FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Gray Middle School	District Name: Lake
Principal: Dean Haack	Superintendent: Dr. Susan Moxley
SAC Chair: Tricia Blunt	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

High School Feedback Report

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

Administrators

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

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

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	Dean Haack	BS – Speech Pathology and Audiology, Florida State University ; MS – Speech Pathology, Florida State University; Ed. S. – Educational Leadership, National Louis University. Certified by the State of Florida in Ed. Leadership (all levels), School Principal (all levels), Speech-Language Impaired (k-12)	0	6	11/12 Assistant Principal Leesburg High School (Correct II School) Grade Pending Reading Proficiency: 42%, Math Proficiency: 49%, Writing Proficiency: 23%. Reading AYP: 59%, Math AYP: 35%, Lowest Quartile AYP Reading: 67%. Lowest Quartile Math: 54%. 10/11 Assistant Principal Leesburg High School (Correct II School) Grade C Reading Proficiency: Total population: decreased from 42% to 33%, White: decreased from 49% to 40%, Black: decreased from 26% to 22%, Economically Disadvantaged: decreased from 33% to 27%, Math Proficiency: Total population: decreased from 69% to 65%, White: decreased from 76% to 74%, Black: decreased from 49% to 42%, Economically Disadvantaged: decreased from 64% to 59%, Writing: Total population: decreased from 95% to 94%, White: maintained at 95%, Black: decreased from 94% to 89%, Economically Disadvantaged: decreased from 94% to 92%, Students with Disabilities: decreased from 80% to 67%. 09/10 Assistant Principal Leesburg High School (Correct II School – Lowest 5% School) Reading Proficiency: 40%, Math Proficiency: 72%, Writing Proficiency: 74%. Reading AYP: 41%, Math AYP: 67%, Lowest Quartile AYP Reading: 42%. Lowest Quartile Math: 58%. – LHS was D school for previous 7 years. 08/09 Assistant Principal Tavares High School Grade B 07/08 Assistant Principal Tavares High Grade B 06/07 Assistant Principal Tavares High Grade B
Assistant Principal	Maralena Coggins	BS – Physical Education, Health and Recreation, Indiana University; MS Degree – School Psychology, Nova	10	14	Assistant Principal of Gray MS in 2010-2011: Grade: A, Reading Proficiency: 71%, Math Proficiency: 69%, Science Proficiency: 59%, Writing Proficiency: 83%. AYP: 82%, Total and Hispanic did not make AYP in reading. Total, White, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP

		University; Ed.S. Degree – Educational Leadership, Nova University; Certified by the State of Florida in School Principal, Guidance Counselor, Physical Education 6-12 and Middle Grades English			in math. Assistant Principal of Gray MS in 2009-2010: Grade: A, Reading Proficiency: 68%, Math Proficiency: 68%, Science Proficiency: 56%, Writing Proficiency: 93%. AYP: 82%, Total, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in reading. Total, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in math. Assistant Principal of Gray MS in 2008-2009: Grade: A, Reading Proficiency: 70%, Math Proficiency: 73%, Science Proficiency: 55%, Writing Proficiency: 91%. AYP: 77%, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, ELL and SWD did not make AYP in reading. Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in math. Assistant Principal of Gray MS in 2007-2008: Grade: A, Reading Proficiency: 68%, Math Proficiency: 69%, Science Proficiency: 49%, Writing Proficiency: 85%. AYP: 92%, Black and ELL did not make AYP in reading. ELL did not make AYP in math.
Assistant Principal	William Skelton	BS –Mathematics Education, Florida International University; MS Degree–Educational Leadership, Nova University; Certified by the State of Florida in School Principal and Mathematics 6-12	4	9	Assistant Principal of Gray MS in 2010-2011: Grade: A, Reading Proficiency: 71%, Math Proficiency: 69%, Science Proficiency: 59%, Writing Proficiency: 83%. AYP: 82%, Total and Hispanic did not make AYP in reading. Total, White, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in math. Assistant Principal of Gray MS in 2009-2010: Grade: A, Reading Proficiency: 68%, Math Proficiency: 68%, Science Proficiency: 56%, Writing Proficiency: 93%. AYP: 82%, Total, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in reading. Total, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in math. Assistant Principal of Gray MS in 2008-2009: Grade: A, Reading Proficiency: 70%, Math Proficiency: 73%, Science Proficiency: 55%, Writing Proficiency: 91%. AYP: 77%, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, ELL and SWD did not make AYP in reading. Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in math.

					Assistant Principal of Clermont MS in 2007-2008: Grade: A, Reading Proficiency: 67%, Math Proficiency: 69%, Science Proficiency: 49%, Writing Proficiency: 91%. AYP: 95%, Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in reading. Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in math.
Assistant Principal	Stephanie Rhodes	BS –Exceptional Student Education, Florida International University; MS Degree–Educational Leadership, National Louis University; Certified by the State of Florida in Educational Leadership, Emotionally Handicap K-12, and Specific Learning Disabilities K-12.	1	4	Assistant Principal of ERMS in 2010-2011: Grade: A, Reading Proficiency: 74%, Math Proficiency: 78%, Science Proficiency: 64%, Writing Proficiency: 94%. AYP: 85%, Total, White, Black, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in reading. Black students did not make AYP in math. ESE Specialist of ERMS in 2009-2010: Grade A: 74% met high standards in reading and 74% met high standards in math. In writing, 98% of the students met high standards with 84% scoring a 4 or higher. In science, 61% met high standards. Of the students identified in the lowest quartile, 70% made learning gains in reading and 75% in math.

