the curriculum, that aligns with the demands so FCAT 2.0.	5e.2. Increase cognitively complex authentic writing opportunities and purposes of writing.	5e.2. Denise Miller	5e.2. PLC review of Tier 1 formative assessment data, as facilitated by an administrator and documented in PLC minutes	5e.2. Ongoing formative assessments
			5e.3. Small group instruction not fully aligned to tested benchmarks at the appropriate level of cognitive/text	5e.3. Implement small groups that are fully aligned to tested benchmarks at the appropriate level of cognitive/text complexity and	5e.3. Denise Miller	5e.3. Teacher develops and maintains small group plans based on formative assessments of benchmarks	5e.3. Ongoing formative assessments and lesson plans

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

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
Standards-based lesson planning	PK-7	Administrator and IB Coordinator	All instructional staff	Ongoing	Ongoing classroom embedded coaching	Administrator and IB Coordinator
Data driven decision making	K-7	Administrator and IB Coordinator	All instructional staff	Ongoing	Ongoing classroom embedded coaching	Administrator and IB Coordinator
Cognitive/text complexity as aligned to the demands of FCAT 2.0	PK-7	Administrator and IB Coordinator	All instructional staff	Ongoing	Ongoing classroom embedded coaching	Administrator and IB Coordinator
Purposes of writing across the curriculum and subject areas	PK-7	Administrator and IB Coordinator	All instructional staff	Ongoing	Ongoing classroom embedded coaching	Administrator and IB Coordinator

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

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
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
IB on-site and external training	Integration of reading-writing	Magnet monies	$1500.00
			Subtotal: $1,500.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
IB Transdisciplinary Instructional Resources	Books, magazines	Magnet monies	$637.00
			Subtotal:
			Total: $2,137.00

End of Reading Goals

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

Elementary and Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

<table>
<tr>
<th colspan="3">Elementary and Middle School
Mathematics Goals</th>
<th colspan="5">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</th>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="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:</td>
<td>Anticipated Barrier</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td>
<td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td>
<td>Evaluation Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="3">1a.FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at AchievementLevel 3 in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #1a:
Decrease the percentage of students scoring level 1 & 2 from 55% to 45%.</td>
<td>1a.1.
Determining the appropriate level of cognitive/text complexity as aligned to the demands of FCAT 2.0.</td>
<td>1a.1.
Deepening understanding and precision of selecting appropriate level of cognitive/text complexity for the demands of FCAT 2.0/Common Core State Standards</td>
<td>1a.1.
Maria Lehman</td>
<td>1a.1.
PLC Minutes document time spent discussing and planning for cognitive/text complexity and demands of FCAT 2.0

PLC review of Tier 1 formative assessment data, as facilitated by an administrator and documented in PLC minutes</td>
<td>1a.1.
Ongoing formative assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*

22%(62)</td>
<td>2013Expected Level of Performance:*

Decrease in level 1 and 2 from 55% to 45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="3"></td>
<td>1a.2.
IB transdisciplinary and interdisciplinary planning has included few cognitively complex authentic writing activities across the curriculum, that aligns with the demands so FCAT 2.0.</td>
<td>1a.2.
Increase cognitively complex authentic writing opportunities and classroom conversations. Strengthen understanding of the Standards for Mathematical Practice.</td>
<td>1a.2.
Maria Lehman</td>
<td>1a.2.
PLC review of Tier 1 formative assessment data, as facilitated by an administrator and documented in PLC minutes</td>
<td>1a.2.
Ongoing formative assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="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:</td>
<td>Anticipated Barrier</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td>
<td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td>
<td>Evaluation Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="3">2a.FCAT 2.0:Students scoring at or above AchievementLevels 4 and 5 in mathematics.</td>
<td>2a.1.
Determining the appropriate level of cognitive/text</td>
<td>2a.1.
Deepening understanding and precision of selecting</td>
<td>2a.1.
Maria Lehman</td>
<td>2a.1.
PLC Minutes document time spent discussing and</td>
<td>2a.1.
Ongoing formative</td>
</tr>
</table>

