# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

The Villages Charter School
Grades K-12
School Improvement Plan (SIP)

2012-2013

# 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

## PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

| | |
|---|---|
| School Name: **The Villages Charter School** | District Name: **Sumter** |
| Principal: **Dr. Randy McDaniel, Director of Education** | Superintendent: **Richard Shirley** |
| SAC Chair: **Dr. Gary Lester, School Board Chair** | Date of School Board Approval:  September 27, 2012 |

## Student Achievement Data:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

High School Feedback Report

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

## Highly Effective Administrators

List your school's highly effective administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school.  Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment performance (Percentage data for Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) progress.

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | Number of Years at Current School | Number of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels,  Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Principal | Elementary LeAnne Yerk | Bachelors in Elementary Education Masters in Educational Leadership Certifications: Elementary Education (1-6), Educational | 12 | 10.5 | 2011-2012 School Grade Pending: Reading Grade 3-84% Proficient, Grade 4-83% Proficient, FCAT Math Grade 3 80% Proficient, Grade 4-86% Proficient; FCAT Writing Grade 4-94% Proficient: 2010-2011 School Grade Pending; Reading Grade 3-91% Proficient, Grade 4-87% Proficient, FCAT Math Grade 3-95% Proficient, Grade 4-91% Proficient; FCAT Writing Grade 4-94% Proficient; Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities did meet AYP for Reading and Math; Reading Proficiency was not met for the Hispanic subgroup. 2009-2010 School Grade A; FCAT |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Leadership (All levels) | | | Reading Grade 3-88% Proficient, Grade 4-89% Proficient; FCAT Math Grade 3-93% Proficient, Grade 4-90% Proficient; FCAT Writing Grade 4-98% Proficient; Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities failed to make AYP in Reading; Students with Disabilities failed to make AYP in Math. <u>2008-2009</u> School Grade A; FCAT Reading Grade 3-93% Proficient, Grade 4-88% Proficient; FCAT Math Grade 3-97% Proficient, Grade 4-90% Proficient; FCAT Writing Grade 4-87% Proficient; Students with Disabilities failed to make AYP in Math. <u>2007-2008</u> School Grade A; FCAT Reading Grade 3-89% Proficient, Grade 4-86% Proficient; FCAT Math Grade 3-92% Proficient, Grade 4-86% Proficient; FCAT Writing Grade 4-79% Proficient |
| Principal | Middle School Dr. Peggy Irwin | Bachelors in Library Science and Spanish; Masters in Educational Leadership, Educational Specialist in School Guidance and Counseling, Doctorate in Educational Leadership Certifications: Educational Media Specialist (K-12); School Guidance and Counseling (K-12); School Principal (All Levels); | 5 | 4 | <u>2011-2012-</u> School Grade Pending; FCAT Reading Grade 5-77% Proficient, Grade 6-80% Proficient, Grade 7-73% Proficient, Grade 8-75% Proficient.  FCAT Math Grade 5-61% Proficient, Grade 6-75% Proficient, Grade 7-82% Proficient, Grade 8-77%.  FCAT Science Grade 5-73% Proficient, Grade 8-64% Proficient.  FCAT Writes-92% Proficient. <u>2010-2011</u> School Grade Pending; FCAT Reading Grade 5-86% Proficient, Grade 6-86% Proficient, Grade 7-84% Proficient, Grade 8-70% Proficient.  FCAT Math Grade 5-81% Proficient, Grade 6-83% Proficient, Grade 7-82% Proficient, Grade 8-88%.  FCAT Science Grade 5-68% Proficient, Grade 8-64% Proficient.  FCAT Writes-92% Proficient. Hispanic students failed to meet AYP in reading. <u>2009-2010</u> School Grade A; FCAT Reading Grade 5-85% Proficient, Grade 6-87% Proficient; Grade 7-86% Proficient; Grade 8-71% Proficient; FCAT Math Grade 5-79% Proficient, Grade 6-80% Proficient; FCAT Math Grade 7-78% Proficient, FCAT Math Grade 8-84% Proficient, FCAT Writing Grade 8-97% Proficient; FCAT Science Grade 5-64% Proficient; Science Grade 8-64% Proficient; Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities failed to make AYP in Reading; |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | English of Speakers of Other Languages (K-12) | | | Students with Disabilities failed to make AYP in Math. <u>2008-2009</u> School Grade A; FCAT Reading Grade 5-88% Proficient, Grade 6-88% Proficient; Grade 7-86% Proficient; Grade 8-72% Proficient; FCAT Math Grade 5-81% Proficient, Grade 6-79% Proficient; FCAT Math Grade 7-81% Proficient, FCAT Math Grade 8-85% Proficient, FCAT Writing Grade 8-92% Proficient; FCAT Science Grade 5-64% Proficient; Science Grade 8-57% Proficient; Students with Disabilities failed to make AYP in Math. <u>2007-2008</u> School Grade A; FCAT Reading Grade 5-83% Proficient, Grade 6-80% Proficient; Grade 7-86% Proficient; Grade 8-74% Proficient; FCAT Math Grade 5-68% Proficient, Grade 6-72% Proficient; FCAT Math Grade 7-89% Proficient, FCAT Math Grade 8-88% Proficient, FCAT Writing Grade 8-95% Proficient; FCAT Science Grade 5-53% Proficient; Science Grade 8-65% Proficient; |
| Principal | High School Dr. Bill Zwick | Doctorate in School Administration Certification: Educational Leadership (All Levels) | 6 | 6 | <u>2011-2012</u> School Grade Pending; FCAT Reading Grade 9-74% Proficient, Grade 10-72% Proficient. FCAT Writes Grade 10-88% Proficient. Algebra I EOC grade 9-93% proficient (Score L3 or greater) <u>2010-2011</u> School Grade Pending; FCAT Reading Grade 9-72% Proficient, Grade 10-62% Proficient. FCAT Math Grade 10-91% Proficient. FCAT Science Grade 11-59% Proficient. FCAT Writes Grade 10-98% Proficient. Hispanic students failed to meet AYP in reading. <u>2009-2010</u> School Grade A; FCAT Reading Grade 9-66% Proficient, Grade 10-54% Proficient; FCAT Math Grade 9-97% Proficient, Grade 10-96% Proficient; FCAT Writing Grade 10-90% Proficient; FCAT Science Grade 11-64% Proficient; Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities failed to make AYP in Reading; Students with Disabilities failed to make AYP in Math. <u>2008-2009</u> School Grade A; FCAT Reading Grade 9-72% Proficient, Grade 10-60% |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Proficient; FCAT Math Grade 9-97% Proficient, Grade 10-90% Proficient; FCAT Writing Grade 10-85% Proficient; FCAT Science Grade 11-65% Proficient; Students with Disabilities failed to make AYP in Math. 2007-2008 School Grade A; FCAT Reading Grade 9-76% Proficient, Grade 10-50% Proficient; FCAT Math Grade 9-93% Proficient, Grade 10-82% Proficient; FCAT Writing Grade 10-86% Proficient; FCAT Science Grade 11-66% Proficient |
| Assistant Principal | Elementary Kristine Rohan | Bachelors in Elementary Education; Masters of Education, specializing in Early Childhood Education; Educational Specialist in Educational Leadership Certifications: Primary Education (K-3); Educational Leadership (All levels) | 12 | 12 | 2011-2012 School Grade Pending: Reading Grade 3-84% Proficient, Grade 4-83% Proficient, FCAT Math Grade 3 80% Proficient, Grade 4-86% Proficient; FCAT Writing Grade 4-94% Proficient. 2010-2011 School Grade Pending; Reading Grade 3-91% Proficient, Grade 4-87% Proficient, FCAT Math Grade 3-95% Proficient, Grade 4-91% Proficient; FCAT Writing Grade 4-94% Proficient; Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities did meet AYP for Reading and Math; Reading Proficiency was not met for the Hispanic subgroup. 2009-2010 School Grade A; FCAT Reading Grade 3-88% Proficient, Grade 4-89% Proficient; FCAT Math Grade 3-93% Proficient, Grade 4-90% Proficient; FCAT Writing Grade 4-98% Proficient; Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities failed to make AYP in Reading; Students with Disabilities failed to make AYP in Math. 2008-2009 School Grade A; FCAT Reading Grade 3-93% Proficient, Grade 4-88% Proficient; FCAT Math Grade 3-97% Proficient, Grade 4-90% Proficient; FCAT Writing Grade 4-87% Proficient; Students with Disabilities failed to make AYP in Math. 2007-2008 School Grade A; FCAT Reading Grade 3-89% Proficient, Grade 4-86% Proficient; FCAT Math Grade 3-92% Proficient, Grade 4-86% Proficient; FCAT Writing Grade 4-79% Proficient |
| Assistant Principal | Elementary Sharon | Bachelors in Elementary | 11 | 5 | 2011-2012 School Grade Pending: Reading Grade 3-84% Proficient, Grade 4-83% Proficient, FCAT Math Grade 3 80% Proficient, Grade 4-86% Proficient; FCAT Writing Grade 4-94% |

| | Tatman | Education Masters in Educational Leadership Certifications: Elementary Education (1-6), ESOL (K-12), Educational Leadership (All levels) | | | Proficient. 2010-2011 School Grade Pending; Reading Grade 3-91% Proficient, Grade 4-87% Proficient, FCAT Math Grade 3-95% Proficient, Grade 4-91% Proficient; FCAT Writing Grade 4-94% Proficient; Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities did meet AYP for Reading and Math; Reading Proficiency was not met for the Hispanic subgroup. 2009-2010 School Grade A; FCAT Reading Grade 3-88% Proficient, Grade 4-89% Proficient; FCAT Math Grade 3-93% Proficient, Grade 4-90% Proficient; FCAT Writing Grade 4-98% Proficient; Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities failed to make AYP in Reading; Students with Disabilities failed to make AYP in Math. 2008-2009 School Grade A; FCAT Reading Grade 3-93% Proficient, Grade 4-88% Proficient; FCAT Math Grade 3-97% Proficient, Grade 4-90% Proficient; FCAT Writing Grade 4-87% Proficient; Students with Disabilities failed to make AYP in Math. 2007-2008 School Grade A; FCAT Reading Grade 3-89% Proficient, Grade 4-86% Proficient; FCAT Math Grade 3-92% Proficient, Grade 4-86% Proficient; FCAT Writing Grade 4-79% Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Assistant Principal | Middle - Robin Grant | Bachelors in Business Administration; Bachelors in History/Education; Masters in Educational Leadership, Certifications: ESE (K-12); Educational Leadership (All Levels) | 3 | 3 | 2011-2012- School Grade Pending; FCAT Reading Grade 5-77% Proficient, Grade 6-80% Proficient, Grade 7-73% Proficient, Grade 8-75% Proficient. FCAT Math Grade 5-61% Proficient, Grade 6-75% Proficient, Grade 7-82% Proficient, Grade 8-77%. FCAT Science Grade 5-73% Proficient, Grade 8-64% Proficient. FCAT Writes-92% Proficient. 2010-2011 School Grade Pending; FCAT Reading Grade 5-86% Proficient, Grade 6-86% Proficient, Grade 7-84% Proficient, Grade 8-70% Proficient. FCAT Math Grade 5-81% Proficient, Grade 6-83% Proficient, Grade 7-82% Proficient, Grade 8-88%. FCAT Science Grade 5-68% Proficient, Grade 8-64% Proficient. FCAT Writes-92% Proficient. Hispanic students failed to meet AYP in reading 2009-2010   21 years in education; new to VCS |

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

| Assistant Principal | Middle - Cathy Rowan | Bachelors in Social Science Masters in Educational Leadership Certifications: Social Science (6-12) Educational Leadership (All Levels) | 6 | 4 | 2011-2012- School Grade Pending; FCAT Reading Grade 5-77% Proficient, Grade 6-80% Proficient, Grade 7-73% Proficient, Grade 8-75% Proficient.  FCAT Math Grade 5-61% Proficient, Grade 6-75% Proficient, Grade 7-82% Proficient, Grade 8-77%.  FCAT Science Grade 5-73% Proficient, Grade 8-64% Proficient.  FCAT Writes-92% Proficient. 2010-2011 School Grade Pending; FCAT Reading Grade 5-86% Proficient, Grade 6-86% Proficient, Grade 7-84% Proficient, Grade 8-70% Proficient.  FCAT Math Grade 5-81% Proficient, Grade 6-83% Proficient, Grade 7-82% Proficient, Grade 8-88%.  FCAT Science Grade 5-68% Proficient, Grade 8-64% Proficient.  FCAT Writes-92% Proficient. Hispanic students failed to meet AYP in reading 2009-2010 School Grade A; FCAT Reading Grade 5-85% Proficient, Grade 6-87% Proficient; Grade 7-86% Proficient; Grade 8-71% Proficient; FCAT Math Grade 5-79% Proficient, Grade 6-80% Proficient; FCAT Math Grade 7-78% Proficient, FCAT Math Grade 8-84% Proficient, FCAT Writing Grade 8-97% Proficient; FCAT Science Grade 5-64% Proficient; Science Grade 8-64% Proficient; Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities failed to make AYP in Reading; Students with Disabilities failed to make AYP in Math. 2008-2009 School Grade A; FCAT Reading Grade 5-88% Proficient, Grade 6-88% Proficient; Grade 7-86% Proficient; Grade 8-72% Proficient; FCAT Math Grade 5-81% Proficient, Grade 6-79% Proficient; FCAT Math Grade 7-81% Proficient, FCAT Math Grade 8-85% Proficient, FCAT Writing Grade 8-92% Proficient; FCAT Science Grade 5-64% Proficient; Science Grade 8-57% Proficient; Students with Disabilities failed to make AYP in Math. 2007-2008 School Grade A; FCAT Reading Grade 5-83% Proficient, Grade 6-80% Proficient; Grade 7-86% Proficient; Grade 8-74% Proficient; FCAT Math Grade 5-68% Proficient, Grade 6-72% Proficient; FCAT Math Grade 7-89% Proficient, FCAT Math |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Grade 8-88% Proficient, FCAT Writing Grade 8-95% Proficient; FCAT Science Grade 5-53% Proficient; Science Grade 8-65% Proficient; |
| Assistant Principal | High - Janice Thompson | Bachelors in Mathematics; Masters in Education Certifications: Educational Leadership (All Levels), Guidance and Counseling (Prekindergarten – Grade 12), Mathematics (Grades 6-12) | 6 | 19 | 2011-2012 School Grade Pending; FCAT Reading Grade 9-74% Proficient, Grade 10-72% Proficient. FCAT Writes Grade 10-88% Proficient. Algebra I EOC grade 9-93% proficient (Score L3 or greater). 2010-2011 School Grade Pending; FCAT Reading Grade 9-72% Proficient, Grade 10-62% Proficient. FCAT Math Grade 10-91% Proficient. FCAT Science Grade 11-59% Proficient. FCAT Writes Grade 10-98% Proficient. Hispanic students failed to meet AYP in reading. 2009-2010 School Grade A; FCAT Reading Grade 9-66% Proficient, Grade 10-54% Proficient; FCAT Math Grade 9-97% Proficient, Grade 10-96% Proficient; FCAT Writing Grade 10-90% Proficient; FCAT Science Grade 11-64% Proficient; Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities failed to make AYP in Reading; Students with Disabilities failed to make AYP in Math. 2008-2009 School Grade A; FCAT Reading Grade 9-72% Proficient, Grade 10-60% Proficient; FCAT Math Grade 9-97% Proficient, Grade 10-90% Proficient; FCAT Writing Grade 10-85% Proficient; FCAT Science Grade 11-65% Proficient; Students with Disabilities failed to make AYP in Math. 2007-2008 School Grade A; FCAT Reading Grade 9-76% Proficient, Grade 10-50% Proficient; FCAT Math Grade 9-93% Proficient, Grade 10-82% Proficient; FCAT Writing Grade 10-86% Proficient; FCAT Science Grade 11-66% Proficient |
| Assistant Principal | High - David Krakoff | Masters of Arts in Teaching English from Indiana University of Pennsylvania Certifications: Educational | 3 | 4 | 2011-2012 School Grade Pending; FCAT Reading Grade 9-74% Proficient, Grade 10-72% Proficient. FCAT Writes Grade 10-88% Proficient. Algebra I EOC grade 9-93% proficient (Score L3 or greater). 2010-2011 School Grade Pending; FCAT Reading Grade 9-72% Proficient, Grade 10-62% Proficient. FCAT Math Grade 10-91% Proficient. FCAT Science Grade 11-59% Proficient. FCAT Writes Grade 10-98% Proficient. Hispanic students failed |

| | | Leadership (All Levels), English (Grades 6-12) | | | to meet AYP in reading. 2009-2010 New to Florida – no FCAT performance 11 years in education |

## Highly Effective Instructional Coaches

List your school's highly effective instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment performance (Percentage data for Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

| Subject Area | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | Number of Years at Current School | Number of Years as an Instructional Coach | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| There are NO Coaches | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

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

| Description of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date | Not Applicable (If not, please explain why) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. NA | NA | NA | Recruiting and retaining high quality teachers has not been an issue. Through the application process and interviewing questions we have hired a staff of outstanding teachers. |

### *Non-Highly Effective Instructors*
List all instructional staff and paraprofessionals who are teaching out-of-field and/or who are NOT highly effective.

| Name | Certification | Teaching Assignment | Professional Development/Support to Become Highly Effective |
|---|---|---|---|
| Eric Staley | Physical Education Pending | Physical Education GR 6-8 | Eric has a Bachelor's degree in Physical Education and is completing the requirements for certification with close support from administration. A mentor teacher has been assigned to assist him throughout this year. |