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

Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Christy Oradat	Professional Educator's: BA –Elementary Education, North Texas University; MS Degree – Educational Leadership, Barry University; Certified by the State of Florida in Educational Leadership and Elementary Education and has a reading endorsement	9	8.5	Literacy Coach of Gray MS in 2010-2011: Grade: A, Reading Proficiency: 71%, Math Proficiency: 69%, Science Proficiency: 59%, Writing Proficiency: 83%. AYP: 82%, Total and Hispanic did not make AYP in reading. Total, White, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in math. Literacy Coach of Gray MS in 2009-2010: Grade: A, Reading Proficiency: 68%, Math Proficiency: 68%, Science Proficiency: 56%, Writing Proficiency: 93%. AYP: 82%, Total, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in reading. Total, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in math. Literacy Coach of Gray MS in 2008-2009: Grade: A, Reading Proficiency: 70%, Learning Gains: 69%. Lowest 25% Gains: 73% Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, ELL and SWD did not make AYP in reading. Total and White made AYP in reading. Literacy Coach of Gray MS in 2007-2008: Grade: A, Reading Proficiency: 68%, Black and ELL did not make AYP in reading. Total, White, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD made AYP in reading.

Highly Effective Teachers

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

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
Regular meetings with teachers new to Gray as part of our on-going induction program	Assistant Principals, Department Chairs, Team Leaders	May 2013
Partnering new teachers with peer teachers	Assistant Principals	May 2013
Reviewing applications from SearchSoft HR program and from Teachers-Teachers.com	Principal and Assistant Principal I	May 2013
Weekly PLC Meetings	PLC Leader	May 2013
Research based professional development - workshops	District – FDLRS – AVID -	May 2013

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
All Paraprofessionals are highly effective 6 Teachers teaching out of field	<u>Tyner</u> – will take and pass Subject Area Test for Science 5-9. New teacher training is provided. <u>Milchman</u> - will take and pass Subject Area Test for M/G English New teacher training is provided. <u>Gray</u> - will complete the Reading Endorsement New teacher training is provided. <u>Stephens</u> – will take and pass the following Subject Area tests: M/G General Science, M/G Math and Social Science 6-12. New teacher training is provided. <u>Helm</u> will complete the Gifted Endorsement. New teacher training is provided. <u>Carter</u> will take and pass the Subject Area Test for M/G Math and M/G English. New teacher training is provided.

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
56	13% (7)	48% (27)	16% (9)	23% (13)	16% (9)	95% (53)	9%(6)	3% (2)	25% (16)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Amber Green	Elizabeth Lancy	Ms. Lancy is a 2nd year teacher, first year teacher to Gray Middle School. Ms. Green is the Language Arts Department Chair, has been through Clinical Ed. Training, AVID, CRISS trained and has served on numerous school improvement committees.	Meet weekly through PLC to discuss evidence-based strategies, Marzano's Framework for Teaching. Time is also given for feedback, coaching and planning.
Kimberly Simon	Cassie Tyner	Ms. Tyner is a 1st year teacher. Ms. Simon has served as the team leader for several years at Gray Middle and has been instrumental in the lesson planning for the 6th grade Science Department. Ms. Simon is also CRISS trained.	Meet weekly through PLC to discuss evidence-based strategies, Marzano's Framework for Teaching. Time is also given for feedback, coaching and planning. In addition, they lesson plan together weekly.

Eva Sedgwick	Michelle Sorrells	Ms. Sedgwick has served as a mentor, tech con, and department head and SACs and School Improvement Committees from her previous school .	Meet weekly through PLC to discuss evidence-based strategies, Marzano's Framework for Teaching. Time is also given for feedback, coaching and planning. In addition, they lesson plan together weekly.
Natasha Sieber	Heather Ciaramitaro	Heather is a 1st year ESE Inclusion teacher at Gray Middle Schoo. Ms.Sieber is our ESE Program Specialist at Gray Middle. Ms. Sieber is CRISS trained.	Meet weekly through PLC to discuss evidence-based strategies, Marzano's Framework for Teaching. Time is also given for feedback, coaching and planning. In addition, they lesson plan together weekly. On-going ESE inservice as needed.
Whitney Mulder	Christina Delgenio	Christina is a first year teacher. Ms. Mulder is Springboard trained,CRISS trained, KAGAN certified, and has served on several school wide initiatives.	Meet weekly through PLC to discuss evidence-based strategies, Marzano's Framework for teaching. Time is also given for feedback, coaching and planning. In addition, they lesson plan together weekly.
Matt Miller	Natalie Jackson	Natalie Jackson is a first year teacher at Gray Middle School. Mr. Miller has serves as a team leader and is AVID, CRISS, Springboard, and Clinical Ed. trained.	Mr. Miller weekly through PLC to discuss evidence-based strategies, Marzano's Framework for Teaching. Time is also given for feedback, coaching and planning.
Amy Napoles	Angie Helm	Ms. Helm is a first year teacher. Ms. Napoles is CRISS trained and has served on numerous school-wide initiatives.	They are on the same team next door so that Ms. Napoles will be there to assist on a daily basis. In addition, they will have monthly team meetings.
Kathy Black	Kelly Gushleff	Ms. Gushleff is a first year teacher. Ms. Black has been a team leader, CRISS trained and has served as a mentor for many years .	Meet weekly through PLC to discuss evidence-based strategies, Marzano's Framework for Teaching. Time is also given for feedback, coaching and planning. In addition, they lesson plan together

			weekly.
Susan Lafferty	Todd Garback	Mr. Garback is a first year teacher to Gray Middle School. Ms. Lafferty has served as team leader and TAP lead. She is Clinical Ed. Trained, CRISS. Springboard trained. Ms. has served on several school-wide initiatives.	They are on the same team next door so that Ms. Lafferty will be there to assist on a daily basis. In addition, they will have monthly team meetings.