2a.**FCAT 2.0:Students scoring at or above AchievementLevels 4 and 5 in mathematics.**			level of cognitive/text complexity as aligned to the demands of FCAT 2.0.	and precision of selecting appropriate level of cognitive/text complexity for the demands of FCAT 2.0/Common Core State Standards	2a.1. Maria Lehman	spent discussing and planning for cognitive/text complexity and demands of FCAT 2.0	formative assessment
Mathematics Goal #2a: Increase the percentage of students scoring level 4 & 5 from 22% to 27%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 22%(62)	2013Expected Level of Performance:* Increase in level 4 and 5 by 5%				PLC review of Tier 1 formative assessment data, as facilitated by an administrator and documented in PLC minutes	
			2a.2. IB transdisciplinary and interdisciplinary planning has included few cognitively complex authentic writing activities across the curriculum, that aligns with the demands so FCAT 2.0.	2a.2. Increase cognitively complex authentic writing opportunities and classroom conversations. Strengthen understanding of the Standards for Mathematical Practice.	2a.2. Maria Lehman	2a.2. PLC review of Tier 1 formative assessment data, as facilitated by an administrator and documented in PLC minutes	2a.2. Ongoing formative assessment
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. Determining the appropriate level of cognitive/text complexity as aligned to the demands of FCAT 2.0.	3a.1. Deepening understanding and precision of selecting appropriate level of cognitive/text complexity for the demands of FCAT 2.0/Common Core State Standards	3a.1. Maria Lehman	3a.1. PLC Minutes document time spent discussing and planning for cognitive/text complexity and demands of FCAT 2.0	3a.1. Ongoing formative assessment
Mathematics Goal #3a: Increase the percentage of students making learning gains from 72% to 100%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 72% (137)	2013Expected Level of Performance:* 100% of students will make a learning gain				PLC review of Tier 1 formative assessment data, as facilitated by an administrator and documented in PLC minutes	
			3a.2. IB transdisciplinary and interdisciplinary planning has included few cognitively complex	3a.2. Increase cognitively complex authentic writing opportunities and classroom conversations. Strengthen	3a.2. Maria Lehman	3a.2. PLC review of Tier 1 formative assessment data, as facilitated by an administrator and	3a.2. Ongoing formative assessment

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

			3a.2. IB transdisciplinary and interdisciplinary planning has included few cognitively complex authentic writing activities across the curriculum, that aligns with the demands so FCAT 2.0.	3a.2. Increase cognitively complex authentic writing opportunities and classroom conversations. Strengthen understanding of the Standards for Mathematical Practice.	3a.2. Maria Lehman	3a.2. PLC review of Tier 1 formative assessment data, as facilitated by an administrator and documented in PLC minutes	3a.2. Ongoing formative assessment
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. Mathematics Goal #4a: Increase the percentage of students in the lowest quartile making learning gains from 63% to 100%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 63% (33)	2013Expected Level of Performance:* 100% of students will make a learning gain	4a.1. Determining the appropriate level of cognitive/text complexity as aligned to the demands of FCAT 2.0.	4a.1. Deepening understanding and precision of selecting appropriate level of cognitive/text complexity for the demands of FCAT 2.0/Common Core State Standards	4a.1. Maria Lehman	4a.1. PLC Minutes document time spent discussing and planning for cognitive/text complexity and demands of FCAT 2.0 PLC review of Tier 1 formative assessment data, as facilitated by an administrator and documented in PLC minutes	4a.1. Ongoing formative assessment
			4a.2. IB transdisciplinary and interdisciplinary planning has included few cognitively complex authentic writing activities across the curriculum, that aligns with the demands so FCAT 2.0.	4a.2. Increase cognitively complex authentic writing opportunities and classroom conversations. Strengthen understanding of the Standards for Mathematical Practice.	4a.2. Maria Lehman	4a.2. PLC review of Tier 1 formative assessment data, as facilitated by an administrator and documented in PLC minutes	4a.2. Ongoing formative assessment
			4a.3. Students have a lack of confidence in themselves as mathematicians	4a.3. Increase confidence in math by providing opportunities for daily problem solving and sharing of ideas with peers using Talk Moves.	4a.3. Maria Lehman	4a.3. PLC review of Tier 1 or 2 formative assessment data as facilitated by IB Coordinator and/or administrator, and documented in PLC minutes	4a.3 Ongoing formative assessment
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs).	Baseline data 2010 – 2011 42	47	52	57	61	66
Mathematics Goal #5A: **In six years the school will reduce the achievement gap by 50%.**						