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

## Staff Demographics

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

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

| Total Number of Instructional Staff | % of First-Year Teachers | % of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience | % of Teachers with Advanced Degrees | % Highly Effective Teachers | % Reading Endorsed Teachers | % National Board Certified Teachers | % ESOL Endorsed Teachers |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 168 | 5.4% (9/168) | 30.4% (51/168) | 42.9% (72/168) | 21.4% (36/168) | 33.3% (56/168) | Not Available | 7.1% (12/168) | 1.2% (2/168) | 36.3% (61/168) |

## Teacher Mentoring Program

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

| Mentor Name | Mentee Assigned | Rationale for Pairing | Planned Mentoring Activities |
|---|---|---|---|
| Teri Skates & Sharon Sperley | Nicole Anderson | High performing teacher/new to VCS | Weekly grade level meetings, trainings, etc. |
| Leah Krakoff | Holly Lambert | High performing teacher/new to VCS | Weekly grade level meetings, trainings, etc. |
| Christen Wilkinson | Elizabeth Smith | High performing teacher/new to VCS | Weekly grade level meetings, trainings, etc. |
| Stacy Graham | Tracy Wittman | High performing teacher/new to VCS | Weekly grade level meetings, trainings, etc. |
| Desiree Lawrence | Kristen Bell | High performing teacher/new to VCS | Weekly grade level meetings, trainings, etc. |
| Colleen France | Debbie Gallina | High performing teacher/new to VCS | Weekly grade level meetings, trainings, etc. |
| Mary Hockett | Sara Patterson | High performing teacher/new to VCS | Weekly grade level meetings, trainings, etc. |
| Jennifer Yancey | Pamela Saucier | High performing teacher/new to VCS | Weekly grade level meetings, trainings, etc. |
| Charlotte Heasty | Kay Winters | High performing teacher/new to VCS | Weekly grade level meetings, trainings, etc. |
| Ann Perdue | Eric Staley<br>Myrick Guice | Ms. Perdue is the Physical Education Department Chair & Athletic Director | Monthly meetings |

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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Sandy Nielsen | Cynthia Mergaert | Ms. Nielsen is the 6$^{th}$ grade lead teacher | Monthly meetings |
| Gale Fort<br>Lori Hogan | Mallory Perrin<br>Beverly Matos<br>Shelly Northcutt | Ms. Fort is the 5$^{th}$ grade lead teacher<br>Ms. Hogan is the Language Arts Department Chair | Monthly meetings |
| Robbie Riddle – Fine Arts - Music | Andy Deen – Fine Arts - Music | High performing teacher/ new to VHS Members of the same department | Daily interaction and monthly department meetings; Participation in PLC composed of teachers new to The Villages High School. |
| Elizabeth Heathman – Fine Arts - Art | Christy Pelt – Fine Arts - Art | High performing teacher/ new to VHS Members of the same department | Daily interaction and monthly department meetings; Participation in PLC composed of teachers new to The Villages High School. |
| Julie Shepherd - Math<br>Bridget Logan - Science | James Wood – Math and Science | High performing teachers/ new to VHS Members of the same department | Daily interaction and monthly department meetings; Participation in PLC composed of teachers new to The Villages High School. |

## Additional Requirements

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

| |
|---|
| Title I, Part A<br>NA |
| Title I, Part C- Migrant<br>　NA |
| Title I, Part D<br>NA |
| Title II<br>NA |
| Title III<br>NA |
| Title X- Homeless<br>NA |
| Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)<br>NA |

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

| |
|---|
| Violence Prevention Programs<br>NA |
| Nutrition Programs<br>NA |
| Housing Programs<br>NA |
| Head Start<br>NA |
| Adult Education<br>NA |
| Career and Technical Education<br>NA |
| Job Training<br>NA |
| Other<br>NA |

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

| School-Based MTSS/RtI Team |
|---|
| Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.<br>Because the school is K-12 the RtI may vary at the levels to meet the needs and age appropriateness for each student.<br>Elementary leadership team includes the Principal, Vice Principals, Guidance Counselors, ESE teacher, SLP and a regular education teacher.<br>Middle & High School leadership teams include the grade level Administrator, grade level Guidance Counselor, Intervention teacher, and progress monitoring teacher (identified regular ed.). |
| 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?<br>ALL LEVELS: The administrators and guidance counselors meet weekly to discuss the progress of the students in RtI. The county coordinator meets with schools to discuss and share RtI efforts. Grade level administrators do monthly fidelity checks monitoring the interventions on the students. The case facilitator reviews the progress of the monitoring data. The middle school RtI team meets with the grade level, subject area, and literacy team monthly to review interventions. The RtI team meets at the end of every marking period to review the progress of each student. The high school RtI team meets monthly to review the progress of each student. Additional meetings are held with students and parent-teacher conference as needed. |
| Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?<br>All levels: The RtI leadership team meets regularly with grade level chairs, lead teachers and PLC groups. Through these |

| |
|---|
| teams the schools will address SIP goals and strategies during established meetings throughout the year. |

| **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. Elementary team uses data to monitor student progress from FAIR, VIP, SuccessMaker, and Earobics. Middle & High teams use FAIR, Beginning, mid-year, and end of course exams, FCAT Reading-Focus. For math the Math-Focus, Beginning, mid-year, and end of course exams would be used. Science-FCAT Focus, beginning, mid-year, and end of course exams. At all schools types and number of referrals are checked. Also the high school checks for the number of mediations used for behavior. |
| Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. At all levels: Training for all staff was conducted in October 2010 by a school psychologist who is the RtI coordinator for the district.  A refresher training by the district RtI coordinator was conducted in the fall of 2011. |
| Describe plan to support MTSS. The elementary administrators do monthly Fidelity Checks monitoring the interventions.  The case facilitator reviews the progress and monitors the data.  The RtI team meets monthly to review progress and to review interventions.  At the middle school level MTSS is supported not only through the regular curriculum with differentiated instruction but also through intensive reading and math. At the high school level MTSS is supported not only through the regular curriculum with differentiated instruction but also through intensive reading classes.  Mandatory tutoring in all disciplines occurs for students who are experiencing academic difficulty. |

*Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)*

| **School-Based Literacy Leadership Team** |
|---|
| Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Each school level has a LLT whose members are selected to best serve the school level needs. Administrative staff and media specialists are part of all teams. Elementary LLT members also include teachers from each grade level and special areas; Middle school LLT members also include grade level and subject area team leaders; High school includes lead teachers from all subject areas including Language Arts. |
| Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). All school level LLT meet monthly. The LLT members discuss items from their represented areas. There is discussion on ways to promote reading, ways to enhance the reading program and data is always reviewed. |
| What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? The elementary LLT will meet monthly to review and discuss progress toward grade level reading goals and to discuss reading strategies that align with NGSS and CCSS.  The major initiatives at the middle school are to begin the process of moving to common core standards along with a strong writing component across the curriculum.  The high school's concept of **literacy** encompasses |

developing our students as readers and writers.  We are committed to helping our students to become critical thinkers who master the art of interpreting texts as well as expressing their thoughts in focused, meaningful ways.

To help us achieve this end, the high school has developed the following plan for our staff to develop literacy among our students in every curriculum:

1) Teachers will include a minimum of nine (9) literacy lessons and project or writing grades in their lesson plans and gradebooks every nine weeks.
2) At least three (3) of these nine (9) literacy lessons every nine weeks must include a written response graded using the FCAT writing rubric.

The other six (6) literacy lessons and projects will come from a bank of possibilities created by every department.  These projects will be evaluated using the rubric created specifically for literacy projects.

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

*\*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition*

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

NA

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

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

Middle: Every teacher teaches reading strategies. At the beginning of the year, every teacher was given FCAT reading information including the reading clusters. At the monthly faculty meeting a new reading strategy is introduced. Through lesson plans and classroom walkthroughs and observations, administration ensures that every teacher is teaching reading strategies. Common Core Literacy Standards are being utilized across the curriculum.

High: Assignments and projects will use informational reading to help increase the students reading proficiency. Teachers will incorporate grades from the literacy assignments/projects into students' grades. Administration monitors the program.

*\*High Schools Only*

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

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

Each student will select an academy affiliation (Commercial Technology, Communications – Journalism or TV Production, Culinary Arts, Engineering Technology, Fine Arts – Art, Dance, or Music, Health Sciences, and Advanced Studies - Dual Enrollment and AP courses). Each student will develop a business plan that will be presented to professionals and members of the banking industry first semester of the senior year. The business plan will be related to a career in their respective academy.

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

Each student will select an academy affiliation (Commercial Technology, Communications – Journalism or TV Production, Culinary Arts, Engineering Technology, Fine Arts – Art, Dance, or Music, Health Sciences, and Advanced Studies - Dual Enrollment and AP courses). Each student will develop a business plan that will be presented to professionals and members of the banking industry first semester of the senior year. The business plan will be related to a career in their respective academy.

*Postsecondary Transition*

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

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

For the class of 2010, 73.4% of The Villages High School graduates completed a college preparatory curriculum.  This represents a 0.6% increase from the 72.8% in 2009.  The percent of 2010 graduates with standard high school diplomas that took the SAT/ACT/CPT and scored at or above college-level cut scores: 89.1% in math, 93.5% in reading, and 93.5% in writing.  This represents an increase in math, reading, and writing from 2009 in which the scores were 86.7% in math, 93.3% in reading, and 91.7% in writing. Approximately 67% of the 2010 graduates attended either a public or independent Florida college or university. Of the students attending public Florida institutions, 76.8% earned a GPA of 2.0 or better in the Fall of 2010.

For the class of 2009, 72.8% of The Villages High School graduates completed a college preparatory curriculum.  This represents a 5.6% decrease from the 78.4% in 2008.  The percent of 2009 graduates with standard high school diplomas who took the SAT/ACT/CPT and scored at or above college-level cut scores: 93.3% in math, 86.7% in reading, and 91.7% in writing. This represents an increase in reading and writing from 2008 in which the scores were 88.9% in math, 86.7% in reading, and 84.4% in writing. Approximately 63% of the 2009 graduates attended either a public or independent Florida college or university. Of the students attending public Florida institutions, 85.9% earned a GPA of 2.0 or better in the Fall of 2009.

For the class of 2008, 78.4% of The Villages High School graduates completed a college preparatory curriculum. This represents a 12.9% increase from the 65.5% in 2007. The percent of 2008 graduates with standard high school diplomas who took the SAT/ACT/CPT and scored at or above college-level cut scores: 88.9% in math, 86.7% in reading, and 84.4% in writing. This represents an increase in math and reading from 2007 in which the scores were 81.1% in math, 84.9% in reading, and 88.7% in writing. Approximately 57% of the 2008 graduates attended either a public or independent Florida college or university. Of the students attending public Florida institutions, 87.5% earned a GPA of 2.0 or better in the Fall of 2008.

The Villages High School will continue to expand its Dual Enrollment course offerings on campus (13 credits in 2009, 21 credits in 2010, and 29 credits in 2011 and 2012). All students will be given the opportunity to take the CPT at least once before they graduate.

# PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS
## Reading Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).
**April 2012**
**Rule 6A-1.099811**

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

| 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.<br><br>Reading Goal #1a:<br><br>*Level 3 reading scores for grades 3-10 were analyzed to set goals for improving student performance for students scoring level 3. Our focus is to move more students to levels 4-5 and levels 1-2 to level 3.* The school reading average of grades 3-10 students scoring level 3 will increase by 10% or return to 2012 expectations. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*3rd – 26%(49/188)*<br>*4th –27%(52/190)*<br>*5th –28%(44/155)*<br>*6th – 42%(89/213)*<br>*7th –33%(60/181)*<br>*8th –34%(62/182)*<br>*9th –34%(61/179)*<br>*10th –31%(49/157)*<br>*The Reading School Average for level 3 is 32%(466/1445)* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*3rd – 35%*<br>*4th –29%*<br>*5th –32%*<br>*6th – 38%*<br>*7th –36%*<br>*8th –39%*<br>*9th –20%*<br>*10th –23%*<br>*The School Average for reading score will be 39%* | 1a.1. Elementary<br><br>Scheduling of computer time for short frequent assessments.<br><br>Scheduling Voyager sessions | 1a.1.<br><br>Students not showing proficiency on FCAT Focus will receive remediation during Team Time and in after school tutoring.<br><br>All students scoring in the Struggling or Emerging areas according to Voyager's Vital Indicators of Progress (VIP) will receive intensive intervention in the Voyager Program. | 1a.1.<br><br>Administrative Team | 1a.1.<br><br>The Administrative team will monitor teacher and student reports to ensure that students are showing learning gains. | 1a.1.<br><br>Reading curriculum assessments, VIP, FAIR and SuccessMaker. |
| | | | 1a.2. Middle<br><br>Scheduling computer time to accommodate the short frequent assessments from FCAT focus for each benchmark | 1a.2.<br><br>Students not showing proficiency on FCAT Focus will attend after school tutoring for remediation in those benchmarks<br><br>All students scoring a level 1 or 2 on the reading portion of the FCAT are placed in an intensive reading class for 110 minutes for level 1 students and 51 minutes for level 2 students.<br><br>Level 3 students will take a semester reading class. Students that scored a 2 on the 2011 FCAT and a 3 on the 20121 FCAT will have a year-long reading class. | 1a.2.<br><br>Administrative team | 1a.2.<br><br>The administrative team will monitor teacher and student reports to ensure that students are showing learning gains. | 1a.2.<br><br>FCAT FOCUS<br>Language program<br>Rewards program<br>Kamico |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1a.3. High | 1a.3. Teachers will use FAIR assessments to monitor student progress. | 1a.3. Administration | 1a.3. Administrators will review FAIR data reports to ensure that teachers are accessing students according to schedule. | 1a.3. Administrators will review data reports to ensure that students are making learning gains. |
| | | | Teachers will include higher order thinking questions in their lesson plans. | Administration | Lesson plans will be submitted weekly for review. | Administration will review lesson plans weekly. |
| | | | Teachers will use a curriculum map. | Administration | Curriculum maps will be submitted and reviewed by vice principal. | Curriculum maps will be reviewed by vice principal and shared with students and parents. |
| | | | All students scoring a level 1 or 2 on the reading portion of the FCAT are placed in an intensive reading class for 50 minutes per day | Administration | Grades will be monitored by teachers and administration. FACT Focus will be monitored by teachers. Mandatory tutoring will be in place for students who achieving below a grade of a C. | Report cards and 2013 FCAT scores. |

| **1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:** Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. | | | 1b.1. | 1b.1. | 1b.1. | 1b.1. | 1b.1. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reading Goal #1b: **The school does NOT use the Alternative Assessments** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. |
| | | | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in reading.** | | | 2a.1. Elementary Scheduling of differentiated instruction in Team Time. | 2a.1. Elementary Students will receive enrichment during Team Time. | 2a.1. Elementary Administrative Team | 2a.1. Elementary Students showing proficiency on FCAT Focus, Kamico and/or SuccessMaker will determine effectiveness. | 2a.1. Elementary Focus, Kamico and SuccessMaker |
| Reading Goal #2a: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | Due to mandated class size, being able to schedule all | Students meeting criteria | Administrative Team | | Standardized Test Scores: SAT 10 and FCAT |

| | | | students meeting requirement for Acceleration Class | for Acceleration will be placed in the Acceleration class according to number of students. | | Standardized Test Scores from SAT 10 and FCAT will be evaluated by administrative team | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Level 4 &5 reading scores for grades 3-10 were analyzed to set goals for improving student performance for students scoring level 4 & 5.* | *3rd –58%(109/188)*<br>*4th –56%(106/190)*<br>*5th –49%(76/155)*<br>*6th –47%(100/213)*<br>*7th –41%(74/181)*<br>*8th –41%(75/182)*<br>*9th –41%(73/179)*<br>*10th –41%(64/157)*<br>*The reading school average for levels 4 & 5 is 47%(677/1445)* | *3rd – 66%*<br>*4th –67%*<br>*5th –55%*<br>*6th –51%*<br>*7th –45%*<br>*8th –45%*<br>*9th –75%*<br>*10th –74%*<br>*The reading school average for levels 4 & 5 will be 59.75%.* | | | | | |
| The school reading average for the grades 3-10 students scoring levels 4 & 5 will increase by 10% or return to 2012 expectations. | | | 2a.2. Middle<br>Due to mandated class size, not being able to schedule all level 4 & 5 in advanced because of limited space | 2a.2. Middle:<br>Students scoring a level four or five will be placed in advanced classes. | 2a.2. Middle:<br>Administrative team | 2a.2.Middle:<br>The administrative team will monitor grades and results of FCAT Focus to ensure achievement at 85% or higher | 2a.2. Middle:<br>FCAT focus |
| | | | 2a.3 High | 2a.3 High:<br>Teachers will use FAIR assessments to monitor student progress.<br><br>Students will be presented a challenging curriculum | 2a.3 High:<br>Administration<br><br>Administration | 2a.3 High:<br>Administrators will review FAIR data reports to ensure that teachers are accessing students according to schedule.<br><br>Grades will be monitored by teachers and administration. FACT Focus will be monitored by teachers. Mandatory tutoring will be in place for students who achieving below a grade of a C. | 2a.3 High:<br>Printout of FAIR Assessments<br><br>Report Cards and 2013 FCAT scores. |
| **2b. Florida Alternate Assessment:**<br>**Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.** | | | 2b.1. | 2b.1. | 2b.1. | 2b.1. | 2b.1. |
| Reading Goal #2b:<br><br>**The school does NOT use the Alternative Assessments** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | 2b.2. | 2b2. | 2b.2. | 2b.2. | 2b.2. |
| | | | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | 2b.3 |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |