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

Additional Requirements

*Coordination and Integration-***Title I Schools Only**

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

Title I, Part A
Title I, Part C- Migrant
Title I, Part D
Title II
Title III
Title X- Homeless
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Violence Prevention Programs
Nutrition Programs
Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other

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

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

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. Dean Haack, Principal provides a common vision for data based decisions, monitors the planning and implementation of goals, ensures that available resources and supports are provided. Maralena Coggins, Assistant Principal: Assists the principal in ensuring that the school-based team is implementing RtI, conducting assessment of RtI skills of school staff, ensuring implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensuring adequate professional development to support RtI implementation. Provides on-going progress monitoring of quarterly reports. General Education Teachers: Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with members of their departments to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities for their departments. Natasha Sieber, Exceptional Student Education Specialist: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education and ESE inclusion teachers. Christy Oradat, Instructional Reading Coach: Provides guidance on K-12 reading plan, facilitates and supports data collection, assists in data analysis, provides professional development and assistance to teachers regarding research based reading strategies, supports implementation of Tier 1, 2 and 3 intervention plans. Caroline Golay, Gretchen Buczkowski, Kim Brauman, Guidance Counselors: Provides services to support the academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success to the students. Participates in collection, interpretation and analysis of data and facilitates in the development of intervention plans and communicating with parents regarding school-based RtI plans. Provide quarterly RtI reports.
Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts? The team assists in setting clear expectations, defining areas of need, and facilitating in the development of a systemic approach to teaching. During the school year, the team will meet on a regular basis to review relevant data and link to instructional decisions, identify students who are at risk for not meeting benchmarks, identify professional development and resources for teachers, and evaluate implementation. The guidance counselors will provide quarterly reports to administration and hold monthly guidance meetings with administration.
Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? The team sets clear expectations, defined areas of need, and facilitated in the development of a systemic approach to teaching. During the school year, the team will meet on a regular basis to make instructional decisions based on thier review of relevant data, identify students who are at risk for not meeting benchmarks, identify professional development and resources for teachers, and monitors the implementation. The guidance counselors will provide quarterly reports to administration and hold monthly guidance meetings.
MTSS Implementation

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

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior. Guidance counselors will provide quarterly Rtl reports to administration
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. Professional development will be provided during teachers' common planning time. The RtI team will also evaluate staff PD needs and provide on-going support and training as needed. District staff will provide on-going support as needed.
Describe the plan to support MTSS. To provide appropriate staff development to ensure that teachers are implementing Marzano strategies and supporting Content Area Reading. Provide before and after school Learning Center.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

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

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Dean Haack, Principal provides a common vision for data based decisions, monitors the planning and implementation of goals, ensures that available resources and supports are provided, and communicates the school's literacy plan with families of our students. Maralena Coggins assists the principal in monitoring the planning and implementation of goals, ensuring that available resources and supports are provided, and communicating the school's literacy plan with families of our students. Literacy Coach - Christy Oradat;   Reading Department Head - Natalie Heitman ;   General Education Teachers - Charles Eaton, Amber Green, Matthew Monczka, Sarah Schlussel;   Career Technology Education Teacher - Casey Ferguson;   ESE Specialist – Natasha Sieber;   Caroline Golay - Guidance Counselor
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The LLT meets monthly led by the Literacy Coach who provides guidance on the k12 Literacy Plan, facilitates and supports data collection, assists in analysis, provides coaching and professional development for school wide literacy strategies and development of LLT initiatives. The regular education, ESE specialist and CTE teachers provide information on curriculum core instruction and the needs of teachers in the individual PLC groups. They also communicate literacy goals to PLCs and lead those PLCs in their part of meeting those goals including professional development as needed through PLCs. As a group the LLT discusses data, the implications of the data and next steps based on the data.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?   The LLT will ensure the implementation of text complexity, close reading and rereading of text in all content areas. They will ensure implementation of the following: - Text dependent questioning   - Text dependent student responses   - Extensive research and writing opportunities for students

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.

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

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

Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

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

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

All teachers at our school are expected to use reading strategies within their content area(s). Teachers are provided Professional Development in researched based reading strategies such as C.R.I.S.S., AVID, Accelerated Reading and KAGEN. Teachers use these strategies/activities in their classrooms and then provide feedback of the effectiveness and/or ineffectiveness of the strategy during Professional Learning Communities which meet weekly. Administrators and Literacy coach look for the use of reading strategies during classroom walk –throughs and observations. Lesson plans are also expected to include research based strategies and/or activities.

High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.
Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report.