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.** Mathematics Goal #5B: 100% of student subgroups will make learning gains and increase in proficiency by 10%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White: 50% (62) Black: 27% (34) Hispanic: 8% (10) / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 100% of student subgroups will make learning gains and increase proficiency by 10%	5b.1. Determining the appropriate level of cognitive/text complexity as aligned to the demands of FCAT 2.0.	5b.1. Deepening understanding and precision of selecting appropriate level of cognitive/text complexity for the demands of FCAT 2.0/Common Core State Standards	5b.1. Maria Lehman	5b.1. PLC Minutes document time spent discussing and planning for cognitive/text complexity and demands of FCAT 2.0 PLC review of Tier 1 formative assessment data, as facilitated by an administrator and documented in PLC minutes	5b.1. Ongoing formative assessment
		5b.2. IB transdisciplinary and interdisciplinary planning has included few cognitively complex authentic writing activities across the curriculum, that aligns with the demands so FCAT 2.0.	5b.2. Increase cognitively complex authentic writing opportunities and classroom conversations. Strengthen understanding of the Standards for Mathematical Practice.	5b.2. Maria Lehman	5b.2. PLC review of Tier 1 formative assessment data, as facilitated by an administrator and documented in PLC minutes	5b.2. Ongoing formative assessment
		5b.3. Students have a lack of confidence in themselves as mathematicians	5b.3. Increase confidence in math by providing opportunities for daily problem solving	5b.3. Maria Lehman	5b.3. PLC review of Tier 1 or 2 formative assessment data as facilitated by IB Coordinator	5b.3 Ongoing formative assessment

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

			and sharing of ideas with peers using Talk Moves.		and/or administrator, and documented in PLC minutes	

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. Mathematics Goal #5E: 100% of economically disadvantaged students will make learning gains and increase proficiency by 10%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 30% (58)	2013Expected Level of Performance:* 100% of economically disadvantaged students will make learning gains and increase proficiency by 10%.	5e.1. Determining the appropriate level of cognitive/text complexity as aligned to the demands of FCAT 2.0.	5e.1. Deepening understanding and precision of selecting appropriate level of cognitive/text complexity for the demands of FCAT 2.0/Common Core State Standards	5e.1. Maria Lehman	5e.1. PLC Minutes document time spent discussing and planning for cognitive/text complexity and demands of FCAT 2.0 PLC review of Tier 1 formative assessment data, as facilitated by an administrator and documented in PLC minutes	5e.1. Ongoing formative assessment
			5e.2. IB transdisciplinary and interdisciplinary planning has included few cognitively complex authentic writing activities across the curriculum, that aligns with the demands so FCAT 2.0.	5e.2. Increase cognitively complex authentic writing opportunities and classroom conversations. Strengthen understanding of the Standards for Mathematical Practice.	5e.2. Maria Lehman	5e.2. PLC review of Tier 1 formative assessment data, as facilitated by an administrator and documented in PLC minutes	5e.2. Ongoing formative assessment
			5e.3. Students have a lack of confidence in themselves as mathematicians	5e.3. Increase confidence in math by providing opportunities for daily problem solving	5e.3. Maria Lehman	5e.3. PLC review of Tier 1 or 2 formative assessment data as facilitated by IB Coordinator	5e.3 Ongoing formative assessment

			and sharing of ideas with peers using Talk Moves.		and/or administrator, and documented in PLC minutes	

Mathematics Professional Development (Insert rows as needed)

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Standards-based lesson planning	PK-7	Administrator and IB Coordinator	All instructional staff	Ongoing	Ongoing classroom embedded coaching	Administrator and IB Coordinator
Data driven decision making	PK-7	Administrator and IB Coordinator	All instructional staff	Ongoing	Ongoing classroom embedded coaching	Administrator and IB Coordinator
Cognitive/text complexity as aligned to the demands of FCAT 2.0	PK-7	Administrator and IB Coordinator	All instructional staff	Ongoing	Ongoing classroom embedded coaching	Administrator and IB Coordinator

Mathematics Budget(Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
IB external training	Math in the IB Primary Years Programme – Category 3	Magnet monies	$3,350.00
			Subtotal: 3,350.00