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

| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| Reading Goal #3a:<br><br>*There will be a 10% increase in the percent of students in grades 4-10 making learning gain or a return to 2012 expectations.* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*59% (739/1259) of students in grades 4-10 made learning gains.*<br>*GR 4-5:*<br>*59%(203/346)*<br>*GR 6-8:*<br>*58%(333/577)*<br>*GR 9-10:*<br>*60%(202/336)* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*75% of grades 4-10 students will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT reading assessment.* | 3a.1. Elementary Scheduling of computer time for short frequent assessments.<br><br>Scheduling Voyager sessions | 3a.1. Elementary: Students will receive tutoring during Team Time.<br><br>All students scoring in the Struggling or Emerging areas according to Voyager's Vital Indicators of Progress (VIP) will receive intensive intervention in the Voyager Program. | 3a.1. Elementary: Administrative Team | 3a.1. Elementary: Students will show learning gains on Voyager progress monitoring and/or SuccessMaker. | 3a.1. Elementary: Reading curriculum assessments, VIP, FAIR and SuccessMaker |
| | | | 3a.2. Middle: Scheduling computer time to accommodate the short frequent assessments from FCAT focus for each benchmark | 3a.2. Teachers will evaluate each benchmark for proficiency and reteach.<br><br>Students not showing proficiency on FCAT Focus after the 2nd assessment will attend after school tutoring for remediation in those benchmarks.<br><br>Level 3 students will take a semester reading class. Students that scored a 2 on the 2010 FCAT and a 3 on the 2011 FCAT will have a year-long reading class. | 3a.2. Administrative team | 3a.2. The administrative team will monitor teacher and student assessment reports to ensure that students are showing learning gains. | 3a.2. FCAT FAIR FCAT Focus Reading curriculum assessments |
| | | | 3a.3. High: | 3a.3. High: Teachers will use FAIR assessments to monitor student progress.<br><br>Teachers will include higher order thinking questions in their lesson plans.<br><br>Teachers will develop a curriculum map.<br><br>All students scoring a | 3a.3. High: Administration<br><br>Administration<br><br>Administration<br><br>Administration | 3a.3. High: Administrators will review FAIR data reports to ensure that teachers are accessing students according to schedule.<br><br>Lesson plans will be submitted weekly for review.<br><br>Curriculum maps will be submitted and reviewed by vice principal.<br><br>All schedules and grades will be | 3a.3. High: Administrators will review FAIR data reports to ensure that teachers are accessing students according to schedule.<br><br>Lesson plans will be submitted weekly for review.<br><br>Curriculum maps will be submitted and reviewed by vice principal.<br><br>Progress reports and report cards will be reviewed and students will be required to attend mandatory after school help if adequate progress is not demonstrated. |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | level 1or 2 on FCAT reading are placed in an intensive reading class. | | reviewed. | |
| **3b. Florida Alternate Assessment:** Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. | | | 3b.1. | 3b.1. | 3b.1. | 3b.1. | 3b.1. |

| Reading Goal #3b: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* |
|---|---|---|
| **The school does NOT use the Alternative Assessments** | *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3b.2. | 3b.2. | 3b.2. | 3b.2. | 3b.2. |
| 3b.3. | 3b.3. | 3b.3. | 3b.3. | 3b.3. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.** | | | 4a.1. Elementary: Scheduling of computer time for short frequent assessments | 4a.1. Elementary: Students will receive tutoring during Team Time. | 4a.1. Elementary: Administrative Team | 4a.1. Elementary: Students will show learning gains on FCAT Focus, Kamico or Successmaker. | 4a.1. Elementary: Reading curriculum assessments, VIP, FAIR and SuccessMaker. |

| Reading Goal #4a: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* |
|---|---|---|
| *There will be a 10% increase in the percent of students in the lowest 25% in grades 3-10 making learning gains or a return to 2012 expectations.* | *67% (57/85) grades 4-10 made learning gains.* | *73% of the lowest 25% in grades 3-10 will make learning gains* |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4a.2. Middle: Scheduling computer time to accommodate the short frequent assessments from FCAT focus for each benchmark | 4a.2. Middle Teachers will evaluate each benchmark for proficiency and reteach.  Students not showing proficiency on FCAT Focus after the 2nd assessment will attend after school tutoring for remediation in those benchmarks.  All students scoring a level 1 or 2 on the reading | 4a.2. Middle Administrative team | 4a.2. Middle The administrative team will monitor teacher and student assessment reports to ensure that students are showing learning gains. | 4a.2. Middle FCAT FAIR FCAT Focus Reading curriculum assessments |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | portion of the FCAT is placed in an intensive reading class (110 minutes for level 1 students and 51 minutes for level 2 students)<br><br>Level 3 students will take a semester reading class. Students that scored a 2 on the 2010 FCAT and a 3 on the 2011 FCAT will have a year-long reading class. | | |
| | | 4a.3. High: | 4a.3. High:<br>Teachers will use FAIR assessments to monitor student progress.<br><br>Teachers will include higher order thinking questions in their lesson plans.<br><br>Teachers will develop a curriculum map.<br><br>All students scoring a level 1or 2 on FCAT reading are placed in an intensive reading class. | 4a.3. High:<br>Administration<br><br>Administration<br><br>Administration<br><br>Administration | 4a.3. High:<br>Administrators will review FAIR data reports to ensure that teachers are accessing students according to schedule.<br><br>Lesson plans will be submitted weekly for review.<br><br>Curriculum maps will be submitted and reviewed by vice principal.<br><br>All schedules and grades will be reviewed. | 4a.3. High:<br>Administrators will review FAIR data reports to ensure that teachers are accessing students according to schedule.<br><br>Lesson plans will be submitted weekly for review.<br><br>Curriculum maps will be submitted and reviewed by vice principal.<br><br>Progress reports and report cards will be reviewed and students will be required to attend mandatory after school help if adequate progress is not demonstrated. |

| 4b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. | | | 4b.1. | 4b.1. | 4b.1. | 4b.1. | 4b.1. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| Reading Goal #4b:<br><br>The school does NOT use the Alternative Assessments | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | 4b.2. | 4b.2. | 4b.2. | 4b.2. | 4b.2. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 4b.3 | 4b.3. | 4b.3. | 4b.3. | 4b.3. |

| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), 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).<br><br>In six years schools will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Baseline data 2010-2011 | Baseline data 2011-2012 | Goal for 2012-2013 | Goal for 2013-2014 | Goal for 2014-2015 | Goal for 2015-2016 | Goal for 2016-2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Level 3:**<br>$3^{rd}$ – 32%(56/176)<br>$4^{th}$ –26%(36/140<br>$5^{th}$ –25%(45/180)<br>$6^{th}$ –38%(67/175)<br>$7^{th}$ –33%(62/188)<br>$8^{th}$ – 49%(84/171)<br>$9^{th}$ – 39%(82/172)<br>$10^{th}$–25%(35/140)<br>*The Reading School Average for level 3 is 35% (467/1342)*<br><br>**Level 4 & 5:**<br>$3^{rd}$- 60%(106/176)<br>$4^{th}$ -61%(85/140)<br>$5^{th}$ –61%(110/180)<br>$6^{th}$ –46%(81/175)<br>$7^{th}$ –53%(100/188)<br>$8^{th}$ –21%(36/171)<br>$9^{th}$-33%(56/172)<br>$10^{th}$ 37%(52/140)<br>*Reading School Average for Levels 4 & 5 are 47% (626/1342).* | **Level 3:**<br>*$3^{rd}$ – 26%(49/188)*<br>*$4^{th}$ –27%(52/190)*<br>*$5^{th}$ –28%(44/155)*<br>*$6^{th}$ – 33%(89/213)*<br>*$7^{th}$ –33%(60/181)*<br>*$8^{th}$ –34%(62/182)*<br>*$9^{th}$–34%(61/179)*<br>*$10^{th}$ –31%(49/157)*<br><br>*The Reading School Average for level 3 is 32%(466/1445)*<br><br>**Level 4 & 5:**<br>*$3^{rd}$ –58%(109/188)*<br>*4th –56%(106/190)*<br>*$5^{th}$ –49%(76/155)*<br>*$6^{th}$ –47%(100/213)*<br>*$7^{th}$ –41%(74/181)*<br>*$8^{th}$ –41%(75/182)*<br>*$9^{th}$ –41%(73/179)*<br>*10th –41%(64/157)*<br><br>*The reading school average for levels 4 & 5 is 47%(677/1445)* | *Level 3:*<br>*$3^{rd}$-39%*<br>*$4^{th}$-32%*<br>*$5^{th}$ –30%*<br>*$6^{th}$ –35%*<br>*$7^{th}$ –35%*<br>*$8^{th}$ – 36%*<br>*$9^{th}$–20%*<br>*$10^{th}$ –23%*<br><br>*The Reading School Average for level 3 is 30%*<br><br>*Level 4 & 5*<br>*$3^{rd}$-34%*<br>*$4^{th}$-42%*<br>*$5^{th}$ –51%*<br>*$6^{th}$ –50%*<br>*$7^{th}$ –43%*<br>*$8^{th}$ – 43%*<br>*$9^{th}$ –75%*<br>*10th –74%*<br><br>*The reading school average for levels 4 & 5 is 53%* | *Level 3*<br>*$3^{rd}$-43%*<br>*$4^{th}$-35%*<br>*$5^{th}$ –32%*<br>*$6^{th}$ –37%*<br>*$7^{th}$ –37%*<br>*$8^{th}$ – 38%*<br>*$9^{th}$–20%*<br>*$10^{th}$ –21%*<br><br>*The Reading School Average for level 3 is 27%*<br><br>*Level 4 & 5*<br>*$3^{rd}$-37%*<br>*$4^{th}$-46%*<br>*$5^{th}$ –53%*<br>*$6^{th}$ –52%*<br>*$7^{th}$ –45%*<br>*$8^{th}$ – 45%*<br>*$9^{th}$ –76%*<br>*10th –75%*<br><br>*The reading school average for levels 4 & 5 is 62%* | *Level 3*<br>*$3^{rd}$- 47%*<br>*$4^{th}$- 39%*<br>*$5^{th}$ –35%*<br>*$6^{th}$ –40%*<br>*$7^{th}$ –40%*<br>*$8^{th}$ – 40%*<br>*$9^{th}$–20%*<br>*$10^{th}$ –21%*<br><br>*The Reading School Average for level 3 is 35%*<br><br>*Level 4 & 5*<br>*$3^{rd}$-41%*<br>*$4^{th}$-50%*<br>*$5^{th}$ –55%*<br>*$6^{th}$ –55%*<br>*$7^{th}$ –48%*<br>*$8^{th}$ – 48%*<br>*$9^{th}$ –77%*<br>*10th –76%*<br><br>*The reading school average for levels 4 & 5 is 67%* | *Level 3*<br>*$3^{rd}$- 52%*<br>*$4^{th}$- 43%*<br>*$5^{th}$ –38%*<br>*$6^{th}$ –42%*<br>*$7^{th}$ –42%*<br>*$8^{th}$ –42%*<br>*$9^{th}$ –20%*<br>*$10^{th}$ –22%*<br><br>*The Reading School Average for level 3 is 33%*<br><br>*Level 4 & 5*<br>*$3^{rd}$-48%*<br>*$4^{th}$-55%*<br>*$5^{th}$ –58%*<br>*$6^{th}$ –58%*<br>*$7^{th}$ –50%*<br>*$8^{th}$ – 50%*<br>*$9^{th}$ –78%*<br>*10th –77%*<br><br>*The reading school average for levels 4 & 5 is 71%* | *Level 3:*<br>*$3^{rd}$- 57%*<br>*$4^{th}$- 47%*<br>*$5^{th}$ –40%*<br>*$6^{th}$ –45%*<br>*$7^{th}$ –45%*<br>*$8^{th}$ – 45%*<br>*$9^{th}$ –21%*<br>*$10^{th}$ –22%*<br><br>*The Reading School Average for level 3 is 40%*<br><br>*Level 4 & 5*<br>*$3^{rd}$-41%*<br>*$4^{th}$-52%*<br>*$5^{th}$ –60%*<br>*$6^{th}$ –60%*<br>*$7^{th}$ –52%*<br>*$8^{th}$ – 52%*<br>*$9^{th}$ –79%*<br>*10th –78%*<br><br>*The reading school average for levels 4 & 5 is 72%* |
| **Reading Goal #5A:**<br><br>**Elementary:** In grades 3-4, 86% of the students will achieve proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.<br><br>**Middle:** 95% of the students in grades 5-8 will score at a level 3 or higher on the FCAT reading portion.<br><br>**High:** By 2016-2017 all students in grades 9 and 10 will be scoring at Level 3 or higher on FCAT Reading. | | | | | | | |

| 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.<br>White:<br>Black:<br>Hispanic:<br>Asian:<br>American Indian: | 5B.1. Elementary | 5B.1. Elementary | 5B.1. Elementary | 5B.1. Elementary | | |

| Reading Goal #5B: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* |
|---|---|---|

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

| In grades 3-10, 7% of the students will NOT achieve proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading Test. | White:22%(245/1138) Black: NA 40%(19/48) Hispanic: 32%(52/161) Asian: NA 5%(3/57) American Indian: 0% Multi-Racial:12%(4/34) Hawaiian/PI: 0% | White: 7% Black: NA Hispanic:7% Asian: NA American Indian: NA Multi-Racial: NA Hawaiian/PI: NA | Elementary: Scheduling of computer time for short frequent assessments. | Students will receive tutoring during Team Time. | Administrative Team | Students will show learning gains on FCAT Focus, Kamico or Successmaker | Reading curriculum assessments, VIP, FAIR and SuccessMaker. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 5B.2.. Middle: Scheduling computer time to accommodate the short frequent assessments from FCAT focus for each benchmark | 5B.2. Middle: Teachers will evaluate each benchmark for proficiency and reteach.<br><br>Students not showing proficiency on FCAT Focus after the 2nd assessment will attend after school tutoring for remediation in those benchmarks.<br><br>All students scoring a level 1 or 2 on the reading portion of the FCAT is placed in an intensive | 5B.2. Middle: Administrative team | 5B.2. Middle: The administrative team will monitor teacher and student assessment reports to ensure that students are showing learning gains. | 5B.2. Middle: 2012 FCAT results FCAT Focus Progress Monitoring Lesson Plan Checks |
| | | | 5B.3. High | 5B.3. High Teachers will use FAIR assessments to monitor student progress.<br><br>Teachers will include higher order thinking questions in their lesson plans.<br><br>Teachers will develop a curriculum map.<br><br>All students scoring a level 1or 2 on FCAT reading are placed in an intensive reading class. | 5B.3. High Administration<br><br>Administration<br><br>Administration<br><br>Administration | 5B.3. High Administrators will review FAIR data reports to ensure that teachers are accessing students according to schedule.<br><br>Lesson plans will be submitted weekly for review.<br><br>Curriculum maps will be submitted and reviewed by vice principal.<br><br>All schedules and grades will be reviewed. | 5B.3. High Administrators will review FAIR data reports to ensure that teachers are accessing students according to schedule.<br><br>Lesson plans will be submitted weekly for review.<br><br>Curriculum maps will be submitted and reviewed by vice principal.<br><br>Progress reports and report cards will be reviewed and students will be required to attend mandatory after school help if adequate progress is not demonstrated. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.** | | | 5C.1. Elementary: Scheduling of computer time | 5C.1. Elementary Students will receive | 5C.1. Elementary Administrative Team | 5C.1. Elementary Students will show learning gains | 5C.1. Elementary Reading curriculum assessments, VIP, FAIR and |

| Reading Goal #5C:<br><br>In grades 3-10, 7% of the students will NOT achieve proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading Test. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | for short frequent assessments. | tutoring during Team Time. | | on FCAT Focus, Kamico or Successmaker. | SuccessMaker. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 63%(12/19) | In grades 3-8, 7% students will NOT achieve proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading test High: NA | | | | | |
| | | | 5C.2. Middle<br>Scheduling computer time to accommodate the short frequent assessments from FCAT focus for each benchmark | 5C.2. Middle:<br>Teachers will evaluate each benchmark for proficiency and reteach.<br><br>Students not showing proficiency on FCAT Focus after the 2nd assessment will attend after school tutoring for remediation in those benchmarks.<br><br>All students scoring a level 1 or 2 on the reading portion of the FCAT is placed in an intensive reading class (110 minutes for level 1 students and 51 minutes for level 2 students)<br><br>Level 3 students will take a semester reading class. Students that scored a 2 on the 2010 FCAT and a 3 on the 2011 FCAT will have a year-long reading class. | 5C.2. Middle:<br>Administrative team | 5C.2. Middle:<br> The administrative team will monitor teacher and student assessment reports to ensure that students are showing learning gains. | 5C.2. Middle:<br>Fair<br>2012 FCAT results<br>FCAT Focus<br>Progress Monitoring<br>Lesson Plan Checks |
| | | | 5C.3. High: | 5C.3. High:<br>Teachers will use FAIR assessments to monitor student progress.<br><br>Teachers will include higher order thinking questions in their lesson plans. | 5C.3. High:<br>Administration<br><br>Administration | 5C.3. High:<br>Administrators will review FAIR data reports to ensure that teachers are accessing students according to schedule.<br><br>Lesson plans will be submitted weekly for review. | 5C.3. High:<br>Administrators will review FAIR data reports to ensure that teachers are accessing students according to schedule.<br><br>Lesson plans will be submitted weekly for review.<br><br>Curriculum maps will be submitted and reviewed by |