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
Reading Goal #1A: The percentage of students scoring at or above Level 3 will increase from 64% to 66%	**2012 Current Level of Performance:** * **64% (634) scored at or above level 3 in Reading**	**67% will score at or above Level 3 in 2012-13**	1A.1. Teachers need to be able to support students in comprehension of complex text in the content areas. 1A.2 Content area teachers need to be able to begin providing students access to Common Core State Standards for Literacy	1A.1. Provide professional development through PLCs 1A.2 Professional development and use of the coaching model by Literacy Coach	1A.1. Literacy Coach, Literacy Leadership Team, Administration. 1A.2 . Literacy Coach, Literacy Leadership Team, PLC Leaders, Administration.	1A.1. Lesson Plan review, Classroom Walkthrough, Teacher feedback, Review of student work, Progress Monitoring 1A.2 Lesson Plan review, Classroom Walkthrough, Teacher feedback, Review of student work, Progress Monitoring, Coaching Log	1A.1. Classroom Walkthrough, PLC Agenda Notes, FAIR, Marzano TEAM 1A.2 Classroom Walkthrough, PLC Agenda Notes, Coaching Log, FAIR data, Marzano TEAM
			1A.2. Content Area teachers need to be able to utilize effective group work.	1A.2.Kagan/Cooperative Group professional development	1A.2. . Literacy Coach, Literacy Leadership Team, Administration.	1A.2. Lesson Plan review, Classroom Walkthrough, Teacher feedback, Review of student work , Progress Monitoring	1A.2. . Classroom Walkthrough, PLC Agenda Notes, Marzano TEAM
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.**			1A.1. Teachers need to be able to support students in comprehension of complex text in the content areas. 1A.2 Content area teachers need to begin implementing Common Core State Standards for Literacy	1A.1. Provide professional development through PLCs 1A.2 Professional development and use of the coaching model by Literacy Coach	1A.1. Literacy Coach, Literacy Leadership Team, Administration. 1A.2 . Literacy Coach, Literacy Leadership Team, PLC Leaders, Administration.	1A.1. Lesson Plan review, Classroom Walkthrough, Teacher feedback, Review of student work, Progress Monitoring 1A.2 Lesson Plan review, Classroom Walkthrough, Teacher feedback, Review of student work, Progress Monitoring, Coaching Log	1A.1. Classroom Walkthrough, PLC Agenda Notes, FAIR, Marzano TEAM 1A.2 Classroom Walkthrough, PLC Agenda Notes, Coaching Log, FAIR data, Marzano TEAM
Reading Goal #1B: "Providing this data violates student confidentiality."	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.			1A.1. Teachers need to be able to support students in comprehension of complex text in the content areas.	1A.1. Provide professional development through PLCs, Lesson Study	1A.1. Literacy Coach, Literacy Leadership Team, Administration.	1A.1. Lesson Plan review, Classroom Walkthrough, Teacher feedback, Review of student work, Progress Monitoring	1A.1. Classroom Walkthrough, PLC Agenda Notes, FAIR, Marzano TEAM
Reading Goal #2A: **The percentage of students scoring at or above Level 4 in reading will increase from 21.5 % to 24.5%**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **21.5% (203) students scored at or above Level 4 in reading**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **25% will score at level 4, in reading in 2013**	1A.2 Content area teachers need to be able implementation of Common Core State Standards for Literacy	1A.2 Professional development and use of the coaching model by Literacy Coach, Lesson Study	1A.2 . Literacy Coach, Literacy Leadership Team, PLC Leaders, Administration.	1A.2 Lesson Plan review, Classroom Walkthrough, Teacher feedback, Review of student work, Progress Monitoring, Coaching Log	1.A. 2 Classroom Walkthrough, PLC Agenda Notes, FAIR, Marzano TEAM
			1A.3. Teachers need to be able to utilize effective group work	1A.3. Kagan/Cooperative Group professional development, Lesson Study	1A.3. . . Literacy Coach, Literacy Leadership Team, Administration	1A.3 . Lesson Plan review, Classroom Walkthrough, Teacher feedback, Review of student work, Progress Monitoring	1A.3. Classroom Walkthrough, PLC Agenda Notes, Marzano TEAM
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.			NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Reading Goal #2B: "Providing this data violates student confidentiality."	2012 Current Level of Performance:* NA	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* NA					