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

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: $3,350.00

End of Mathematics Goals

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

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. Determining the appropriate level of cognitive/text complexity as aligned to the demands of FCAT 2.0.	1a.1. Deepening understanding and precision of selecting appropriate level of cognitive/text complexity for the demands of FCAT 2.0/Common Core State Standards	1a.1. Maria Lehman	1a.1. PLC Minutes document time spent discussing and planning for cognitive/text complexity and demands of FCAT 2.0 PLC review of Tier 1 formative assessment data, as facilitated by an administrator and documented in PLC minutes	1a.1. Ongoing formative assessment
Science Goal #1a: Decrease the percentage of level 1 & 2 scores from 50% to 40%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 35%(23)	2013Expected Level of Performance:* Decrease the number of level 1 and 2					
			1a.2 IB transdisciplinary and interdisciplinary planning has included few cognitively complex authentic writing activities across the curriculum, that aligns with the demands so FCAT 2.0.	1a.2 Increase cognitively complex authentic writing opportunities and classroom conversations. Strengthen understanding of the Standards for Mathematical Practice.	1a.2 Maria Lehman	1a.2 PLC review of Tier 1 formative assessment data, as facilitated by an administrator and documented in PLC minutes	1a.2 Ongoing formative assessment
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. Science Goal #2a: Increase the percentage of level 4 & 5 from 15% to	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*	2a.1. Determining the appropriate level of cognitive/text complexity as aligned to	2a.1. Deepening understanding and precision of selecting appropriate level of cognitive/text complexity	2a.1. Maria Lehman	2a.1. PLC Minutes document time spent discussing and planning for cognitive/text complexity and demands of	2a.1. Ongoing formative assessment

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

2a. FCAT 2.0:Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.			2a.1. Determining the	2a.1. Deepening understanding	2a.1. Maria Lehman	2a.1. PLC Minutes document time	2a.1. Ongoing formative
Science Goal #2a: Increase the percentage of level 4 & 5 from 15% to 20%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	15%(10)	Increase the level 4 and 5 students 5%					
			2a.2 IB transdisciplinary and interdisciplinary planning has included few cognitively complex authentic	2a.2 Increase cognitively complex authentic writing opportunities and classroom conversations. Strengthen understanding	2a.2 Maria Lehman	2a.2 PLC review of Tier 1 formative assessment data, as facilitated by an administrator and documented in PLC minutes	2a.2 Ongoing formative assessment

Science Professional Development (Insert rows as needed)

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

<table>
<tr><th colspan="7">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.</th></tr>
<tr><th>PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus</th><th>Grade Level/Subject</th><th>PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader</th><th>PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)</th><th>Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)</th><th>Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring</th><th>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</th></tr>
<tr><td>Standards-based lesson planning</td><td>PK-7</td><td>Administrator and IB Coordinator</td><td>All instructional staff</td><td>Ongoing</td><td>Ongoing classroom embedded coaching</td><td>Administrator and IB Coordinator</td></tr>
<tr><td>Data driven decision making</td><td>PK-7</td><td>Administrator and IB Coordinator</td><td>All instructional staff</td><td>Ongoing</td><td>Ongoing classroom embedded coaching</td><td>Administrator and IB Coordinator</td></tr>
<tr><td>Cognitive/text complexity as aligned to the demands of FCAT 2.0</td><td>PK-7</td><td>Administrator and IB Coordinator</td><td>All instructional staff</td><td>Ongoing</td><td>Ongoing classroom embedded coaching</td><td>Administrator and IB Coordinator</td></tr>
</table>

Science Budget(Insert rows as needed)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="4">Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Strategy</td><td>Description of Resources</td><td>Funding Source</td><td>Amount</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3"></td><td>Subtotal:</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Technology</td></tr>
<tr><td>Strategy</td><td>Description of Resources</td><td>Funding Source</td><td>Amount</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3"></td><td>Subtotal:</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Professional Development</td></tr>
<tr><td>Strategy</td><td>Description of Resources</td><td>Funding Source</td><td>Amount</td></tr>
<tr><td>IB external training</td><td>Science in the IB Middle Years Programme</td><td>Magnet monies</td><td>$1,300.00</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3"></td><td>Subtotal: $1,300.00</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Other</td></tr>
<tr><td>Strategy</td><td>Description of Resources</td><td>Funding Source</td><td>Amount</td></tr>
<tr><td>Inquiry& cognitive complexity</td><td>Science hands-on materials</td><td>Magnet monies</td><td>$350.00</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3"></td><td>Subtotal: $350.00</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3"></td><td>Total: $1,650.00</td></tr>
</table>