| | | | Teachers will develop a curriculum map.<br><br>All students scoring a level 1 or 2 on FCAT reading are placed in an intensive reading class. | Administration<br><br>Administration | Curriculum maps will be submitted and reviewed by vice principal.<br><br>All schedules and grades will be reviewed. | vice principal.<br><br>Progress reports and report cards will be reviewed and students will be required to attend mandatory after school help if adequate progress is not demonstrated. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data... | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.** | | | 5D.1. Elementary: Scheduling with ESE Inclusion Teacher | 5D.1. Communication between regular education teacher, ESE and Speech teachers about individual student data on Focus assessments for specific skill remediation. | 5D.1. Administrative Team, Guidance Counselor, ESE Inclusion Teacher and Speech Pathologist. | 5D.1. The administrative team will oversee and monitor FCAT Focus results to ensure learning gains and assist teachers in applying interventions as needed. | 5D.1. FCAT, FCAT Focus and FAIR |
| Reading Goal #5D:<br><br>In grades 3-10, 7% of the students will NOT achieve proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading Test. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>63%(59/93) | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>In grades 3-8 7% students will NOT achieve proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading test<br><br>High: NA | | | | | |
| | | | 5D.2. Middle: Scheduling computer time to accommodate the short frequent assessments from FCAT focus for each benchmark | 5D.2. Teachers will evaluate each benchmark for proficiency and reteach.<br><br>Students not showing proficiency on FCAT Focus after the 2nd assessment will attend after school tutoring for remediation in those benchmarks.<br><br>All students scoring a level 1 or 2 on the reading portion of the FCAT is placed in an intensive reading class (110 minutes for level 1 students and 51 minutes for level 2 students)<br><br>Level 3 students will take a semester reading class. | 5D.2. Administrative team | 5D.2. The administrative team will monitor teacher and student assessment reports to ensure that students are showing learning gains. | 5D.2. Fair 2012 FCAT results FCAT Focus Progress Monitoring Lesson Plan Checks |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Students that scored a 2 on the 2010 FCAT and a 3 on the 2011 FCAT will have a year-long reading class. | | | | |
| | | 5D.3. High: | 5D.3. High:<br>Teachers will use FAIR assessments to monitor student progress.<br><br>Teachers will include higher order thinking questions in their lesson plans.<br>Teachers will develop a curriculum map.<br><br>All students scoring a level 1or 2 on FCAT reading are placed in an intensive reading class. | 5D.3. High:<br>Administration<br><br><br>Administration<br><br><br>Administration<br><br><br>Administration | 5D.3. High:<br>Administrators will review FAIR data reports to ensure that teachers are accessing students according to schedule.<br><br>Lesson plans will be submitted weekly for review.<br><br>Curriculum maps will be submitted and reviewed by vice principal.<br><br>All schedules and grades will be reviewed. | 5D.3. High:<br>Administrators will review FAIR data reports to ensure that teachers are accessing students according to schedule.<br><br>Lesson plans will be submitted weekly for review.<br><br>Curriculum maps will be submitted and reviewed by vice principal.<br><br>Progress reports and report cards will be reviewed and students will be required to attend mandatory after school help if adequate progress is not demonstrated. |

| 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. Elementary:<br>Scheduling computer time to accommodate the short frequent assessments from FCAT focus for each benchmark | 5E.1. Elementary<br>Students not showing proficiency on FCAT Focus will attend after school tutoring for remediation in those benchmarks. | 5E.1. Elementary<br>Administrative Team, Guidance Counselor, ESE Inclusion Teacher and Speech Pathologist. | 5E.1. Elementary<br>The administrative team will oversee and monitor FCAT Focus results to ensure learning gains and assist teachers in applying interventions as needed. | 5E.1. Elementary<br>FCAT, Focus and FAIR |
| Reading Goal #5E:<br><br>In grades 3-10, 7% of the students will NOT achieve proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading Test. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>31%(125/401) | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*7% of grades 3-10 students will NOT* achieve proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading test. | | | | | |
| | | | 5E.2. Middle:<br>Scheduling computer time to accommodate the short frequent assessments from FCAT focus for each benchmark | 5E.2 Middle:<br>All students scoring a level 1 or 2 on the reading portion of the FCAT is placed in an intensive reading class (110 minutes for level 1 students and 51 minutes for level 2 students | 5E.2. Middle:<br>Administrative team | 5E.2. Middle:<br>The administrative team will monitor teacher and student assessment reports to ensure that students are showing learning gains. | 5E.2. Middle:<br>Fair<br>2012 FCAT results<br>FCAT Focus<br>Progress Monitoring<br>Lesson Plan Checks |
| | | | 5E.3 High: | 5E.3 High: | 5E.3 High: | 5E.3 High: | 5E.3 High: |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | FAIR testing program freezes forcing the student to close the program and sign in again. Students become frustrated by this. | Teachers will use FAIR assessments to monitor student progress.<br><br>Teachers will include higher order thinking questions in their lesson plans.<br><br>Teachers will develop a curriculum map.<br><br>All students scoring a level 1or 2 on FCAT reading are placed in an intensive reading class. | Administration<br><br>Administration<br><br>Administration<br><br>Administration | Administrators will review FAIR data reports to ensure that teachers are accessing students according to schedule.<br><br>Lesson plans will be submitted weekly for review.<br><br>Curriculum maps will be submitted and reviewed by vice principal.<br><br>All schedules and grades will be reviewed | Administrators will review FAIR data reports to ensure that teachers are accessing students according to schedule.<br><br>Lesson plans will be submitted weekly for review.<br><br>Curriculum maps will be submitted and reviewed by vice principal.<br><br>Progress reports and report cards will be reviewed and students will be required to attend mandatory after school help if adequate progress is not demonstrated. |

## Reading 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 |
| Building Critical Writers and Readers | K-4 | Chris Lewis | All teachers K-4, ESE teacher, Speech teacher and Admin. Team | All day workshops: Oct. 2012, Nov. 2012, Dec. 2012, Jan. 2013 and March 2013 | Monthly Reading Committee meetings to review data. | Administration Team |
| Common Core Standards | K-4 | Administrators | All Faculty K-12 | September 2012 | Lesson Plan Review | Administrative Team |
| Common Core Standards | K-12 | FLDOE | All Faculty K-12 | January 2012 | Lesson Plan Review and monthly meetings | Administrative Team |
| Differentiated Instruction | K-4 | Florida Inclusion Network | New Teachers, Teachers of Acceleration classes, 2-4 grade teachers | August 1, 2012 & January 2013 | Lesson Plans and observation | Administrative Team will monitor implementation |
| Common Core Standards | 5-8 | Administration | School wide | Monthly beginning August 2012-May 2013 | Reviewing lesson plans & classroom observation | Administration Team |
| Response to Intervention Update | 5-8 | Guidance Counselors & Administration | All Faculty K-12 | September 2012 | Implementation and monitoring | Administrative Team and Guidance counselors |
| Building Critical Writers and Readers | 5-8 | Professional Development for Achievement | Language Arts teachers in grades 5-8. Speech Therapist | Half day workshop in August 2012, Full day in October 2012 & January 2013 | Administrative team will meet monthly with language arts teachers to monitor progress | Administration |
| Building Critical Writers | 9 -12 | Professional | Language Arts Teacher, Media | Half day workshops August 27, | Administrative team will meet monthly with | Administration |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| and Readers | | Development for Achievement | Specialist and ESE Specialist. | 2012, November 13, 2012 and January 17, 2013 | language arts teachers and media specialist to monitor progress | |
| Use of FAIR materials | 9-12 | Administration | Language Arts Teachers | Monthly Department Meetings | Monitoring of lesson plans and walkthroughs | Administration |
| Unpacking the Curriculum | K-12 | Cathy Hinckley | All Teachers | October 19, 2012 | Monthly department meetings and lesson plans | Administration |
| Lesson Plan Development | 9-12 | Administration | All Teachers | Monthly Department Meetings | Monitoring of lesson plans and walkthroughs | Administration |
| Curriculum Map Development | 9-12 | Administration | All Teachers | Monthly Department Meetings | Monitoring of lesson plans and walkthroughs | Administration |

## Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| ELEMENTARY: Place all students who score as Struggling or Emerging according to VIP in Voyager Passport Reading Program. | Voyager Passport is an intensive reading remediation program where students are taught or remediated on all 5 components of reading. The program is done in small groups daily for 30 minutes. | School based budget | $9,133.80 |
| ELEMENTARY: Storytown FCAT Tested Benchmark workbooks assist students in grades 3 and 4 with practicing benchmark skills. | Benchmark Practice Workbook for individual students | School based budget | $4,080.28 |
| MIDDLE: Place all students scoring a level 1 & 2 in an intensive reading class | !Language Series | School Budget | $7,000.00 |
| MIDDLE: Place level 3 students in a semester reading class in 6th and 7th grade | Rewards Program Kamico | School Budget | $1,000.00 |
| | | Subtotal: | $21,214.08 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | Subtotal: | |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Build a strong writing and reading connection at grades K-4 | Professional Development for Achievement Writers in Control program | School based budget | $7,500.00( in Writing Budget) |

| Build a strong writing and reading connection at grades 5-8 | Professional Development for Achievement Writers in Control program | School based budget | $2,000.00 (in Writing Budget) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Build a strong writing and reading connection at grades 9-10 | Professional Development for Achievement Writers in Control program | School based budget | $2,000.00 (in Writing Budget) |
| | | | **Subtotal: $11,500.00** |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| | | | **Total: $32,714.08** |

*End of Reading Goals*

## Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

| CELLA Goals | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1. Students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking.**<br><br>CELLA Goal #1:<br><br>*In grades KG-11, 72% of the ELL students taking the 2013 CELLA assessment will be proficient in Listening/Speaking.* | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:<br><br>*KG-50%(5/10)*<br>*1st -90%(9/10)*<br>*2nd – 100%(10/10)*<br>*3rd -40%(4/10)*<br>*4th -44%(4/9)*<br>*5th -33%(1/3)*<br>*6th – No students*<br>*7th -50%(1/2)*<br>*8th –No students*<br>*9th-100%(1/1)*<br>*10th - 100%(2/2)*<br>*11th – 100%(1/1)*<br><br>*KG-11th Avg.66%(38/58)* | 1.1.<br>Elementary: Students have had limited time to adapt to the ESOL Program. | 1.1.<br>Elementary: Students participate in the Voyager Reading intervention program and work with an ESOL assistant one time per week in a small group setting within the classroom as well as the use of students' heritage language dictionaries. | 1.1<br>Guidance Counselor and ESOL Coordinator | 1.1.<br>Voyager Reports from VPORT, CELLA scores, teacher observation, grades and FAIR data | 1.1.<br>Voyager VIP, CELLA test and classroom assessments and FAIR assessments |
| | | 1.2. Middle:<br>Scheduling computer time to accommodate the short frequent assessments from FCAT focus for each benchmark | 1.2. Teachers will evaluate each benchmark for proficiency and reteach.<br><br>Students not showing proficiency on FCAT Focus after the 2nd assessment will attend after | 1.2.Administrative Team | 1.2. The administrative team will monitor teacher and student assessment reports to ensure that students are showing learning gains. | 1.2. Fair<br>2012 FCAT results<br>FCAT Focus<br>Progress Monitoring<br>Lesson Plan Checks |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | school tutoring for remediation in those benchmarks.<br><br>All students scoring a level 1 or 2 on the reading portion of the FCAT is placed in an intensive reading class (110 minutes for level 1 students and 51 minutes for level 2 students)<br><br>Level 3 students will take a semester reading class. Students that scored a 2 on the 2011 FCAT and a 3 on the 2012 FCAT will have a year-long reading class. | | | |
| | 1.3.High:<br>None – Two current Ell students are enrolled in Honors courses. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

| Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2. Students scoring proficient in Reading.**<br><br>CELLA Goal #2:<br><br>*In grades KG-11, 70% of the ELL students taking the 2013 CELLA assessment will be proficient in Reading.* | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :<br><br>*KG-100%(10/10)*<br>*1$^{st}$ -40%(4/10)*<br>*2$^{nd}$ – 90%(9/10)*<br>*3$^{rd}$ -30%(3/10)*<br>*4$^{th}$ -56%(5/9)*<br>*5$^{th}$ -100%(3/3)*<br>*6$^{th}$ – No students*<br>*7$^{th}$ -50%(1/2)*<br>*8$^{th}$ –No students*<br>*9$^{th}$-100%(1/1)*<br>*10$^{th}$ - 50%(1/2)*<br>*11$^{th}$ – 100%(1/1)*<br><br>*KG-11$^{th}$ Avg.64%(37 /58)* | 2.1. Elementary: Students have had limited time to acquire language skills. | 2.1. Elementary: Students participate in the Voyager Reading intervention program and work with an ESOL assistant one time per week in a small group setting within the classroom | 2.1. Guidance Counselor and Martha Grant, Classroom Teacher | 2.1. Voyager Reports from VPORT, CELLA scores, teacher observation, grades and FAIR data | 2.1. Voyager VIP, CELLA test and classroom assessments and FAIR assessments |
| | | 2.1.Scheduling computer time to accommodate the short frequent assessments from FCAT focus for each benchmark | 2.1. Teachers will evaluate each benchmark for proficiency and reteach.<br><br>Students not showing proficiency on FCAT Focus after the 2$^{nd}$ | 2.1..Administrative Team | 2.1. The administrative team will monitor teacher and student assessment reports to ensure that students are showing learning gains | 2.1. Fair<br>2012 FCAT results<br>FCAT Focus<br>Progress Monitoring<br>Lesson Plan Checks |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | assessment will attend after school tutoring for remediation in those benchmarks.<br><br>All students scoring a level 1 or 2 on the reading portion of the FCAT is placed in an intensive reading class (110 minutes for level 1 students and 51 minutes for level 2 students)<br><br>Level 3 students will take a semester reading class. Students that scored a 2 on the 2011 FCAT and a 3 on the 2012 FCAT will have a year-long reading class. | | | |
| | | 2.31.3.High:<br>None – Two current Ell students are enrolled in Honors courses. | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | Anticipated Barrier | | | | |
| **3. Students scoring proficient in Writing.**<br><br>CELLA Goal #3:<br><br>*In grades KG-11, 70% of the ELL students taking the 2013 CELLA assessment will be proficient in Writing.* | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :<br><br>*KG-100%(10/10)*<br>*1ˢᵗ -50%(5/10)*<br>*2ⁿᵈ – 70%(7/10)*<br>*3ʳᵈ -30%(3/10)*<br>*4ᵗʰ -78%(7/9)*<br>*5ᵗʰ -33%(1/3)*<br>*6ᵗʰ – No students*<br>*7ᵗʰ -100%(2/2)*<br>*8ᵗʰ –No students*<br>*9ᵗʰ-100%(1/1)*<br>*10ᵗʰ - 0%(0/2)*<br>*11ᵗʰ – 0%(0/1)*<br><br>*KG-11ᵗʰ Avg.62%(36 /58)* | 2.1.<br><br>Elementary: Students have had limited time to acquire writing skills | 2.1.<br><br>Elementary: Teachers will implement our current writing program called Building Critical Writers, and students will work with an ESOL Assistant one day week within the classroom as well as the use of the student's heritage language dictionary. | 2.1.<br><br>Classroom teacher, Guidance Counselor and ESOL Coordinator | 2.1.<br><br>Classroom Assessments and CELLA Test | 2.1.<br><br>Rubric and Scoring Guide related to writing program and CELLA Test |
| | | 2.1.<br><br>None | 2.1.Students will participate in monthly writing prompts which will be scored utilizing the FCAT Writes Rubric.<br><br>Students scoring below a 4 will receive one on one tutoring after the regular school day | 2.1.Administrative team Language Arts teachers | 2.1.The Language Arts teachers will monitor the scores and provide tutoring to students not scoring a 4 | 2.1.FCAT Writes Rubric |

The percentages column reads:
KG-100%(10/10)
$1^{st}$ -50%(5/10)
$2^{nd}$ – 70%(7/10)
$3^{rd}$ -30%(3/10)
$4^{th}$ -78%(7/9)
$5^{th}$ -33%(1/3)
$6^{th}$ – No students
$7^{th}$ -100%(2/2)
$8^{th}$ –No students
$9^{th}$-100%(1/1)
$10^{th}$ - 0%(0/2)
$11^{th}$ – 0%(0/1)

KG-$11^{th}$ Avg.62%(36 /58)

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 2.31.3.High: None – Two current Ell students are enrolled in Honors courses. | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |

## CELLA 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 |
| K-4  ESOL Dictionaries | Dictionary | School-based funds | $100.00 |
| K-4 Voyager Passport 50 students | Teacher-directed instruction along with student workbook | School-based funds | .6%of  total $9,133.80 = $548.00 |
| K-4 IPT Oral | Assessment booklet | School-based funds | $88.00 |
| Grades 5-8To increase fluency 5 students | Language! Program | School budget | .6% of  total $7,000.00 = $42.00 |
| | | | **Subtotal:  $778.00** |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| ESOL Training Meetings | Guidance counselor training | Sumter county | |
| Grades 5-8 To conduct monthly writing prompts  5 students | Core Connections trainer | School budget | .6% of  total $2,000.00 = $12.00 |
| | | | **Subtotal:  $12.00** |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| | | | **Total: $790.00** |