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3A.1. Teachers need to be able to support students in comprehension of complex text in the content areas.	3A.1. Provide professional development through PLCs	3A.1. Literacy Coach, Literacy Leadership Team, Administration.	3A.1. Lesson Plan review, Classroom Walkthrough, Teacher feedback, Review of student work, Progress Monitoring	3A.1. Classroom Walkthrough, PLC Agenda Notes, FAIR, Marzano TEAM
Reading Goal #3A: **The percentage of students making learning gains in reading will increase from 70% to 73% in 2012-13**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **70% of students made learning gains in Reading in 2012**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **73% of students will make learning gains in Reading in 2013.**	3A.2 Content area need to be able to implement Common Core State Standards for Literacy	3A.2 Professional development and use of the coaching model by Literacy Coach	3A.2 . Literacy Coach, Literacy Leadership Team, PLC Leaders, Administration.	3A.2 Lesson Plan review, Classroom Walkthrough, Teacher feedback, Review of student work, Progress Monitoring, Coaching Log	3A.2 Classroom Walkthrough, PLC Agenda Notes, Coaching Log, FAIR data, Marzano TEAM
			3A.2. Content Area need to be able to utilize effective group work.	3A.2.Kagan/Cooperative Group professional development	3A.2. . Literacy Coach, Literacy Leadership Team, Administration.	3A.2. Lesson Plan review, Classroom Walkthrough, Teacher feedback, Review of student work , Progress Monitoring	3A.2. . Classroom Walkthrough, PLC Agenda Notes, Marzano TEAM
			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4A.1. Students need extended learning time for additional instruction in reading.	4A.1. Homeroom focus groups	4A.1. LLT, Literacy Coach	4A.1. Monthly LLT meeting.	4A.1. Data Chat Reports, Quarterly RtI report, Progress Reports, Grades
Reading Goal #4A: **The percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading will increase from 76 % to 79% in 2012-13.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **76 % (752) of students in lowest 25% made learning gains.**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **79% of students will make learning gains in reading in 2013**					
			4A.2.	4A.2. Before school Learning Center	4A.2. Administration, guidance counselors, MTSSS team,	4A.2. Learning Center Progress Report	4A.2. Quarterly RtI report, Progress Reports, Grades
			4A.3.	4A.3. Academic Wednesday School	4A.3. Administration	4A.3. Academic Wednesday School Progress Report	4A.3. Progress Reports, Grades
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4B.1. NA	4B.1. NA	4B.1. NA	4B.1. NA	4B.1. NA
Reading Goal #4B: "Providing this data violates student confidentiality."	2012 Current Level of Performance:* NA	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* NA					
			4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.
			4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** **71%**	**64%**	**66%**	**69%**	**73%**	**66%**	**66%**
Reading Goal #5A: **Student achievement in Reading will continue improving by 3 to 4 percentage points each year through 2016-17.**							

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**		5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: Students need extended learning time for additional instruction in reading.	5B.1. Homeroom focus groups	4A.1. LLT, Literacy Coach	5B.1. Monthly LLT meeting.	5B.1. Data Chat Reports, Quarterly RtI report, Progress Reports, Grades	
Reading Goal #5B: **Students in all subgroups will make adequate progress in reading.**	**2012 Current Level of Performance:*** White: 74% (377) Black: 53% (46) Hispanic: 50% (169) Asian: 47% (9) American Indian:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:*** White: 73% Black: 51% Hispanic: 56% Asian: 68% American Indian:					
		5B.2.	5B.2. Before school Learning Center	5B.2. Administration, guidance counselors, MTSSS team,	5B.2. Learning Center Progress Report	5B.2. Quarterly RtI report, Progress Reports, Grades	
		5B.3.	5B.3. Academic Wednesday School	5B.3. Administration	5B.3. Academic Wednesday School Progress Report	5B.3. Progress Reports, Grades	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5C.1. Students need extended learning language and for additional instruction in reading.	5C.1. Before school Learning Center with Rosetta Stone.	5C.1. LLT, Literacy Coach	5C.1. Monthly LLT meeting.	5C.1.
Reading Goal #5C: **The percentage of ELL students who make satisfactory progress in reading will improve from 15% in 2011-12 to 28% in 2012-13**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **15% (6) of ELL students made satisfactory progress in reading in 2011-12**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **The percentage of ELL students who make satisfactory progress in reading will improve to 34% in 2012-13**					
			5C.2.	5C.2. Before school Learning Center	5C.2. Administration, guidance counselors, MTSSS team,	5C.2. Learning Center Progress Report	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 reading.			5.D.1. Students need extended learning time for additional instruction in reading.	5D.1. Homeroom focus groups	5D.1. LLT, Literacy Coach	5D1. Monthly LLT meeting.	5D.1. Data Chat Reports, Quarterly RtI report, Progress Reports, Grades
Reading Goal #5D: **The percentage of Students with Disabilities who make satisfactory progress in reading will improve from 30% in 2011-12 to 40% in 2012-13**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **30% (39) of Students with Disabilities made satisfactory progress in reading in 2011-12**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **40%n of Students with Disabilities will make satisfactory progress in reading in 2012-13**					
				5D.2. Before school Learning Center	5D.2. Administration, guidance counselors, MTSSS team,	5D.2. Learning Center Progress Report	5D.2. Quarterly RtI report, Progress Reports, Grades
				5D.3. Academic Wednesday School	5D.3. Administration	5D.3. Academic Wednesday School Progress Report	5D.3. Progress Reports, Grades

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5E.1. Students need extended learning time for additional instruction in reading.	5E.1. Homeroom focus groups	5E.1. LLT, Literacy Coach	5E.1. Monthly LLT meeting.	5E.1. Data Chat Reports, Quarterly RtI report, Progress Reports, Grades
Reading Goal #5E: **The percentage of Economically Disadvantages students who make satisfactory progress in reading will improve from 55% in 2011-12 to 58% in 2012-13**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **55% (324) of Economically students Disadvantagd made satisfactory progress in reading in 2011-12**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **57% of Economically Disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in reading in 2012-13**					
			5E.2.	45E2. Before school Learning Center	5E.2. Administration, guidance counselors, MTSSS team,	5E.2. Learning Center Progress Report	5E.2. Quarterly RtI report, Progress Reports, Grades
			5E.3.	5E.3. Academic Wednesday School	5E.3. Administration	5E.3. Academic Wednesday School Progress Report	5E.3. Progress Reports, Grades

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Comprehension Instructional Strategies	6-8	Reading Coach, PLC leaders (all)	School wide	PLC's meet each Thursday	Lesson Plans, CWT's, Peer Coaching, Observation	Administration, Literacy Coach, Department Chairs
Common Core State Standards for Literacy implementation in Content Areas of Social Studies, Language Arts,	6-8	Reading Coach, PLC leaders (all)	Social Studies, Language Arts, Science, CTE and other Electives	PLC's meet each Thursday	Lesson Plans, CWT's, Peer Coaching, Observation	Administration, Literacy Coach, Department Chairs