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

End of Science Goals

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

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1a. FCAT:Students scoring at Achievement Level3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a: Increase percentage of students scoring level 3 and above from 82% to 84%. 2012 Current Level of Performance:* Level 3 and above 82% (32) Level 4 and above 26% (10) 2013Expected Level of Performance:* Increase the percentage of students scoring level 4 and above.	1a.1. IB transdisciplinary and interdisciplinary planning has included few cognitively complex authentic writing activities across the curriculum, that aligns with the demands so FCAT 2.0.	1a.1. Increase cognitively complex authentic writing opportunities and purposes of writing.	1a.1. Denise Miller	1a.1. PLC review of Tier 1 formative assessment data, as facilitated by an administrator and documented in PLC minutes	1a.1. Ongoing formative assessments

Writing Professional Development (Insert rows as needed)

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Standards-based lesson planning	PK-7	Administrator and IB Coordinator	All instructional staff	Ongoing	Ongoing classroom embedded coaching	Administrator and IB Coordinator
Data driven decision making	PK-7	Administrator and IB Coordinator	All instructional staff	Ongoing	Ongoing classroom embedded coaching	Administrator and IB Coordinator
Cognitive/text complexity as aligned to the demands	PK-7	Administrator and IB	All instructional staff	Ongoing	Ongoing classroom embedded coaching	Administrator and IB Coordinator

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

of FCAT 2.0		Coordinator				
Purposes of writing across the curriculum and subject areas	PK-7	Administrator and IB Coordinator	All instructional staff	Ongoing	Ongoing classroom embedded coaching	Administrator and IB Coordinator

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Increase 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

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

1. Attendance			1a.1. The family's perception of the importance of timeliness along with attending school regularly and the effect that it has on their children's academic success.	1a.1. To emphasize the importance of each student begin on-time by the 8:35 am tardy bell, a research based "check in" system will be implemented for students identified by the Child Study Team utilizing Portal data as being at risk for excessive tardies. To assist in a paradigm shift of the parent's perception of the effects of excessive tardies and absences on academic performance, academic data will be shared in the Child Study Team attendance conferences. The Child Study Team will assign varying school personnel to individual students.	1a.1. Robyn Royall, Social Worker	1a.1. A change in the attendance behavior for the specific students involved in this intervention. A positive change in academic data	1a.1. Attendance data from Portal Review of the impact on RtI academic data
Attendance Goal #1: Improve average daily attendance from 96% to 97%.	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
	96%	97%					
	2012 Current Number of Studentswith Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
Decrease the number of students with excessive absences from 126 to 113.	126	10% decrease from prior year					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	124	10% decrease from prior year					
Decrease the number of students with excessive tardies from 124 to 112.							
			1a.2. Input of inaccurate data into database concerning absences and tardies	1a.2. Train school personnel on the policies/procedures and the importance of accuracy input of data in Portal	1a.2. Child Study Team and school personnel	1a.2. Review of data input for accuracy	1a.2. Portal data

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	PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus
Review School Board attendance policy and Portal codes	Review School Board attendance policy and Portal codes	Review School Board attendance policy and Portal codes	Review School Board attendance policy and Portal codes	Review School Board attendance policy and Portal codes	Review School Board attendance policy and Portal codes	Review School Board attendance policy and Portal codes

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

Attendance Budget(Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			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 Suspension Goal #1: Decrease the total number of In-School	2012Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions	1.1. Consistent/dedicated time to review data and meet with teachers	1.1. Strengthen Tier 1 support through PBS (Positive Behavior Support) with more consistent	1.1. Administrator	1.1. Monthly review of data at SBLT meetings	1.1. FLRtI-B Database

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

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">1. Suspension</td><td>1.1.
Consistent/dedicated</td><td>1.1.
Strengthen Tier 1 support</td><td>1.1.
Administrator</td><td>1.1.
Monthly review of data at</td><td>1.1.
FLRtI-B</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="4">Suspension Goal #1: Decrease the total number of In-School Suspensions from 41 to 37.