*End of CELLA Goals*

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

## Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

| Elementary Mathematics Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.** | | | 1a.1.Elementary Scheduling of computer lab time for use of the SuccessMaker program. | 1a.1. Students not showing proficiency on FCAT Focus will attend after school tutoring for remediation in those benchmarks. Students who are not scoring proficient on FCAT Focus will participate in Team Time with in the classroom. Students who are not scoring proficient on FCAT Focus will participate in differentiated learning centers. | 1a.1. Administrative Team | 1a.1. Focus Assessments and Student Grades | 1a.1. FCAT Focus Math Assessments |
| Mathematics Goal #1a: *Level 3 mathematics scores for grades 3-4 were analyzed to set goals for improving student performance for students scoring level 3. Our focus is to move more students to levels 4-5 and levels 1-2 to level 3 thus having a smaller percentage of students scoring at level 3.* The school mathematics average of grades 3-4 students scoring levels 3 will decrease by 10%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* *$3^{rd}$ - 35%(66/188) $4^{th}$ -28%(53/190) $5^{th}$ –28%(43/155)* Grades 3-5 average is **30%(162/533)** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *$3^{rd}$ - 32% $4^{th}$ -26% $5^{th}$ –26%* Grades 3-5 average will be 27% | | | | | |
| | | | 1a.2.MS $5^{th}$ Grade Scheduling of computer lab time | 1a.2. Students not showing proficiency on FCAT Focus will attend after school tutoring for remediation in those benchmarks | 1a.2. Administrative Team | 1a.2. Focus Assessments and Student Grades | 1a.2. FCAT Focus Math Assessments |
| | | | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | 1a.3. |
| **1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.** | | | 1b.1. | 1b.1. | 1b.1. | 1b.1. | 1b.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #1b: **The school does NOT use the Alternative Assessments** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. |

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

| | | | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.**<br><br>Mathematics Goal #2a:<br><br>*Level 4 &5 mathematics scores for grades 3-8 &10 were analyzed to set goals for improving student performance for students scoring level 4 & 5.*<br><br>The school mathematics average for the grades 3-5 students scoring levels 4 & 5 will increase by 10% or a return to 2012 expectations. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*3rd* – 45%(85/188)<br>*4th* - 57%(108/190)<br>*5th* –34%(53/155)<br><br>Grades 3-5 average is **40%(246/618)** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*3rd* – 81%<br>*4th* -72%<br>*5th* –61%<br><br>Grades 3-5 average will be 71% | 2a.1.Elemenatary<br><br>Scheduling of computer lab time for use of the SuccessMaker program | 2a.1.<br>Students not showing proficiency on FCAT Focus will attend after school tutoring for remediation in those benchmarks<br><br>Students who are not scoring proficient on FCAT Focus will participate in Team Time with in the classroom.<br><br>Students who are not scoring proficient on FCAT Focus will participate in differentiated learning centers. | 2a.1.<br>Administrative Team | 2a.1.<br>Focus Assessments and Student Grades | 2a.1.<br>FCAT Focus Math Assessments |
| | | | 2a.2.  MS 5th Grade Scheduling of computer lab time | 2a.2.<br>Students not showing proficiency on FCAT Focus will attend after school tutoring for remediation in those benchmarks | 2a.2<br>Administrative Team. | 2a.2.<br>Focus Assessments and Student Grades | 2a.2.<br>FCAT Focus Math Assessments |
| | | | 2a.3 | 2a.3 | 2a.3 | 2a.3 | 2a.3 |
| **2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.**<br><br>Mathematics Goal #2b:<br><br>**The school does NOT use the Alternative Assessments** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | 2b.1. | 2b.1. | 2b.1. | 2b.1. | 2b.1. |
| | | | 2b.2. | 2b2. | 2b.2. | 2b.2. | 2b.2. |
| | | | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | 2b.3 |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |

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

| **3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.** | | | 3a.1. ELEMENTARY:<br><br>Scheduling of computer time for short frequent assessments.<br><br>Attendance within school day as well as in after school tutoring program. | 3a.1. ELEMENTARY:<br><br>Students will receive tutoring during Team Time during the school day.<br><br>Intensive Intervention Math Kit and Online Intervention Component. | 3a.1. ELEMENTARY:<br><br>Administrative Team | 3a.1. ELEMENTARY:<br><br>SuccessMaker Reports<br><br>Assessments within the Math Program | 3a.1. ELEMENTARY:<br><br>SuccessMaker<br><br>Go Math Assessments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mathematics Goal #3a:<br><br>**There will be a 10% increase in the percent of students in the lowest 25% in grades 4-5 making learning gains on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test or return to 2012 expectations.** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*49% (170/346) of the students in grades 4-5 made learning gains.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*86% of the students in grades 4-5 will make learning gains.* | | | | | |
| | | | 3a.2. MS 5th Grade Scheduling of computer time for short frequent assessments.<br><br>Attendance within school day as well as in after school tutoring program | 3a.2. Students scoring a level 1will be scheduled into an intensive math class during the school day.<br><br>Level 2 Students will be placed into an Intensive Math tutorial after the regular school day. | 3a.2. Administrative Team | 3a.2. Assessments within the Math Program<br><br>FCAT Focus | 3a.2. Go Math Assessments<br>IXL math software |
| | | | 3a.3. | 3a.3. | 3a.3. | 3a..3. | 3a.3. |
| **3b. Florida Alternate Assessment:** **Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.** | | | 3b.1. | 3b.1. | 3b.1. | 3b.1. | 3b.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #3b:<br><br>**The school does NOT use the Alternative Assessments** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | 3b.2. | 3b.2. | 3b.2. | 3b.2. | 3b.2. |
| | | | 3b.3. | 3b.3. | 3b.3. | 3b.3. | 3b.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.** | | | 4a.1. ELEMENTARY:<br>Scheduling of computer time for short frequent | 4a.1.<br>Students will receive tutoring during Team Time during the | 4a.1.<br>Administrative Team | 4a.1.<br>SuccessMaker Reports | 4a.1.<br>SuccessMaker |

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

| Mathematics Goal #4a:<br><br>*There will be a 10% increase in the percent of students in the lowest 25% in grades 4-5 making learning gains on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test or return to 2012 expectations.* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*12% (7/59) of the lowest 25% students in grades 4-5 made learning gains.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*84% of the lowest 25% students in grades 4-5 will make learning gains* | assessments.<br><br>Attendance within school day as well as in after school tutoring program. | school day.<br><br>Intensive Intervention Math Kit and Online Intervention Component. | | Assessments within the Math Program | Go Math Assessments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 4a.2. MS 5th Grade Scheduling computer time to accommodate the short frequent assessments from FCAT focus for each benchmark | 4a.2.<br>Students not showing proficiency on FCAT Focus will attend after school tutoring for remediation in those benchmarks.<br><br>Students scoring a level 1 on the math portion of the FCAT will be placed in an intensive math class for 51 minutes a day. | 4a.2.<br>Administrative Team | 4a.2..<br>Assessments within the Math Program<br><br>FCAT Focus | 4a.2.<br>Go Math Assessments<br>IXL math software |
| | | | 4a.3 | 4a.3. | 4a.3. | 4a.3. | 4a.3. |
| **4b. Florida Alternate Assessment:**<br>**Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.** | | | 4b.1. | 4b.1. | 4b.1. | 4b.1. | 4b.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #4b:<br><br>**The school does NOT use the Alternative Assessments** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | 4b.2. | 4b.2. | 4b.2. | 4b.2. | 4b.2. |
| | | | 4b.3 | 4b.3. | 4b.3. | 4b.3. | 4b.3. |

| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), 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). In six year school will reduce their** | Baseline data 2010-2011<br>Level 3:<br>*3rd - 22%(/39/176)*<br>*4th -26%(26/140)*<br>*5th –26%(47/180)*<br>Levels 4 & 5:<br>*3rd -74%(131/176)*<br>*4th -65%(91/140)*<br>*5th –55%(99/180)* | Level 3:<br><br>*3rd - 35%(66/188)*<br>*4th -28%(53/190)*<br>*5th –28%(43/155)*<br><br>Levels 4 & 5: | Level 3:<br><br>*3rd - 39%*<br>*4th -31%*<br>*5th –30%*<br><br>Levels 4 & 5: | Level 3:<br><br>*3rd - 43%*<br>*4th -34%*<br>*5th –35%*<br><br>Levels 4 & 5: | Level 3:<br><br>*3rd - 47%*<br>*4th -37%*<br>*5th –40%*<br><br>Levels 4 & 5: | Level 3:<br><br>*3rd - 52%*<br>*4th -41%*<br>*5th –45%*<br><br>Levels 4 & 5: | Level 3:<br><br>*3rd - 57%*<br>*4th -45%*<br>*5th –45%*<br><br>Levels 4 & 5: |

| achievement gap by 50%. | | $3^{rd}$ – 45%(85/188)<br>$4^{th}$ - 57%(108/190)<br>$5^{th}$ –34%(53/155) | $3^{rd}$ – 50%<br>$4^{th}$ - 63%<br>$5^{th}$ –40% | $3^{rd}$ – 55%<br>$4^{th}$ - 63%<br>$5^{th}$ –45% | $3^{rd}$ – 61%<br>$4^{th}$ - 69%<br>$5^{th}$ –45% | $3^{rd}$ – 67%<br>$4^{th}$ - 76%<br>$5^{th}$ –50% | $3^{rd}$ – 74%<br>$4^{th}$ - 84%<br>$5^{th}$ –50% |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Mathematics Goal #5A:

Elementary: In grades 3 & 4, 86% of students will achieve proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.

GRADE 5: 95% of the students in grade five will score a level 3 or higher on the math portion of the FCAT

| 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.** | | 5B.1.<br>White:<br>Black:<br>Hispanic:<br>Asian:<br>American Indian:<br><br>ELEMENTARY:<br>Scheduling of computer time for short frequent assessments.<br><br>Attendance within school day as well as in after school | 5B.1.<br><br>Students will receive tutoring during Team Time during the school day.<br><br>Intensive Intervention Math Kit and Online Intervention | 5B.1.<br><br>Administrative Team | 5B.1.<br><br>SuccessMaker Reports<br><br>Assessments within the Math Program | 5B.1.<br><br>SuccessMaker<br><br>Go Math Assessments |
| Mathematics Goal #5B:<br><br>There will be a 10% decrease of the grades 3-5 students NOT achieving proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>White: 22%(193/867)<br>Black: 29%(111/138)<br>Hispanic: 30%(39/129)<br>Asian: 7%(3/46)<br>American Indian: 0%<br>Multi-Racial: 32%(7/22)<br>Hawaiian/PI: 0% | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>White: 20%<br>Black: 26%<br>Hispanic: 27%<br>Asian: 6%<br>American Indian: NA : | | | | |
| | | 5B.2. MS $5^{th}$ Grade-Scheduling computer time to accommodate the short frequent assessments from FCAT focus for each benchmark | 5B.2.<br>Students not showing proficiency on FCAT Focus will attend after school tutoring for remediation in those benchmarks.<br><br>Students scoring a level 1 on the math portion of the FCAT will be placed in an intensive math class for 51 minutes a day. | 5B.2.<br>Administrative team | 5B.2.<br>Administrative team will monitor FCAT Focus results to ensure learning gains. | 5B.2.<br>Go Math Assessments<br>FCAT Focus |
| | | 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. ELEMENTARY: Scheduling of computer time for short frequent assessments.<br><br>Attendance within school day as well as in after school tutoring program. | 5C.1. Students will receive tutoring during Team Time during the school day.<br><br>Intensive Intervention Math Kit and Online Intervention Component. | 5C.1. Administrative Team | 5C.1. SuccessMaker Reports<br><br>Assessments within the Math Program | 5C.1. SuccessMaker<br><br>Go Math Assessments |
| Mathematics Goal #5C:<br><br>In grades 3-5, 14% of the students will NOT achieve proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*56%(5/9)* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*14% of the grades 3-5 students will NOT be proficient* | | | | | |
| | | | 5C.2.5th Grade-MS Scheduling computer time to accommodate the short frequent assessments from FCAT focus for each benchmark | 5C.2. Students not showing proficiency on FCAT Focus will attend after school tutoring for remediation in those benchmarks.<br><br>Students scoring a level 1 on the math portion of the FCAT will be placed in an intensive math class for 51 minutes a day. | 5C.2. Administrative team | 5C.2. Administrative team will monitor FCAT Focus results to ensure learning gains. | 5C.2. Go Math Assessments FCAT Focus |
| | | | 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. ELEMENTARY: Scheduling of computer time for short frequent assessments.<br><br>Attendance within school day as well as in after school tutoring program. | 5C.1. Students will receive tutoring during Team Time during the school day.<br><br>Intensive Intervention Math Kit and Online Intervention Component. | 5C.1. Administrative Team | 5C.1. SuccessMaker Reports<br><br>Assessments within the Math Program | 5C.1. SuccessMaker<br><br>Go Math Assessments<br><br>FCAT Focus |
| Mathematics Goal #5D:<br><br>In grades 3-5 14% of the students will NOT achieve proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*50%(11/22)* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*14% of the grades 3-5students will NOT be proficient.* | | | | | |
| | | | 5D.2.5th Grade-MS Scheduling computer time to accommodate the short frequent assessments from FCAT focus for each benchmark | 5D.2. Students not showing proficiency on FCAT Focus will attend after school tutoring for remediation in those benchmarks.<br><br>Students scoring a level 1 on the math portion of the FCAT will be placed in an intensive math class | 5D.2. Administrative team | 5D.2. Administrative team will monitor FCAT Focus results to ensure learning gains. | 5D.2. Go Math Assessments FCAT Focus |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | for 51 minutes a day. | | |
| | | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.** | | | 5E.1.. ELEMENTARY: Scheduling of computer time for short frequent assessments.<br><br>Attendance within school day as well as in after school tutoring program. | 5E.1.<br>Students will receive tutoring during Team Time during the school day.<br><br>Intensive Intervention Math Kit and Online Intervention Component. | 5E.1.<br>Administrative Team | 5E.1.<br>SuccessMaker Reports<br><br>Assessments within the Math Program | 5E.1.<br>SuccessMaker<br><br>Go Math Assessments |
| Mathematics Goal #5E:<br><br>In grades 3-5, 14% of the students will NOT achieve proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.<br>. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*33%(33/99)* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*14% of the grades 3-5 students will NOT be proficient* | | | | | |
| | | | 5E.2.5$^{th}$ Grade-MS Scheduling computer time to accommodate the short frequent assessments from FCAT focus for each benchmark | 5E.2<br>Students not showing proficiency on FCAT Focus will attend after school tutoring for remediation in those benchmarks.<br><br>Students scoring a level 1 on the math portion of the FCAT will be placed in an intensive math class for 51 minutes a day. | 5E.2. Administrative team | 5E.2. Administrative team will monitor FCAT Focus results to ensure learning gains. | 5E.2.<br>Go Math Assessments<br>FCAT Focus |
| | | | 5E.3 | 5E.3 | 5E.3 | 5E.3 | 5E.3 |

*End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals*

## Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

| **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.<br>Scheduling computer time to accommodate the short frequent assessments from FCAT focus for each benchmark | 1a.1.<br>Students not showing proficiency on FCAT Focus will attend after school tutoring for remediation in those benchmarks.<br><br>Students scoring a level 1 on the math portion of the FCAT will be placed in an intensive math class for 51 minutes a day. | 1a.1.<br>Administrative team | 1a.1.<br>Administrative team will monitor FCAT Focus results to ensure learning gains. | 1a.1.<br>FCAT Focus<br>Math Connects Mini-assessments |
| Mathematics Goal #1a:<br><br>*Level 3 mathematics scores for grades 6-8 were analyzed to set goals* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*6$^{th}$-26%(55/213)*<br>*7$^{th}$-32%(58/181)*<br>*8$^{th}$-46%(84/182)* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*30% of the grades 6-8 students will score at a level 3.* | | | | | |

| *for improving student performance for students scoring level 3 thus it is expected to have a lower percentage of students scoring level 3. Our focus is to move more students to levels 4-5 and levels 1-2 to level 3.*<br><br>The school mathematics average of grades 6-8 students scoring levels 3 will decrease by 10% or return to the 2012 expectation. | Grades 6-8 average is **34%(197/576)** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1a.2. | 1a.2. | 1a.2. | 1a.2. | 1a.2. |
| | | | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | 1a.3. |

| **1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.** | | | 1b.1. | 1b.1. | 1b.1. | 1b.1. | 1b.1. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mathematics Goal #1b:<br><br>**The school does NOT use the Alternative Assessments** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. |
| | | | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. |