Science, CTE and other Electives						
Cooperative Structures/Kagan	6-8	Kagan Trained classroom Teachers	School wide	PLC's meet each Thursday	Lesson Plans, CWT's, Peer Coaching, Observation	Administration, Literacy Coach, Department Chairs
Marzano Teaching Frameworks	6-8	PLC Leaders	School wide	PLC's meet each Thursday	Lesson Plans, CWT's, Peer Coaching, Observation	Administration, Literacy Coach, Department Chairs
CRISS	ALL	District	New Teachers	TBD	Lesson Plans, CWT	Administration, Literacy Coach
AVID	7TH	DISTRICT	AVID Teachers	TBD	Lesson Plans, CWT	Administration, Literacy Coach

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

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Reading Goals

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

<u>Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals</u>

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

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.		1.1. Attendance	1.1. Guidance Counselors communicate with parents via phone and mail,	1.1. Guidance Counselors Social Worker, Assistant Principals	1.1. Review of attendance records. the meet regularly with social worker when needed	1.1. AS400
<u>CELLA Goal #1:</u> Increase the percentage of ELL students who are proficient in Listening /Speaking by 3%	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</u> 22% of 6th graders 67% of 7th graders 40% of 8th graders are proficient in Listening & Speaking					
		1.2. Home School Communication	1.2. Use of interpreter for communication	1.2. Guidance Counselors, classroom teachers. Input from ELL teacher assistant	1.2. Parent feedback	1.2. Informal
		1.3.Receptive & Expressive English Language Development	1.3. Rosetta Stone, Read 180, translation dictionaries available, Peer buddy, ELL teacher assistant in classroom	1.3. Guidance Counselor	1.3.monitoirng of grades	1.3. Grades, classroom assessments.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.		2.1. Attendance	2.1. . Communication with parents via phone and mail Regular communication with social worker when needed	2.1. Guidance Counselors Social Worker, Assistant Principal responsible for attendance	2.1. Review of attendance records	2.1. AS400
<u>CELLA Goal #2:</u> Increase the percentage of ELL students who are proficient in Reading by 3%	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: 6th – 0% 7th – 25% 8th – 20% are proficient in reading					

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

		2.2. Home School Communication	2.2. . Use of interpreter for communication	2.2. Guidance Counselor, classroom teachers. Input from ELL teacher assistant	2.2. Parent feedback	2.2. Informal.
		2.3. Receptive & Expressive English Language Development	2.3. Rosetta Stone, Read 180, translation dictionaries available, Peer buddy, ELL teacher assistant in classroom	2.3. Guidance Counselor	2.3. monitoirng of grades	2.3. . Grades, classroom assessments.

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.		2.1. Attendance	2.1. . Communication with parents via phone and mail Regular communication with social worker when needed	2.1. Guidance counselors Social Worker, Assistant Principal responsible for attendance	2.1. Review of attendance records	2.1. AS400
CELLA Goal #3: Increase the percentage of ELL students who are proficient in writing by 3%	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
	6th – 11%					
	7th – 25%					
	8th – 20% are proficient in Writing					
		2.2. Home School Communication	2.2. Use of interpreter for communication	2.2. Guidance Counselor, classroom teachers. Input from ELL teacher assistant	2.2. Parent feedback	2.2. Informal.
		2.3. Receptive & Expressive English Language Development	2.3. Rosetta Stone, Read 180, translation dictionaries available, Peer buddy, ELL teacher assistant in classroom	2.3. Guidance Counselor	2.3. monitoirng of grades	2.3. Grades, classroom assessments.

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

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CELLA Goals

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

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
Mathematics Goal #1A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *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.*					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Mathematics Goal #1B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**							5A.
Mathematics Goal #5A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*								

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

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

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

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1A: **The percentage of students scoring at or above Level 3 will increase from 58% to 64% in 2013**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **58% (574) of students scored at or above level 3 in math.**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **64% (634) will score at or above level 3 in 2013**	1A1.Students need to improve ability to read complex, informational math text – textbook and work problems Teachers need to be able to teach reading of the math text – informational text.	1A.1. Professional development for Comprehension Instructional Sequence and/or NGCAR-pd through the Literacy Coach Peer classroom observations	1A.1. Literacy Coach, PLC Leader, administration, Literacy Leadership Team.	1A.1 . Class Assessments, grades, benchmark assessments, student tracking and self assessment.	1A.1. data review, classroom walk through, lesson plan review. Review of Peer Observation Form
			1A.2. Students need to improve ability to process and complete complex tasks. Teachers need to be able to provide support and differentiated learning opportunities for tasks at higher levels of complexity –	1A.2 Professional development including PLC work and lesson study. Cooperative Learning GAPS Springboard Common Core State Standards awareness Teacher-student data chats Peer classroom observations	1A.2. Literacy Coach, PLC Leader, administration,	1A.2. . Class Assessments, grades, benchmark assessments, student tracking and self assessment. Observation of student use of academic vocabulary	1A.2. data review, classroom walk through, lesson plan review. Review of Peer Observation Form Informal – teacher report
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1B: "Providing this data violates student confidentiality."	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.1. NA	1B.1. NA	1B.1. NA	1B.1. NA	1B.1. NA