Decrease the total number of students suspended in-school from 28 to 25.

Decrease the total number of out-of-school suspensions from 51 to 46.

Decrease the total number of students suspended out-of-school from 26 to 23.</td><td>2012Total Number of In –School Suspensions</td><td>2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions</td><td rowspan="4"></td><td rowspan="4"></td><td rowspan="4"></td><td rowspan="4"></td><td rowspan="4"></td></tr>
<tr><td>41</td><td>10% decrease from prior year</td></tr>
<tr><td>2012Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</td><td>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School</td></tr>
<tr><td>28</td><td>10% decrease from prior year</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>2012Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</td><td>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>51</td><td>10% decrease from prior year</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>2012Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School</td><td>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>26</td><td>10% decrease from prior year</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>1.2.
Divergent behavior expectations between school and home.</td><td>1.2.
In-house professional development to help increase parent communication skills regarding behavior issues and help increase knowledge of school culture</td><td>1.2.
Administrator</td><td>1.2.
Pro-Ed Mini Break-out sessions</td><td>1.2.
FLRTI-B database</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>1.3
Students lack of social skills in school based setting</td><td>1.3
Based on frequent data reviews or teacher observation, use classroom meeting, Skills Streaming or Second Step</td><td>1.3
Administrator</td><td>1.3
PLC minutes
Monthly Data Reviews</td><td>1.3
FLRTI-B database</td></tr>
</table>

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

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 Additional Goal #1: A positive and proactive behavior plan will be developed that supports social/emotional learning and behavior. A 10% improvement on the FLPBS Benchmarks of Quality will be used to measure implementation with fidelity.	2010 Current Level: BOQ baseline score (06/2011): 92/108: 85%	2012 Expected Level: *95%*	1.1. Data collection system will need to be learned and used when analyzing data	1.1. Use database to review data more frequently (2x a month) to help increase effective and efficient use of data	1.1. Administrator	1.1. Bring experiences to SBLT along with data to review and receive input from SBLT members	1.1. Minutes from team meeting will indicate the review of data at least monthly.
			1.2. Not all staff & students are aware of school-wide Guidelines for success/Expectations	1.2. Guidelines for Success/Expectations will be posted in all classrooms and common areas. Lessons for each of these will be taught during the 1st semester of school.	1.2. Guidance Counselor, Administrator	1.2. Walk-through/check list Random sample check of both students and staff.	1.2. Walk-through/check list data Random sample of data

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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Staff training in PBS expectations & best practice strategies	PK-7	Assistant Principal	School wide	Extended days on Tuesdays 1 time per month	Walk-throughs, PLC meetings Data review	Administrator
I care language program	Kdg/1st	School Counselor	Students	PLC meetings and class meetings	PLC meetings, Data review and planned feedback	School Counselor
RtI-Behavior Process	K-7	SBLT	SBLT	On-going and SBLT meetings	Through SBLT meetings	Administrator

Suspension Budget(Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

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 Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	1.1a. Two way communication has not been fully developed	1.1a Provide flexible trainings throughout the year for parents and teachers. Provide, at a minimum	1.1a. Joyce Reichle	1.1a Collect data generated from parent usage of Focus. Provide parents with a	1.1a Focus Usage data report Parent feedback on the

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

<table>
<tr>
<td colspan="2">1. Parent Involvement

<u>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</u>
*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</td>
<td>1.1a.
Two way communication has not been fully developed</td>
<td>1.1a
Provide flexible trainings throughout the year for parents and teachers.</td>
<td>1.1a.
Joyce Reichle</td>
<td>1.1a
Collect data generated from parent usage of Focus.</td>
<td>1.1a
Focus Usage data report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve current level of performance

Focus logins by parents</td>
<td>2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:*

2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*
Increase by 20%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide, at a minimum, two training videos to post online - FOCUS and an academic emphasis. For example, "Reading with your child."</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide parents with a survey for reflecting on the posted videos.</td>
<td>Parent feedback on the videos made available</td>
</tr>
</table>