| 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. Middle<br><br>None | 2a.2.<br>Students scoring levels 4 or 5 on the math portion of FCAT will be placed in advanced classes in 6th and 7th grade and Algebra 1 Honors in 8th grade<br><br>Students will be given an algebra readiness test at the end of 6th grade for placement into Algebra I Honors in 7th grade | 2a.2.<br>Administrative team | 2a.2.<br>Administrative team will monitor FCAT Focus results bi-weekly to ensure learning gains. | 2a.2.<br>FCAT Focus<br>Math Connects Mini-assessments |
| Mathematics Goal #2a:<br>*Level 4 &5 mathematics scores for grades 6-8 were analyzed to set goals for improving student performance for students scoring level 4 & 5.*<br><br>The school mathematics average for the grades 6-8 | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>*6th -49%(104/213)*<br>*7th -50%(91/181)*<br>*8th- 31%(56/182)*<br>Grades 6-8 average is **44%(251/576)** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>*60% of the grades 6-8 students will score a level 4 or 5.* | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| students scoring levels 4 & 5 will increase by 10% or return to the 2012 expectation. | | 2a.2. | 2a.2. | 2a.2. | 2a.2. | 2a.2. |
| | | 2a.3 | 2a.3 | 2a.3 | 2a.3 | 2a.3 |
| **2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.** | | 2b.1. | 2b.1. | 2b.1. | 2b.1. | 2b.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #2b:<br><br>**The school does NOT use the Alternative Assessments** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | |
| | | 2b.2. | 2b2. | 2b.2. | 2b.2. | 2b.2. |
| | | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | 2b.3 |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.** | | 3a.1.<br><br>Scheduling computer time to accommodate the short frequent assessments from FCAT focus for each benchmark | 3a.1.<br><br>Students not showing proficiency on FCAT Focus will attend after school tutoring for remediation in those benchmarks.<br><br>Students scoring a level 1 on the math portion of the FCAT will be placed in an intensive math class for 51 minutes a day. | 3a.1.<br><br>Administrative team | 3a.1.<br><br>Administrative team will monitor FCAT Focus results to ensure learning gains. | 3a.1.<br><br>FCAT Focus |
| Mathematics Goal #3a:<br><br>**There will be a 10% increase in the percent of students in grades 6-8 making learning gains on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test or a return to the 2012 expectation.** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*58% (336/577) of the students in grades 6-8 made learning gains.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*86% of the students in grades 6-8 will make learning gains* | | | | |
| | | 3a.2. | 3a.2. | 3a.2. | 3a.2. | 3a.2. |
| | | 3a.3. | 3a.3. | 3a.3. | 3a..3. | 3a.3. |
| **3b. Florida Alternate Assessment:  Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.** | | 3b.1. | 3b.1. | 3b.1. | 3b.1. | 3b.1. |
| Mathematics  Goal #3b:<br><br>**The school does NOT use the Alternative Assessments** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in* | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *this box.* | *this box.* | | | |
| | | | 3b.2. | 3b.2. | 3b.2. | 3b.2. | 3b.2. |
| | | | 3b.3. | 3b.3. | 3b.3. | 3b.3. | 3b.3. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.**<br><br>Mathematics Goal #4a:<br>*There will be a 10% increase in the percent of students in the lowest 25% in grades 6-8 making learning gains on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test or a return to the 2012 expectation.*<br><br>**2012 Current Level of Performance:***  *20% (17/84) of the lower quarter students made learning gains.*   **2013 Expected Level of Performance:***  *84% of the lowest 25% students in grades 6-8 will make learning gains.* | 4a.1. Scheduling computer time to accommodate the short frequent assessments from FCAT focus for each benchmark | 4a.1. Students not showing proficiency on FCAT Focus will attend after school tutoring for remediation in those benchmarks.<br><br>Students scoring a level 1 on the math portion of the FCAT will be placed in an intensive math class for 51 minutes a day. | 4a.1. Administrative team | 4a.1. Administrative team will monitor FCAT Focus results to ensure learning gains. | 4a.1. FCAT Focus |
| | 4a.2. | 4a.2. | 4a.2. | 4a.2. | 4a.2. |
| | 4a.3 | 4a.3. | 4a.3. | 4a.3. | 4a.3. |
| **4b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.**<br><br>Mathematics Goal #4b: The school does NOT use the Alternative Assessments<br><br>**2012 Current Level of Performance:*** *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*   **2013 Expected Level of Performance:*** *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | 4b.1. | 4b.1. | 4b.1. | 4b.1. | 4b.1. |
| | 4b.2. | 4b.2. | 4b.2. | 4b.2. | 4b.2. |
| | 4b.3 | 4b.3. | 4b.3. | 4b.3. | 4b.3. |

| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), 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). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Baseline data 2010-2011 | Level 3: | Level 3: | Level 3: | Level 3: | Level 3: | Level 3: |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Level 3:* <br> *6th -31%(54/175)* <br> *7th -36%(67/187)* <br> *8th -51%(87/171)* <br> <br> Grades 63-8 school average is 39%. <br> <br> Level 4 & 5: <br> *6th -52%(91/175)* <br> *7th -46%(86/187)* <br> *8th -37%(63/171)* <br> <br> Grades 3-8 school average is 45% | 6th-26% <br> 7th-32% <br> 8th-46% <br> <br> **Level 4 & 5:** <br> <br> 6th-49% <br> 7th-50% <br> 8th-31% | 6th-28% <br> 7th-34% <br> 8th-48% <br> <br> **Level 4 & 5:** <br> <br> 6th-51% <br> 7th-52% <br> 8th-33% | 6th -30% <br> 7th -36% <br> 8th-50% <br> <br> **Level 4 & 5:** <br> <br> 6th-53% <br> 7th-54% <br> 8th-35% | 6th -32% <br> 7th -38% <br> 8th-52% <br> <br> **Level 4 & 5:** <br> <br> 6th-55% <br> 7th-56% <br> 8th-37% | 6th -34% <br> 7th -40% <br> 8th-54% <br> <br> **Level 4 & 5:** <br> <br> 6th-57% <br> 7th-58% <br> 8th-40% | 6th - 34% <br> 7th - 40% <br> 8th - 54% <br> <br> **Level 4 & 5:** <br> <br> 6th-57% <br> 7th-58% <br> 8th-40% |

Mathematics Goal #5A:

Middle: 90% of the students in grades 6-8 will score a level 3 or higher on the math portion of the FCAT

| 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.** <br> <br> Mathematics Goal #5B: In grades 6-8, 10% students will NOT achieve proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test. <br><br> **2012 Current Level of Performance:*** <br> White: 21%(93/437) <br> Black: 32%(8/25) <br> Hispanic:26%(19/72) <br> Asian: 12%(3/25) <br> American Indian: 0% <br> Multi-Racial: 38%(5/13) <br> Hawaiian/PI: 0% <br><br> **2013 Expected Level of Performance:*** <br> White:19% <br> Black:29% <br> Hispanic:23% <br> Asian:11% <br> Multi-Racial: 34% | 5B.1. <br> White: <br> Black: <br> Hispanic: <br> Asian: <br> American Indian: <br> <br> Scheduling computer time to accommodate the short frequent assessments from FCAT focus for each benchmark | 5B.1. <br> <br> Students not showing proficiency on FCAT Focus will attend after school tutoring for remediation in those benchmarks. <br> <br> Students scoring a level 1 on the math portion of the FCAT will be placed in an intensive math class for 51 minutes a day. | 5B.1. <br> Administrative team | 5B.1. <br> <br> Administrative team will monitor FCAT Focus results bi-weekly to ensure learning gains. | 5B.1. <br> <br> FCAT Focus |
| | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. |
| | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.** | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. |

| Mathematics Goal #5C:<br><br>In grades 6-8, 10% English Language Learner students will NOT achieve proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test or return to 2012 expectation. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*50% (1/2) were not proficient.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*22% will NOT be proficient.* | Scheduling computer time to accommodate the short frequent assessments from FCAT focus for each benchmark | Students not showing proficiency on FCAT Focus will attend after school tutoring for remediation in those benchmarks.<br><br>Students scoring a level 1 on the math portion of the FCAT will be placed in an intensive math class for 51 minutes a day | Administrative team | Administrative team will monitor FCAT Focus results bi-weekly to ensure learning gains. | FCAT Focus |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 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.<br><br>Scheduling computer time to accommodate the short frequent assessments from FCAT focus for each benchmark | 5D.1.<br><br>Students not showing proficiency on FCAT Focus will attend after school tutoring for remediation in those benchmarks. The students will also receive before school tutoring from the ESE inclusion teacher<br><br>Students scoring a level 1 on the math portion of the FCAT will be placed in an intensive math class for 51 minutes a day. | 5D.1.<br><br>ESE inclusion teacher and administrative team | 5D.1.<br><br>Administrative team and inclusion teacher will monitor FCAT Focus results bi-weekly to ensure learning gains. | 5D.1.<br><br>FCAT Focus |
| Mathematics Goal #5D:<br>In grades 6-8, 10% of the Students with Disabilities will NOT achieve proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test or return to 2012 expectation. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*59% (24/41) were not proficient.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*22% will NOT be proficient.* | | | | | |
| | | | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. |
| | | | 5D.3 | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.** | | | 5E.1.<br>Scheduling computer time to accommodate the short frequent assessments from FCAT focus for each benchmark | 5E.1.<br>Students not showing proficiency on FCAT Focus will attend after school tutoring for remediation in those benchmarks. The students will also receive before school tutoring from the ESE inclusion teacher<br><br>Students scoring a level 1 on the math portion of the FCAT will be placed in an intensive math class | 5E.1.<br>The administrative team | 5E.1.<br>Administrative team and inclusion teacher will monitor FCAT Focus results bi-weekly to ensure learning gains. | 5E.1.<br>FCAT Focus |
| Mathematics Goal #5E:<br><br>In grades 6-8, 10% students will Not achieve proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test or return to 2012 | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*30% (51/168) were not proficient.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*22% will not be proficient.* | | | | | |

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

| expectations. | | | | for 51 minutes a day. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 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*

## Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals
* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

| High School Mathematics Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.** | | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #1:<br><br>**The school does NOT use the Alternative Assessments** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.** | | | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #2:<br><br>**The school does NOT use the Alternative Assessments** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |

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

| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **3. Florida Alternate Assessment:** Percentage of students making **Learning Gains in mathematics.** | | | 3.1. | 3.1. | 3.1. | 3.1. | 3.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #3:<br><br>**The school does NOT use the Alternative Assessments** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. |
| | | | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **4. Florida Alternate Assessment:** Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. | | | 4.1. | 4b.1. | 4b.1. | 4b.1. | 4b.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #4:<br><br>**The school does NOT use the Alternative Assessments** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. |
| | | | 4.3 | 4.3. | 4.3. | 4.3. | 4.3. |

*End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals*


## Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

| Algebra EOC Goals | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |
|---|---|
| | |

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra.** | | | 1.1.<br>None | 1.1.<br>Teachers will use EOC benchmark assessments to monitor student progress. | 1.1.<br>Administration | 1.1.<br>Administrators will review assessments to ensure that teachers are accessing students according to schedule. | 1.1.<br>Printout of EOC assessments. |
| <u>Algebra Goal #1:</u><br><br>All Algebra I and Algebra I B students will score level 3 or higher. | **2012 Current Level of Performance:***<br><br>*8th- 44%(24/54)*<br>*9th – 64%(66/103)*<br>*10th – 25%(5/20)*<br>*Average: 54%(95/177)* | **2013 Expected Level of Performance:***<br><br>*9th – 72%*<br>*10th – 100%* | | Teachers will include higher order questions on lesson plans. | Administration | Lesson plans will be submitted weekly to vice principal for review. | Walkthroughs will be used to determine frequency of higher order questions. |
| | | | | Teachers will develop curriculum maps. | Administration | Curriculum maps will be submitted and reviewed by vice principal and student grades will be reviewed. | Progress reports and report cards will be reviewed and students will be required to attend mandatory after school help if adequate progress is not demonstrated. |
| | | | | Teachers will periodically administer a diagnostic test | Administration | Teachers will use diagnostic assessment to check for understanding of the EOC benchmarks | Test based on EOC benchmarks |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra.** | | | 2.1.<br>None | 2.1.<br>Teachers will use EOC benchmark assessments to monitor student progress. | 2.1.<br>Administration | 2.1.<br>Administrators will review assessments to ensure that teachers are accessing students according to schedule. | 2.1.<br>Printout of EOC assessments. |
| Algebra Goal #2:<br><br>*Algebra scores were analyzed to set goals for improving student performance for students scoring level 4 & 5.*<br><br>All Algebra I Honor students will score level 4 or higher | **2012 Current Level of Performance:***<br><br>*7th –100%(1/1)*<br>*8th- 56%(30/54)*<br>*9th – 29%(30/103)*<br>*10th – 0%(0/20)*<br>*Average: 34% (61/178)* | **2013 Expected Level of Performance:***<br><br>*9th – 28%*<br>*10th – 0%* | | Teachers will include higher order questions on lesson plans. | Administration | Lesson plans will be submitted weekly to vice principal for review. | Walkthroughs will be used to determine frequency of higher order questions. |
| | | | | Teachers will develop curriculum maps. | Administration | Curriculum maps will be submitted and reviewed by vice principal and student grades will be reviewed. | Progress reports and report cards will be reviewed and students will be required to attend mandatory after school help if adequate progress is not demonstrated. |
| | | | | Teachers will periodically administer a diagnostic test | Administration | Teachers will use diagnostic assessment to check for understanding of the EOC benchmarks | Test based on EOC benchmarks |

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

| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | |
| 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** |
| **3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.** | **Baseline data 2010-2011** <br><br> <u>No scores provide</u> | **88%(157/178) passed** | 100% will score a level 3 or higher on the Algebra I EOC | 100% will score a level 3 or higher on the Algebra I EOC | 100% will score a level 3 or higher on the Algebra I EOC | 100% will score a level 3 or higher on the Algebra I EOC | 100% will score a level 3 or higher on the Algebra I EOC |
| <u>Algebra Goal #3A:</u> <br><br> By 2016-2017 all students in Algebra I will be scoring at Level 3 or higher on Algebra I EOC. | | | | | | | |
| 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 | |
| **3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity** (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.** <br><br> <u>Algebra Goal #3B:</u> <br> 0% of the Algebra students will Not achieve proficiency on the 2013 administration of the Algebra EOC | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <br><br> White: 10%(18/178) <br> Black: 0% <br> Hispanic: 2%(3/178) <br> Asian: 0% <br> American Indian: 0% <br> Multi-Racial: .5%(1/178) <br><br> 12% of the students did Not achieve proficiency. / <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <br><br> White: 0% <br> Black: 0% <br> Hispanic: 0 % <br> Asian:0% <br> American Indian: 0% <br> Multi-Racial: 0% <br> 0% will not be proficient. | 3B.1. <br> White: <br> Black: <br> Hispanic: <br> Asian: <br> American Indian: | 3B.1. <br> Teachers will use EOC benchmark assessments to monitor student progress. <br><br><br> Teachers will include higher order questions on lesson plans. <br><br> Teachers will develop curriculum maps. <br><br><br> Teachers will periodically administer a diagnostic test | 3B.1. <br> Administration <br><br><br><br><br> Administration <br><br><br> Administration <br><br><br> Administration | 3B.1. <br> Administrators will review assessments to ensure that teachers are accessing students according to schedule. Lesson plans will be submitted weekly to vice principal for review. <br><br> Curriculum maps will be submitted and reviewed by vice principal and student grades will be reviewed. <br><br> Teachers will use diagnostic assessment to check for understanding of the EOC benchmarks | 3B.1. <br> Printout of EOC assessments. <br><br> Walkthroughs will be used to determine frequency of higher order questions. <br><br> Progress reports and report cards will be reviewed and students will be required to attend mandatory after school help if adequate progress is not demonstrated. <br><br> Test based on EOC benchmarks | |
| | | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | |
| | | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |

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

| 3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. | | | 3C.1. None | 3C.1. Teachers will use EOC benchmark assessments to monitor student progress. | 3C.1. Administration | 3C.1. Administrators will review assessments to ensure that teachers are accessing students according to schedule. | 3C.1. Printout of EOC assessments. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Algebra Goal #3C:<br><br>0% of the English Language Learner Algebra students will Not achieve proficiency on the 2013 administration of the Algebra EOC | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*.5%(1/178)* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*0% will NOT be proficient.* | | Teachers will include higher order questions on lesson plans.<br><br><br>Teachers will develop curriculum maps. | Administration<br><br><br><br>Administration | Lesson plans will be submitted weekly to vice principal for review.<br><br>Curriculum maps will be submitted and reviewed by vice principal and student grades will be reviewed. | Walkthroughs will be used to determine frequency of higher order questions.<br><br>Progress reports and report cards will be reviewed and students will be required to attend mandatory after school help if adequate progress is not demonstrated. |
| | | | 3C.2. | 3C.2. | 3C.2. | 3C.2. | 3C.2. |
| | | | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | 3C.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. | | | 3D.1. None | 3D.1. Teachers will use EOC benchmark assessments to monitor student progress. | 3D.1. Administration | 3D.1. Administrators will review assessments to ensure that teachers are accessing students according to schedule. | 3D.1. Printout of EOC assessments. |
| Algebra Goal #3D:<br><br>0% of the SWD Algebra students will Not achieve proficiency on the 2013 administration of the Algebra EOC | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*1%(2/178)* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*0% will NOT be proficient.* | | Teachers will include higher order questions on lesson plans.<br><br><br>Teachers will develop curriculum maps. | Administration<br><br><br><br>Administration | Lesson plans will be submitted weekly to vice principal for review.<br><br>Curriculum maps will be submitted and reviewed by vice principal and student grades will be reviewed. | Walkthroughs will be used to determine frequency of higher order questions.<br><br>Progress reports and report cards will be reviewed and students will be required to attend mandatory after school help if adequate progress is not demonstrated. |
| | | | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. |
| | | | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. | | | 3E.1. None | 3E.1. Teachers will use EOC benchmark assessments to monitor student progress. | 3E.1. Administration | 3E.1. Administrators will review assessments to ensure that teachers are accessing students according to schedule. | 3E.1. Printout of EOC assessments. |
| Algebra Goal #3E:<br><br>0% of the SWD Algebra students will | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |

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

| Not achieve proficiency on the 2013 administration of the Algebra EOC | 3%(5/18) | *Less than 2% will NOT be proficient.* | | Teachers will include higher order questions on lesson plans.<br><br>Teachers will develop curriculum maps. | Administration<br><br><br><br>Administration | Lesson plans will be submitted weekly to vice principal for review.<br><br>Curriculum maps will be submitted and reviewed by vice principal and student grades will be reviewed. | Walkthroughs will be used to determine frequency of higher order questions.<br><br>Progress reports and report cards will be reviewed and students will be required to attend mandatory after school help if adequate progress is not demonstrated. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 3E.2. | 3E.2 | 3E.2. | 3E.2. | 3E.2. |
| | | | 3E.3 | 3E.3 | 3E.3 | 3E.3 | 3E.3 |