		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1. .Students need to improve ability to read complex, informational math text – textbook and work problems Teachers need to improve skills for teaching reading of the math text – informational text	2A.1. . Professional development for Comprehension Instructional Sequence and/or NGCAR-pd through the Literacy Coach	2A.1. . Literacy Coach, Literacy Leadership Team, Administration.	2A.1. Class Assessments, grades, benchmark assessments, student tracking and self assessment.	2A.1. data review, classroom walk through, lesson plan review. Review of Peer Observation Form
Mathematics Goal #2A: **The percentage of students scoring Level 4 or 5 will increase from 29.5% to 32.5%**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 29.5% (293) of students scored at Level 4 or 5 in 2012.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 32.5% (322) will score at Level 4 or 5 in 2013					
			2A.2. Students need to improve ability to process and complete complex tasks. . Teachers need to improve ability to provide support and differentiated learning opportunities for tasks at higher levels of complexity –	2A.2. 2 Professional development including PLC work and lesson study. Cooperative Learning GAPS Springboard Common Core State Standards implementation Peer classroom observations	2A.2. . Literacy Coach, PLC Leader, administration	2A.2. . Class Assessments, grades, benchmark assessments, student tracking and self assessment. Observation of student use of academic vocabulary	2A.2. data review, classroom walk through, lesson plan review. Review of Peer Observation Form Informal – teacher report
			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. NA	2B.1. NA	2B.1. NA	2B.1 NA	2B.1. NA
Mathematics Goal #2B: "Providing this data violates student confidentiality."	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.*					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3A.1. Students need extended learning time for additional instructional time in mathematics	3A.1. Homeroom focus groups Before school Learning Center Academic Wednesday School	3A.1. Administrators, Guidance Counselors, MTSSS Team,	3A.1. Learning Center Progress Report, Academic Wednesday School Progress Report, FCIM, LBA	3A.1. Data Chat Reports, Quarterly RtI Reports, Progress Reports, Grades
Mathematics Goal #3A: **The percentage of students making learning gains in reading will increase from 71% to 74% in 2012-13.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **71% of students made learning gains in math in 2011-12.**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **74% of students will make learning gains in math in 2012-13.**					
			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. NA	3B.1. NA	3B.1. NA	3B.1. NA	3B.1. NA
Mathematics Goal #3B: "Providing this data violates student confidentiality."	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.*					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1. Students need extended learning time for additional instructional time in mathematics	4A.1. Homeroom focus groups Before school Learning Center Academic Wednesday School	4A.1. Administrators, Guidance Counselors, MTSSS Team,	4A.1. Learning Center Progress Report, Academic Wednesday School Progress Report, FCIM, LBA	4A.1. Data Chat Reports, Quarterly RtI Reports, Progress Reports, Grades
Mathematics Goal #4A: The percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains will improve from 63% to 66% in 2012-13.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 63% (156) of students in lowest 25% made learning gains in math 2011-12.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 66% of students in lowest 25% will make learning gains in math 2012-13.					
			4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4B.1. NA	4B.1. NA	4B.1. NA	4B.1. NA	4B.1. NA
Mathematics Goal #4B: "Providing this data violates student confidentiality."	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.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.
			4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	20 14-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** **69**						
Mathematics Goal #5A: **5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.**		**57**	**64**	**68**	**71**	**75**	**79**

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**			5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: Students need extended learning time for additional instructional time in mathematics	5B.1. Homeroom focus groups Before school Learning Center Academic Wednesday School	5B.1. Administrators, Guidance Counselors, MTSSS Team,	5B.1. Learning Center Progress Report, Academic Wednesday School Progress Report, FCIM, LBA	5B.1. Data Chat Reports, Quarterly RtI Reports, Progress Reports, Grades	
Mathematics Goal #5B: All subgroups will improve in Math.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White: 69% (351) Black: 45% (36) Hispanic: 46% (155) Asian: 47% (9) American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White: 72% Black: 51% Hispanic: 56% Asian: 68% American Indian:						
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1. Attendance	5C.1. Communication with parents via phone and mail Regular communication with social worker when needed	5C.1 Guidance counselors Social Worker, Assistant Principal responsible for attendance	5C.1. Review of attendance records	5C.11. AS400
Mathematics Goal #5C: **ELL students will improve in making satisfactory progress in math from 21% to 37% in 2012-13**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **21% (8) of ELL students made satisfactory progress in math in 2011-12**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **ELL students will improve in making satisfactory progress in math to 37% in 2012-13**					
			5C.2. . Home School Communication	5C.2. Use of interpreter for communication	5C.2 Guidance Counselor, classroom teachers. Input from ELL teacher assistant	5C.2 Parent feedback	5C.2. Informal
			5C.3. Cooperative Learning with Differentiated Instruction	5C.3. translation dictionaries available, Peer buddy, ELL teacher assistant in classroom, PENDA	5C.3. Guidance Counselor. Classroom Teacher, Administrator	5C.3 monitoring of grades, Observation, Lesson Plan review	5C.3. Grades, classroom assessments.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1. Students need extended learning time for additional instructional time in mathematics	5D.1. Homeroom focus groups Before school Learning Center Academic Wednesday School	5D.1. Administrators, Guidance Counselors, MTSSS Team,	5D.1. Learning Center Progress Report, Academic Wednesday School Progress Report, FCIM, LBA	5D.1. Data Chat Reports, Quarterly RtI Reports, Progress Reports, Grades
Mathematics Goal #5D: **The percentage of Students with Disabilities making satisfactory progress in math will improve from 29% in 2011-12 to 45% in 2012-13**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **29% (37) of Students with Disabilities made satisfactory improvement in math in 2011-12**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **In 2012-13 45% of Students with Disabilities will make satisfactory improvement in math**					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.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
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1. Students need extended learning time for additional instructional time in mathematics	5E.1. Homeroom focus groups Before school Learning Center Academic Wednesday School	5E.1. Administrators, Guidance Counselors, MTSSS Team,	5E.1. Learning Center Progress Report, Academic Wednesday School Progress Report, FCIM, LBA	5E.1. Data Chat Reports, Quarterly RtI Reports, Progress Reports, Grades
Mathematics Goal #5E: **The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged Students making satisfactory progress in math will improve from 47% in 2011-12 to 56% in 2012-13**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **47% (277) of Economically Disadvantaged students will made satisfactory improvement in math in 2011-12.**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **In 2012-13 56% of Economically Disadvantaged Students will make satisfactory improvement in math.**					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Mathematics Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *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.*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Based on 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: "Providing this data violates student confidentiality."	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.*					
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.
Mathematics Goal #4: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *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.*					
			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