Parent Involvement Professional Development

<table>
<tr>
<td colspan="7">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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus</td>
<td>Grade Level/Subject</td>
<td>PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader</td>
<td>PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)</td>
<td>Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)</td>
<td>Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring</td>
<td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Involvement Strategies</td>
<td>PK-7</td>
<td>Joyce Reichle</td>
<td>Ongoing at varying times & with varying groups</td>
<td>Various Tuesday am Pro Ed sessions</td>
<td>ProEd Evaluations</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
</tr>
</table>

Parent Involvement Budget

<table>
<tr>
<td colspan="4">Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="4">Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Description of Resources</td>
<td>Funding Source</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="4" align="right">Subtotal:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="4">Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Description of Resources</td>
<td>Funding Source</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="4" align="right">Subtotal:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="4">Professional Development</td>
</tr>
</table>

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Access to daily 2-way communication between home/school	Agendas	Internal funds	2,589.72
			Subtotal: 2,589.72
			Total: 2,589.72

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Additional Goal I Wellness (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: Wellness Additional Goal #1: Provide comprehensive supports for healthier school environment by achieving Gold Level status in four out of eight components of the self-report Healthy Schools Inventory	2012 Current Level :* 38% Gold Level status (3of 8 components Gold)	2013 Expected Level :* 50% Gold Level Status (4 of 8 components Gold)	1.1a. Staff time to research Alliance for Healthier Generation's guidelines, tools, resources, posted grants and success stories.	1.1a. Sanderlin Wellness Council to analyze and disseminate information	1.1a. Kacee Crumpacker	1.1a. Completion of Healthy Schools Builder six steps with updated status of one or more items on the Healthy Schools Inventory.	1.1a. Healthy Schools Builder

Additional Wellness Goals Professional Development

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

Additional Wellness 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:

Additional Goal II Bradley MOU (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: Black Academic Achievement	1.1. Lack of differentiation of	1.1. Differentiate Instruction	1.1. Administrator who evaluates	1.1. Content materials are differentiated by student interests, cultural background	1.1. Lesson Plans & Walkthrough

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

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">1. Additional Goal: Black Academic Achievement</td><td>1.1.
Lack of differentiation of instruction</td><td>1.1.
Differentiate Instruction</td><td>1.1.
Administrator who evaluates teacher</td><td>1.1.
Content materials are differentiated by student interests, cultural background, prior knowledge of content, and skill level
*Content materials are appropriately scaffolded to meet the needs of diverse learners (learning readiness and specific learning needs)
*Models, examples and questions are appropriately scaffolded to meet the needs of diverse learners *Teachers provide small group instruction to target specific learning needs.
*These small groups are flexible and change with the content, project and assessments
*Students are provided opportunities to demonstrate or express knowledge and</td><td>1.1.
Lesson Plans & Walkthrough</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Additional Goal #1:

There will be an increase in black student achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td>2012 Current Level :*</td><td>2013 Expected Level :*</td></tr>
<tr><td>Reading level 3 and above: 25% (39)

MathLevel 3 and above: 27% (34)</td><td>All black students to make learning gains in reading and math</td></tr>
</table>

Additional MOU Goals Professional Development

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

Additional MOU 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:

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

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

Additional Goal III Bradley MOU (s)

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

<table>
<tr>
<th colspan="2">Additional Goal(s)</th>
<th colspan="5">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</th>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="2">Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:</td>
<td>Anticipated Barrier</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td>
<td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td>
<td>Evaluation Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="2">

1. Additional Goal: Student Engagement for Black Students

Additional Goal #1: There will be an increase in black student engagement	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*
	38% (85)	Decrease the percent of Black students receiving referrals, and Receiving in school and out of school suspensions

</td>
<td>1.1.
Lack of Student Engagement</td>
<td>1.1.
Positive behavior supports are in place in the form of an effective school wide behavior plan</td>
<td>1.1.
SBLT</td>
<td>1.1.
Determine:
Expectations are clearly and positively defined
Behavioral expectations are taught and reviewed with all students and staff
Appropriate behaviors are acknowledged
Behavioral errors are proactively corrected
A database for keeping records and making decisions is established
Data-based monitoring and adaptations to the plan are regularly conducted</td>
<td>1.1.
Decrease in Number of In-School Suspension
Number of Students suspended In-School
Number of out-of-school suspensions
Number of Students suspended out-of-school
Number of alternative bell assignments
Number of students assigned to alternative bell schedule</td>
</tr>
</table>