*End of Algebra EOC Goals*


## Geometry End-of-Course Goals
* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

| Geometry EOC Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.**<br><br>Geometry Goal #1:<br><br>60 % of the Geometry students will score level 3 or higher. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*1/3 level- 29% 2/3level-38% 3/3 level-34%* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*60% of the students will achieve a level (118/197).* | 1.1.<br>Geometry proficiency levels have not been provided for 2012. | 1.1.<br>Teachers will use EOC benchmark assessments to monitor student progress.<br><br>Teachers will include higher order questions on lesson plans.<br><br>Teachers will develop curriculum maps. | 1.1.<br>Administration<br><br><br><br>Administration<br><br><br><br>Administration | 1.1.<br>Administrators will review assessments to ensure that teachers are accessing students according to schedule.<br><br>Lesson plans will be submitted weekly to vice principal for review.<br><br>Curriculum maps will be submitted and reviewed by vice principal and student grades will be reviewed. | 1.1.<br>Printout of EOC assessments.<br><br><br>Walkthroughs will be used to determine frequency of higher order questions.<br><br>Progress reports and report cards will be reviewed and students will be required to attend mandatory after school help if adequate progress is not demonstrated. |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |

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

| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. | | | 2.1.<br>Geometry proficiency levels have not been provided for 2012. | 2.1.<br>Teachers will use EOC benchmark assessments to monitor student progress.<br><br>Teachers will include higher order questions on lesson plans.<br><br>Teachers will develop curriculum maps. | 2.1.<br>Administration<br><br><br>Administration<br><br><br><br>Administration | 2.1.<br>Administrators will review assessments to ensure that teachers are accessing students according to schedule.<br><br>Lesson plans will be submitted weekly to vice principal for review.<br><br>Curriculum maps will be submitted and reviewed by vice principal and student grades will be reviewed. | 2.1.<br>Printout of EOC assessments.<br><br><br>Walkthroughs will be used to determine frequency of higher order questions.<br><br>Progress reports and report cards will be reviewed and students will be required to attend mandatory after school help if adequate progress is not demonstrated. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Geometry Goal #2:<br><br>40 % of the Geometry students will score level 4 or higher. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*1/3 level- 29%*<br>*2/3level-38%*<br>*3/3 level-34%* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*40% of the students will achieve a level 4 or 5 (79/197).* | | | | | |
| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |

| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target | | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.** | **Baseline data 2011-2012**<br><br>**Data is not available to complete this section** | | 100% will score a level 3 or higher on the Geometry EOC | 100% will score a level 3 or higher on the Geometry EOC | 100% will score a level 3 or higher on the Geometry EOC | 100% will score a level 3 or higher on the Geometry EOC | 100% will score a level 3 or higher on the Geometry EOC |
| Geometry Goal #3A:<br><br>By 2016-2017 all students in Geometry will be scoring at Level 3 or higher on the Geometry EOC. | | | | | | | |

| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity** (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.** | | | 3B.1.<br>White:<br>Black:<br>Hispanic:<br>Asian:<br>American Indian:<br><br>Geometry proficiency levels have not been provided for 2012.<br><br>Teachers will develop | 3B.1.<br>Teachers will use EOC benchmark assessments to monitor student progress.<br><br>Teachers will include higher order questions on lesson plans. | 3B.1.<br>Administration<br><br><br><br>Administration<br><br><br>Administration | 3B.1.<br>Administrators will review assessments to ensure that teachers are accessing students according to schedule.<br><br>Lesson plans will be submitted weekly to vice principal for review.<br><br>Curriculum maps will be | 3B.1.<br>Printout of EOC assessments.<br><br><br>Walkthroughs will be used to determine frequency of higher order questions.<br><br>Progress reports and report |
| Geometry Goal #3B:<br>**The Geometry EOC did not have proficiency levels for 2012 assessment.** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in* | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Data is not available to complete this section.**<br><br>**It is anticipated that less than 0% of the students will not be proficient on the 2013 EOC.** | *this box.*<br>White:<br>Black:<br>Hispanic:<br>Asian:<br>American Indian: | *this box.*<br>White:<br>Black:<br>Hispanic:<br>Asian:<br>American Indian: | | curriculum maps. | | submitted and reviewed by vice principal and student grades will be reviewed. | cards will be reviewed and students will be required to attend mandatory after school help if adequate progress is not demonstrated. |
| | | | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. |
| | | | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.** | | | 3C.1.<br>Geometry proficiency levels have not been provided for 2012. | 3C.1.<br>Teachers will use EOC benchmark assessments to monitor student progress. | 3C.1.<br>Administration | 3C.1.<br>Administrators will review assessments to ensure that teachers are accessing students according to schedule. | 3C.1.<br>Printout of EOC assessments. |
| Geometry Goal #3C:<br><br>**The Geometry EOC did not have proficiency levels for 2012 assessment.**<br><br>**Data is not available to complete this section.**<br><br>**It is anticipated that less than 0% of the students will not be proficient on the 2013 EOC.** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | Teachers will include higher order questions on lesson plans.<br><br>Teachers will develop curriculum maps. | Administration<br><br><br>Administration | Lesson plans will be submitted weekly to vice principal for review.<br><br>Curriculum maps will be submitted and reviewed by vice principal and student grades will be reviewed. | Walkthroughs will be used to determine frequency of higher order questions.<br><br>Progress reports and report cards will be reviewed and students will be required to attend mandatory after school help if adequate progress is not demonstrated. |
| | | | 3C.2. | 3C.2. | 3C.2. | 3C.2. | 3C.2. |
| | | | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | 3C.3. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.** | | | 3D.1.<br>Geometry proficiency levels have not been provided for 2012. | 3D.1.<br>Teachers will use EOC benchmark assessments to monitor student progress. | 3D.1.<br>Administration | 3D.1.<br>Administrators will review assessments to ensure that teachers are accessing students according to schedule. | 3D.1.<br>Printout of EOC assessments. |
| Geometry Goal #3D:<br><br>**The Geometry EOC did not have proficiency levels for 2012 assessment.**<br><br>**Data is not available to complete this section.** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | Teachers will include higher order questions on lesson plans.<br><br>Teachers will develop curriculum maps. | Administration<br><br><br>Administration | Lesson plans will be submitted weekly to vice principal for review.<br><br>Curriculum maps will be submitted and reviewed by vice principal and student grades will be reviewed. | Walkthroughs will be used to determine frequency of higher order questions.<br><br>Progress reports and report cards will be reviewed and students will be required to attend mandatory after school |

| | | | | | | | help if adequate progress is not demonstrated. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **It is anticipated that less than 0% of the students will not be proficient on the 2013 EOC.** | | | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. |
| | | | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.**<br><br>Geometry Goal #3E:<br><br>**The Geometry EOC did not have proficiency levels for 2012 assessment.**<br><br>**Data is not available to complete this section.**<br><br>**It is anticipated that 0 % of the students will not be proficient on the 2013 EOC.** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | 3E.1.<br>Geometry proficiency levels have not been provided for 2012. | 3E.1.<br>Teachers will use EOC benchmark assessments to monitor student progress.<br><br>Teachers will include higher order questions on lesson plans.<br><br>Teachers will develop curriculum maps. | 3E.1.<br>Administration<br><br><br>Administration<br><br><br>Administration | 3E.1.<br>Administrators will review assessments to ensure that teachers are accessing students according to schedule.<br><br>Lesson plans will be submitted weekly to vice principal for review.<br><br>Curriculum maps will be submitted and reviewed by vice principal and student grades will be reviewed. | 3E.1.<br>Printout of EOC assessments.<br><br><br><br>Walkthroughs will be used to determine frequency of higher order questions.<br><br>Progress reports and report cards will be reviewed and students will be required to attend mandatory after school help if adequate progress is not demonstrated. |
| | | | 3E.2. | 3E.2 | 3E.2. | 3E.2. | 3E.2. |
| | | | 3E.3 | 3E.3 | 3E.3 | 3E.3 | 3E.3 |

*End of Geometry EOC Goals*

## Mathematics Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD 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 |
| State Common Core Math Training | 6-10 | FL DOE | 6-8 Math, Alg. And Geo teachers | Nov. 6 & 7, 2012 | Discussion during bi-monthly subject area meetings | Administration |
| Math & the Common Core Standards | 6-12 | TBA | Math teachers | January 2013 | Discussion during bi-monthly subject area meetings | Administration |
| Differentiated Instruction | K-4 | Florida Inclusion Network | KG and 1st grade, New teachers in 2nd and 4th | August 1, 2012 | Lesson Plans and Observation | Administrative team will monitor implementation |
| Use of FCAT Focus | 9-12 | Administration | Mathematics Teachers | Monthly | Monitoring of lesson plans and | Administration |

| materials | | | | | walkthroughs | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lesson Plan Development | 9-12 | Administration | Mathematics Teachers | Monthly | Monitoring of lesson plans and walkthroughs | Administration |
| Curriculum Map Development | 9-12 | Administration | Mathematics Teachers | Monthly | Monitoring of lesson plans and walkthroughs | Administration |

## Mathematics 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 |
| | | | |
| ELEMENTARY: The Florida Black line Assessment workbook allows students to continually practice benchmark skills. | Go Math Florida Assessment Black line Master Workbook is for individual student practice. | School based budget | $6,712.30 |
| MIDDLE: After school tutoring | Teachers | School Budget | $2,000.00 |
| HIGH: | | | None |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: $8,712.30 |
| 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: $8,712.30** |

*End of Mathematics Goals*

## Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

| 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.** <br><br> Science Goal #1a: <br><br> The school science FCAT Test administered in 2013 average of grades 5 & 8 students scoring levels 3 will increase by 10% or return to 2012 expectations. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* <br><br> *$5^{th}$-38%(59/154) $8^{th}$-43%(78/182)* <br><br> *Avg. of $5^{th}$ & $8^{th}$ 41%(137/336)* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <br><br> *$5^{th}$-44% $8^{th}$-56%* <br><br> *Av. of $5^{th}$ & $8^{th}$ 41%(137/336)* | 1a.1. GRADES 5 & 8 <br><br> Scheduling computer time to accommodate the short frequent assessments from FCAT focus for each benchmark | 1a.1. <br><br> Students not showing proficiency on FCAT Focus will attend after school tutoring for remediation in those benchmarks. | 1a.1. <br><br> Administrative team | 1a.1. <br><br> Administrative team will monitor FCAT Focus results to ensure learning gains. | 1a.1. <br><br> FCAT Focus |
| | | | 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 Level 4, 5, and 6 in science.** <br><br> Science Goal #1b: <br><br> **The school does NOT use the Alternative Assessments** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* <br><br> *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <br><br> *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | 1b.1. | 1b.1. | 1b.1. | 1b.1. | 1b.1. |
| | | | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. |
| | | | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |

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

| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science. | | | 2a.1. GRADES 5 & 8 Scheduling computer time to accommodate the short frequent assessments from FCAT focus for each benchmark | 2a.1. Students performing above proficiency will be placed in advanced classes and will learn the scientific method by participating in the science fair | 2a.1. Teachers and administrative team | 2a.1. Administrative team will monitor FCAT Focus results to ensure learning gains. | 2a.1. FCAT Focus |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Science Goal #2a:**<br><br>The school science FCAT Test administered in 2013 average of grades 5 & 8 students scoring levels 4 & 5 will increase by 25%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*5th-35%(54/154)*<br>*8th-21%(38/182)*<br><br>*Avg. of 5th & 8th 27%(92/336)* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*5th-43%*<br>*8th-26%* | | | | | |
| | | | 2a.2. | 2a.2. | 2a.2. | 2a.2. | 2a.2. |
| | | | 2a.3 | 2a.3 | 2a.3 | 2a.3 | 2a.3 |
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. | | | 2b.1. | 2b.1. | 2.1. | 2b.1. | 2b.1. |
| **Science Goal #2b:**<br><br>**The school does NOT use the Alternative Assessments** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | 2b.2. | 2b.2. | 2b.2. | 2b.2. | 2b.2. |
| | | | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | 2b.3 |

*End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals*

## Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals
* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

| High School Science Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Level 4, 5, and 6 in science. | | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| **Science Goal #1:**<br><br>**The school does NOT use the Alternative Assessments** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in* | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *this box.* | *this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.** | | | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| Science Goal #2:<br><br>**The school does NOT use the Alternative Assessments** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |

*End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals*

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

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

| Biology 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 Biology.** | | | 1.1.<br>Biology proficiency levels have not been provided for 2012. | 1.1.<br>Teachers will use EOC benchmark assessments to monitor student progress. | 1.1.<br>Administration | 1.1.<br>Administrators will review assessments to ensure that teachers are accessing students according to schedule. | 1.1.<br>Printout of EOC assessments. |
| Biology Goal #1:<br><br>*66% of the students will achieve level 3 on the 2013 Biology EOC.* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Level 1/3: 15%(23/151) Level 2/3: 36%(54/151)* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*It is expected that 66 % of the students will achieve level 3.* | | Teachers will include higher order questions on lesson plans.<br><br>Teachers will develop curriculum maps. | Administration<br><br>Administration | Lesson plans will be submitted weekly to vice principal for review.<br><br>Curriculum maps will be submitted and reviewed by vice principal and student grades will be reviewed. | Walkthroughs will be used to determine frequency of higher order questions.<br><br>Progress reports and report cards will be reviewed and students will be required to attend mandatory after school help if adequate progress is not demonstrated. |

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

| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology.**<br><br>Biology Goal #2:<br>*34 % of the students will achieve levels 4 or 5 on the 2013 Biology EOC.* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Level 3/3: 49%(74/151)* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*34% of the students will achieve levels 4 or 5.* | 2.1.<br>Biology proficiency levels have not been provided for 2012. | 2.1.<br>Teachers will use EOC benchmark assessments to monitor student progress.<br><br>Teachers will include higher order questions on lesson plans.<br><br>Teachers will develop curriculum maps. | 2.1.<br>Administration<br><br><br>Administration<br><br><br><br>Administration | 2.1.<br>Administrators will review assessments to ensure that teachers are accessing students according to schedule.<br><br>Lesson plans will be submitted weekly to vice principal for review.<br><br>Curriculum maps will be submitted and reviewed by vice principal and student grades will be reviewed. | 2.1.<br>Printout of EOC assessments.<br><br><br>Walkthroughs will be used to determine frequency of higher order questions.<br><br>Progress reports and report cards will be reviewed and students will be required to attend mandatory after school help if adequate progress is not demonstrated. |
| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |

*End of Biology EOC Goals*

## Science Professional Development

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

## Science Budget

| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials. |
|---|
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) |

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

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
|---|---|---|---|
| ELEMENTARY: Aligning curriculum with the NGSSS | Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Florida Science Fusion K-5 series | School budget | $4,163.73 |
| MIDDLE Grades 5-8: Teachers will utilize the new Science series to align curriculum with NGSSS | Think Central Science for 5<sup>th</sup> grade and Pearson Interactive Science Series 6-8 | School Budget | Included in the textbook purchase. |
| BIOLOGY: Aligning curriculum with the NGSSS & the EOC exam | Standards Practice Workbooks and Reading Essential paperback books were ordered. | School budget | Free with textbook purchase |
| | | | **Subtotal: $4,163.73** |
| **Technology** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| BIOLOGY: Aligning curriculum with the NGSSS & the EOC exam | STEM money from Race to the Top | School budget STEM Grant | $ 8,059.60 |
| | | | **Subtotal: $8,059.60** |
| **Professional Development** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| ELEMENTARY: Teachers will utilize the new science series to align curriculum with NGSS | Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Florida Science Fusion K-5 series Think Central grades K-4 | School Budget | Included in the textbook purchase. |
| MIDDLE Grades 5-8: Teachers will utilize the new Science series to align curriculum with NGSSS | Think Central Science for 5<sup>th</sup> grade and Pearson Interactive Science Series 6-8 | School Budget | Included in the textbook purchase. |
| HIGH: Teachers will utilize the new Science series to align curriculum with NGSSS and EOC | Teachers updated curriculum maps to pace their teaching as well as creating lessons/activities that mirrored the EOC item specifications. | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| **Other** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| | | | **Total: $12,223,33** |

*End of Science Goals*


# Writing Goals

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

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

| 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. ELEMENTARY:<br><br>Attendance in after school writing camp. | 1a.1.<br><br>Teachers will incorporate the Writers in Control program.<br><br>Struggling students will attend the after school writing camp. | 1a.1.<br><br>Administrative Team | 1a.1.<br><br>By using the FCAT writes rubric, teachers will grade the writings and observe an increase on the scores | 1a.1.<br><br>FCAT Writes State rubric |
| Writing Goal #1a:<br><br>The school FCAT Writing Test administered in 2012 average of grades 4,8, 10 students scoring levels 3and above will increase to 100%<br><br>The school will focus our effort on increasing the school average score for grades 4, 8, 10 students scoring levels 4 and above will increase to 96%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Level 4 or higher:*<br>*4th-56%(106/189)*<br>*8th-51%(94/183)*<br>*10th – 42%(69/164)*<br>*Avg for level 4 or higher: 50%( 269/536)*<br><br>*Level 3 or higher:*<br>*4th-93%(176/189)*<br>*8th-91%(166/183)*<br>*10th – 92%(151/164)*<br><br>*Avg,for Level 3 or higher: 92% (493/536).* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Level 3 or higher:*<br>*The school average for students scoring a level 4 or higher will be 96%.* | | | | | |
| | | | 1a.2. MIDDLE:<br>None | 1a.2.<br>Teachers will incorporate the Writers in Control program through monthly demand writing | 1a.2.<br>Language arts teachers and administrative team | 1a.2.<br>By using the FCAT writes rubric, teachers will grade the writings and observe an increase on the scores | 1a.2.<br>FCAT writes rubric |
| | | | 1a.3. HIGH:<br>None | 1a.3.<br>Teachers will incorporate the Writers in Control program through monthly demand writing | 1a.3.<br>Language arts teachers and administrative team | 1a.3.<br>By using the FCAT writes rubric, teachers will grade the writings and observe an increase on the scores | 1a.3.<br>FCAT writes rubric |
| **1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.** | | | 1b.1. | 1b.1. | 1b.1. | 1b.1. | 1b.1. |
| Writing Goal #1b:<br><br>**The school does NOT use the Alternative Assessments** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. |
| | | | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. |

## 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. |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Building Critical Writers and Readers | K-4, ESE , Gifted & Admin | Writers In Control Trainer | K-4 teachers, ESE teacher, Speech teacher and Admin team. | 4th grade: 10-5-12 3rd grade: 10-18-12 2nd grade: 11-8-12 K/1:12-4-12 | Monthly Writing Committee meetings to review data. | Administration Team |
| Building Critical Writers and Readers | 5-8 & Admin | Writers In Control Trainer | Language arts teachers in grades 6-8 and writing teachers in grade 5 | October 2012 & January 2013 | Monthly demand writings and meetings to review data | Teachers and administrative team |
| Building Critical Writers and Readers | 9-12 Language Arts Teachers, ESE teacher, Media Specialist & Admin | Writers In Control Trainer | Language Arts teachers , ESE teacher, Admin, and Media Specialist | August 27, 2012 plus two additional days TBD | Monthly demand writings and meetings to review data | Teachers and administrative team |

## Writing 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 |
| ELEMENTARY: Increase teachers' knowledge of effective writing techniques and strategies. | Professional Development for Achievement, Inc. | Business Partner | $7500.00 |
| MIDDLE: Increase writing proficiency by increasing teachers' knowledge of effective writing strategies. | Professional Development for Achievement, Inc. | School based budget | $2,000.00 |
| HIGH: Increase writing proficiency by increasing teachers' knowledge of effective writing strategies. | Professional Development for Achievement, Inc. | School based budget | $2,300.00 |
| | | | **Subtotal: $11,800.00** |

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

| Other | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| | | | **Total: $11,800.00** |

*End of Writing Goals*

## Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

| Civics EOC Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.** | | | 1.1. Not having baseline data from state testing. | 1.1. Students will be given a school based diagnostic test where questions have been written based on the question item specifications for each benchmark. | 1.1. School administrators | 1.1. Diagnostic assessments will be given quarterly to determine growth of learning for each student. Tutoring will be provided to those students now showing proficiency. | 1.1. Civics Progress Monitoring Diagnostic Assessments |
| Civics Goal #1:<br><br>**The first year of Civics EOC base line testing is SY 2012-13. The school does NOT have any data for the Civics EOC. The goal is based on preparing for the assessment.**<br><br>**Students in Civics will be progress monitored throughout the year quarterly to determine strengths and weaknesses. It is anticipated an 85% growth will be achieved by March 2013.** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>**No data is available** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>**Data will not be available for the SY 12-13 EOC** | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.** | | | 2.1. Not having baseline data from state testing. | 2.1. Students will be given a school based diagnostic test where questions have been written based on the question item specifications for each benchmark. | 2.1. School administrators | 2.1. Diagnostic assessments will be given quarterly to determine growth of learning for each student. Tutoring will be provided to those students now showing | 2.1. Civics Progress Monitoring Diagnostic Assessments |
| Civics Goal #2:<br><br>**The first year of Civics EOC** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |

| base line testing is SY 2012-13. The school does NOT have any data for the Civics EOC. The goal is based on preparing for the assessment.<br><br>Students in Civics will be progress monitored throughout the year quarterly to determine strengths and weaknesses. It is anticipated an 85% growth will be achieved by March 2013. | No data is available | Proficiency Data will not be available for the SY 12-13 EOC | | | | proficiency. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |

## Civics Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Textbook implementation training | 7th | McGraw-Hill | 7th grade Civics teachers | July 2012 | Lesson plans | Administration |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

## Civics Budget

| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Increase awareness of Civics through the textbook | McGraw Hill textbook and supplemental materials | School budget | $20,000.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |

|  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  | **Subtotal:** |
| Other |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | **Subtotal:** |
|  |  |  | **Total: $20,000.00** |

*End of Civics Goals*

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

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

| U.S. History  EOC Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.**<br><br>U.S. History Goal #1:<br><br>**The first year of US History EOC base line testing was SY 2012.  The school does NOT have any data for the US History EOC.**<br>80% of the students will score in either the middle 1/3 or in the top 1/3. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>**No data is available from the baseline EOC** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>**Proficiency Data will not be available for the SY 13 EOC. The following is expected for baseline data at the percentage at each third level considered proficient:**<br>**Level 2: 30%**<br>**Level 3: 50%**<br>**Combined: 80%** | 1.1.<br>US History proficiency levels have not been provided | 1.1.<br>Teachers will use EOC benchmarks assessments to monitor student progress.<br><br>Teachers will include higher order questions on lesson plans.<br><br>Teachers will develop curriculum maps. | 1.1.<br>Administration<br><br><br>Administration<br><br><br>Administration | 1.1.<br>Administrators will review assessments to ensure that teachers are accessing students according to schedule.<br><br>Lesson plans will be submitted weekly to vice principal for review.<br><br>Curriculum maps will be submitted and reviewed by vice principal and student grades will be reviewed. | 1.1.<br>Printout of EOC assessments.<br><br>Walkthroughs will be used to determine frequency of higher order questions.<br><br>Progress reports and report cards will be reviewed and students will be required to attend mandatory after school help if adequate progress in not demonstrated. |
|  |  | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
|  |  | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |

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

| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History. | | | 1.1.<br>US History proficiency levels have not been provided | 1.1.<br>Teachers will use EOC benchmarks assessments to monitor student progress.<br><br>Teachers will include higher order questions on lesson plans.<br><br>Teachers will develop curriculum maps. | 1.1.<br>Administration<br><br><br>Administration<br><br><br>Administration | 1.1.<br>Administrators will review assessments to ensure that teachers are accessing students according to schedule.<br><br>Lesson plans will be submitted weekly to vice principal for review.<br><br>Curriculum maps will be submitted and reviewed by vice principal and student grades will be reviewed. | 1.1.<br>Printout of EOC assessments.<br><br><br>Walkthroughs will be used to determine frequency of higher order questions.<br><br>Progress reports and report cards will be reviewed and students will be required to attend mandatory after school help if adequate progress in not demonstrated. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U.S. History Goal #2:<br><br>**The first year of US History EOC base line testing was SY 2012.  The school does NOT have any data for the US History EOC.**<br>50% of the students will score in the top 1/3. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>**No data is available from the baseline EOC** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>**Proficiency Data will not be available for the SY 13 EOC. The following is expected for baseline data at the percentage at Level 3: 50%** | | | | | |
| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |

## U.S. History Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Teachers will utilize the new US History textbooks to align curriculum with NGSSS and EOC. | GR 11 US History | Pearson Publisher Trainer | GR 11 US History teachers | August 8, 2012 | Lesson plans and classroom observation | Administrators |

## U.S. History 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 |
| Aligning curriculum with NGSSS & the EOC exam | Social Studies textbooks,  Pearson Prentice Hall aligned with NGSSS | School budget | $24,962.00 |
| | | **Subtotal:  $24,962.00** | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Aligning curriculum with NGSSS & the EOC exam | Textbook on-line resources will be utilized to enhance the instruction in the US History classrooms. | School budget | -0- Included in the textbook purchase. |

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

| | | | Subtotal: -0- |
|---|---|---|---|
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Teachers will utilize the new US History textbooks to align curriculum with NGSSS and EOC. | Teachers created curriculum maps to pace their teaching as well as creating lessons/activities that mirrored the EOC item specifications. | School budget | -0- Included in the textbook purchase. |
| | | | **Subtotal: -0-** |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| | | | **Total: $24,962.00** |

*End of U.S. History Goals*


## Attendance Goal(s)

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

| Attendance Goal(s) | | | Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1. Attendance**<br><br>Attendance Goal #1:<br><br>Maintain the school year's average daily attendance of 98% or above the state average. | 2012 Current Attendance Rate:*<br><br>97%<br><br>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)<br><br>*414*<br>*18.6%(414/2220)*<br><br>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*<br><br>98%<br><br>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)<br><br>*300*<br><br>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 1.1. ALL SCHOOLS: The distance students live from the school and the reliance of parents providing transportation to and from school. | 1.1. Letters are sent home on the 5th absence or tardy.<br><br>Elementary teachers call home after the 3rd absence.<br>After the 8th absence or tardy the counselor calls home.<br><br>High school calls home daily on absence students<br><br>Guidance counselors meet with the student has excessive absences. Parent conferences are called when needed.<br><br>After 10 absences an attendance contract may be initiated. | 1.1. Administration & Guidance Counselors | 1.1. Monitoring data on the percent of students absent or tardy from school weekly and monthly average reports are used for comparisons. | 1.1. Monthly attendance reports and final reports for 2012. |

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

| | *261*<br>*11.8%(261/2220)* | *250* | | All schools recognize students quarterly with perfect attendance and no tardies. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

| 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 |
| | | | | | | |

## Attendance 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: -0- |

*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**<br><br>Suspension Goal #1:<br><br>Reduce the total number of In-School suspensions by 10% or return to the 2012 expectations.<br><br>Reduce the number of students who are placed on "In-School" suspensions by 10% or return to the 2012 expectations.<br><br>Reduce the total number of Out-of-School suspensions by 10% or return to the 2012 expectations.<br><br>Reduce the number of students who are placed on "Out-of-School" suspensions by 10%. | 2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions<br><br>*K-5=55*<br>*6-12= 754*<br>*Total 809/2220(36.4%)*<br><br>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School<br><br>*K-5 = 7*<br>*6-8= 101*<br>*9-12=228*<br>*Total=336/2220 (15%)*<br><br>2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions<br><br>*K-5 =30*<br>*6-12=226*<br>*Total=256/2220 (11.5%)*<br><br>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School<br><br>*K-5 = 4*<br>*6-8= 63*<br>*9-12=73*<br>*Total=83/2220 (3.7%)* | 2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions<br><br>*597*<br><br>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School<br><br>*261*<br><br>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions<br><br>*184*<br><br>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School<br><br>*75* | 1.1. ALL SCHOOLS: None | 1.1.<br>Counselors and/or Administrators meet with students who are placed in ISS and OSS to discuss behavior modification strategies.<br><br>Behavior contracts are initiated based on the discipline situation.<br><br>Student recognition programs for good behavior are at each school.<br><br>Elem: "Buffalo Brag"<br>Middle: "Have you Herd"<br>High: "Buffalo Shuffle" | 1.1.<br>Administrators | 1.1.<br>Analysis of data for repeat offenders will be monitored. | 1.1.<br>Monthly reports and 2012 end of year report. |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

## Suspension Professional Development

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | |

## Suspension Budget

| 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: -0- |

*End of Suspension Goals*

## Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Note: Required for High School- F.S., Sec. 1003.53
* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g. 70% (35)).

| Dropout Prevention Goal(s) | Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |

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

| 1. Dropout Prevention | | | 1.1. HIGH:<br>Disenfranchised students who are not interested in school & do not want help to fix their problems. | 1.1.<br>Meet regularly with the student to discuss:<br>　- Academic problems<br>　- Attendance<br>　- Behavior<br>Parent Conferences are also used to discuss the above. | 1.1.<br>Administrators & Guidance Counselors | 1.1.<br>Analysis of data from reports generated off Pinnacle Grade Book and TERMS | 1.1.<br>Weekly and semester reports will be used to measure success. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dropout Prevention Goal #1:<br>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.* | | | | | | | |
| *Maintain the high graduation rate of 100%* | 2012 Current Dropout Rate:*<br><br>.8%(1/125) | 2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*<br><br>0% | | | | | |
| | 2012 Current Graduation Rate:*<br><br>*99.2%(124/125)* | 2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*<br><br>*100%* | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

## Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

## Dropout Prevention Budget

| 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 |

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

|  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  | **Subtotal:** |
| Other |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | **Subtotal:** |
|  |  |  | **Total: -0-** |

*End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)*

## Parent Involvement Goal(s)

<span style="color:green">**Upload Option**</span>-For schools completing the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) please include a copy for this section.
<span style="color:green">**Online Template**</span>- 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**<br><br>Parent Involvement Goal #1:<br>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*<br><br>***Maintain the high number of parent involvement hours for the SY2013. (Our system tracks parent involvement for any parent of a child enrolled during the year.*** | 2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:\* / 2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:\* <br><br> 63,069.75 hours / 65,000 hours | 1.1. ALL SCHOOLS None | 1.1. Continue to require parent involvement (PI) as a portion of qualifying enrollment. Families must do at least 20 hours of parent involvement per school building not to exceed 50 hours. Ten (10) hours of the total must be informational hours that are provided by the school centers through parent night meetings or conferences.<br><br>Recognize parents that go beyond the PI requirement. There are 4 categories.<br><br>Provide parents with a handbook about the PI requirements. | 1.1. Administration and Enrollment Coordinator | 1.1. Analysis of data from reports run quarterly.<br><br>Analysis of data from the parent climate survey. | 1.1. Quarterly reports and end of the year report will be used.<br><br>Data from the parent climate survey. |
|  |  | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
|  |  | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

## Parent Involvement Professional Development

**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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| | | | | | | |

## Parent Involvement Budget

| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | 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: -0- |

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

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

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

| STEM Goal(s) | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |

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

| STEM Goal #1: | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Middle school to increase the number of students taking accelerated and advanced math and science courses by 10% .(581/793)**<br><br>High School: Increase the number of students taking dual enrollment math and science courses, honors math and science or engineering courses by 10% (74/742). | 1.1.<br><br>Teacher Certification<br><br>Time in the schedule | 1.1.<br>Analyze student data for correct placement into accelerated courses.<br><br>Offer extended day opportunities to students | 1.1.<br>Administration | 1.1.<br>Increased number of students taking accelerated courses. | 1.1.<br>Grade book<br>FCAT Scores |
| | 1.2. High School: Teachers with the qualification needed to be accepted as adjunct college professors for our dual enrollment courses | 1.2.<br>Analyze student data for correct placement into accelerated courses. | 1.2.<br>Administration | 1.2.<br>Increased number of students taking accelerated courses. | 1.2.<br>Course Sign-ups for 2014 |
| | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

## STEM Professional Development

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

## STEM 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:** |

**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: -0-** |

*End of STEM Goal(s)*


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

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

| CTE Goal(s) | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| CTE Goal #1:<br>High School:  Increase by 33 % (1/3) the number of opportunities for students to earn industry certification. | 1.1.<br>Lack of appropriate industry certification tests appropriate for high school students. | 1.1.<br>With the Communications Technology teacher look for appropriate industry cortication opportunities. | 1.1.<br>Administration | 1.1.<br>Increased opportunities for students to industry certification. | 1.1.<br>Number of  opportunities available. |
| | 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**

## 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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## CTE Budget

| 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: -0- |

*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: $ 32,714.08** |
| **Mathematics Budget** | |
| | **Total: $8,712.30** |
| **Science Budget** | |
| | **Total: $12,223.33** |
| **Writing Budget** | |
| | **Total: $11,800.00** |
| **Civics Budget** | |
| | **Total: $20,000.00** |
| **US History Budget** | |
| | **Total: $24,962.00** |
| **Attendance Budget** | |
| | **Total: -0-** |
| **Suspension Budget** | |
| | **Total: -0-** |
| **Dropout Prevention Budget** | |
| | **Total: -0-** |
| **Parent Involvement Budget** | |
| | **Total: -0-** |
| **Additional Goals** | |
| | **Total: -0-** |
| | |
| | **Grand Total: $ 110,411.71** |

**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 | | |
|---|---|---|
| ☐ Priority | ☐ Focus | ☐ Prevent |

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

<span style="color:red">**This school is has "A" school status from 2011-2012. Due to being a K-12 combination school it is anticipated that the school grade reported in December 2012 will continue to be "A".**</span>

## 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         X No

| If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements. |
|---|
| The Villages Charter School governing board oversees the operations of the school.  Legislation is set that in lieu of a SAC the School's Board of Directors will serve as the governing board.   The Villages Charter School budgeting process works similar to a school district and uses a business process to develop each school's budget yearly.  School building Principals work with staff, the Director of Education and the board of directors to develop annual budgets based on projected FTE revenue. |

| Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year. |
|---|
| The Villages Charter School Board of Directors is very involved with the school.  They provide valuable advice and support the many school activities and the instructional process. Monthly board meetings are used for business issues as well as a sharing session of what the school centers are doing.  This practice of sharing progress on the SIP goals will continue for the upcoming year. |

| Describe the projected use of SAC funds. | Amount |
|---|---|
| Per Funding for Florida School District handbook, School boards must allocate at least $5 per unweighted FTE student to be used at the discretion of the School Advisory Committee or, in the absence of such a committee, at the discretion of the staff and parents of the school. A portion of the | |

| | |
|---|---|
| money should be used for implementing the school improvement plan as described in Section 1001.42(18), F.S. The improvement plan shall be based on the needs of the statewide and district-wide school improvement plan.  The Charter school budget includes all SIP funds in the school based budget and does not keep the SIP funds as a separate categorical. | |
| Per Funding for Florida School District handbook, School boards must allocate at least $5 per unweighted FTE student to be used at the discretion of the School Advisory Committee or, in the absence of such a committee, at the discretion of the staff and parents of the school. A portion of the money should be used for implementing the school improvement plan as described in Section 1001.42(18), F.S. The improvement plan shall be based on the needs of the statewide and district-wide school improvement plan.  The Charter school budget includes all SIP funds in the school based budget and does not keep the SIP funds as a separate categorical. | |
| Per Funding for Florida School District handbook, School boards must allocate at least $5 per unweighted FTE student to be used at the discretion of the School Advisory Committee or, in the absence of such a committee, at the discretion of the staff and parents of the school. A portion of the money should be used for implementing the school improvement plan as described in Section 1001.42(18), F.S. The improvement plan shall be based on the needs of the statewide and district-wide school improvement plan.  The Charter school budget includes all SIP funds in the school based budget and does not keep the SIP funds as a separate categorical. | |