Additional MOU II Goals Professional Development

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

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

<table>
<tr><td colspan="7" align="center">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.</td></tr>
<tr>
<td align="center">PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus</td>
<td align="center">Grade Level/Subject</td>
<td align="center">PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader</td>
<td align="center">PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)</td>
<td align="center">Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)</td>
<td align="center">Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring</td>
<td align="center">Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

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

<table>
<tr><td colspan="4">Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Strategy</td><td>Description of Resources</td><td>Funding Source</td><td>Amount</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3"></td><td align="right">Subtotal:</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Technology</td></tr>
<tr><td>Strategy</td><td>Description of Resources</td><td>Funding Source</td><td>Amount</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3"></td><td align="right">Subtotal:</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Professional Development</td></tr>
<tr><td>Strategy</td><td>Description of Resources</td><td>Funding Source</td><td>Amount</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3"></td><td align="right">Subtotal:</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Other</td></tr>
<tr><td>Strategy</td><td>Description of Resources</td><td>Funding Source</td><td>Amount</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3"></td><td align="right">Subtotal:</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4" align="right">Total: $7,137.00</td></tr>
</table>

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

<u>Additional Goal IV Bradley MOU (s)</u>

* 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: Black graduation rate <u>Additional Goal #1:</u> There will be an increase in black student graduation rate	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*	1.1. Lack of Student Engagement	1.1. Positive behavior supports are in place in the form of an effective school wide behavior plan	1.1. SBLT	1.1. Determine: Expectations are clearly and positively defined Behavioral expectations are taught and reviewed with all students and staff Appropriate behaviors are acknowledged Behavioral errors are proactively corrected A database for keeping records and making decisions is established Data-based monitoring and adaptations to the plan are regularly conducted	1.1. Increase in black graduation rate

Additional MOU Goals Professional Development

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

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

Additional MOU 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:	

Additional Goal V Bradley MOU (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

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

1. Additional Goal: Black Advanced Coursework			1.1. Lack of differentiation of instruction	1.1. Differentiate Instruction	1.1. Administrator who evaluates teacher	1.1. Content materials are differentiated by student interests, cultural background, prior knowledge of content, and skill level *Content materials are appropriately scaffolded to meet the needs of diverse learners (learning readiness and specific learning needs) *Models, examples and questions are appropriately scaffolded to meet the needs of diverse learners *Teachers provide small group instruction to target specific learning needs. *These small groups are flexible and change with the content, project and assessments *Students are provided opportunities to demonstrate or express knowledge and understanding in different ways, which includes varying degrees of difficulty.	1.1. Lesson Plans & Walkthrough Professional Development includes equity and cultural responsiveness
Additional Goal #1: There will be an increase percent of black students enrolled in rigorous advanced coursework There will be an increase in performance of black students in rigorous advanced coursework	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :* Increase from prior year					

Additional MOU Goals Professional Development

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

Additional MOU 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

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

			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: $2137.00
Mathematics Budget	
	Total: $3,350.00
Science Budget	
	Total: $1,650.00
Writing Budget	
	Total:
Attendance Budget	
	Total:
Suspension Budget	
	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	

	Total:
Additional Goals	
	Total:
	Grand Total:

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.
The School Advisory Council (SAC) has an important function for the success of James B. Sanderlin IB World School. The School Advisory Council (SAC) will meet throughout the year to review student achievement and behavior data, with regular review of the strategies and other components of the SIP to improve the overall success of our school. We will discuss legislative items that impact education and provide input to the district as requested. SAC will have the opportunity to provide input into all areas of school operations. Listed below are some of specific activities of the SAC: • Advise on how to more fully engage parents in the educational initiatives of the school as well as the importance of attending school every day, on time. • Advise, from the parents' perspective, on ways to improve and/or enhance the school's implementation of the International Baccalaureate Programme from PreK-8th grade. • Update the SAC Bylaws & guidelines as part of the review of the structure of SAC with movement toward a K-8 International Baccalaureate school.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
N/A – There are no allocated state or district SIP funds for the 2012 - 13 school year.	

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