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

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

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

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1. Algebra 1 Goal #1: 54% of students taking Algebra 1 EOC scored at Level 3 in 2011-12	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 54% (76) of students taking Algebra 1 EOC scored at Level 3 or above in 2011-12	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 57% of students taking Algebra 1 EOC will score at or above level 3 in 2011-12	1.1. Students need to improve ability to read complex, informational math text – textbook and work problems Teachers need to improve skills for teaching reading of the math text – informational text	1.1. . Professional development for Comprehension Instructional Sequence and/or NGCAR-pd through the Literacy Coach	1.1. Literacy Coach, Literacy Leadership Team, Administration.	1.1. Class Assessments, grades, benchmark assessments, student tracking and self assessment.	1.1. data review, classroom walk through, lesson plan review. Review of Peer Observation Form
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1. Algebra Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring at Level 4 or 5 will improve in 2012-13	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 34% (48) of students taking Algebra 1 EOC scored	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 37% of students taking Algebra 1 EOC will	2.1.. Students need to improve ability to read complex, informational math text – textbook and work problems Teachers need to improve skills for teaching reading of the math text – informational text	2.1. Professional development for Comprehension Instructional Sequence and/or NGCAR-pd through the Literacy Coach	2.1. . Literacy Coach, Literacy Leadership Team, Administration.	2.1. Class Assessments, grades, benchmark assessments, student tracking and self assessment.	2.1. . data review, classroom walk through, lesson plan review. Review of Peer Observation Form

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

	at Level 4 or 5 in 2011-12	score at level 4 or 5 in 2011-12					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**						
Algebra 1 Goal #3A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*							

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.**		3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: . Students need to improve ability to read complex, informational math text – textbook and work problems Teachers need to improve skills for teaching reading of the math text – informational text	3B.1. Professional development for Comprehension Instructional Sequence and/or NGCAR-pd through the Literacy Coach	3B.1. Literacy Coach, Literacy Leadership Team, Administration.	3B.1. Class Assessments, grades, benchmark assessments, student tracking and self assessment.	3B.1. . data review, classroom walk through, lesson plan review. Review of Peer Observation Form	
Algebra 1 Goal #3B: All subgroups will improve in performance on the Algebra 1 EOC in 2012-13	**2012 Current Level of Performance:*** White: 92% (84) Black: 82% (9) Hispanic: 79% (26) Asian: American Indian: / **2013 Expected Level of Performance:*** White: 95% Black: 85% Hispanic: 82% Asian: American Indian:						
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3C.1. . Students need to improve ability to read complex, informational math text – textbook and work problems Teachers need to improve skills for teaching reading of the math text – informational text	3C.1. Professional development for Comprehension Instructional Sequence and/or NGCAR-pd through the Literacy Coach	3C.1. Literacy Coach, Literacy Leadership Team, Administration.	3C.1. Class Assessments, grades, benchmark assessments, student tracking and self assessment.	3C.1. . data review, classroom walk through, lesson plan review. Review of Peer Observation Form
Algebra 1 Goal #3C: ELL students will improve in performance on the Algebra 1 EOC in 2012-13	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	0% (1) of students taking Algebra 1 made satisfactory progress.	10% of students taking Algebra 1 will make satisfactory progress					
			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 1.			3D.1. . Students need to improve ability to read complex, informational math text – textbook and work problems Teachers need to improve skills for teaching reading of the math text – informational text	3D.1. Professional development for Comprehension Instructional Sequence and/or NGCAR-pd through the Literacy Coach	3D.1. Literacy Coach, Literacy Leadership Team, Administration.	3D.1. Class Assessments, grades, benchmark assessments, student tracking and self assessment.	3D.1. . data review, classroom walk through, lesson plan review. Review of Peer Observation Form
Algebra 1 Goal #3D: Students with disabilities will improve in performance on the Algebra 1 EOC in 2012-13	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	0% (0) of students took the Algebra 1 EOC						
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.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
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3E.1. . Students need to improve ability to read complex, informational math text – textbook and work problems Teachers need to improve skills for teaching reading of the math text – informational text	3E.1. Professional development for Comprehension Instructional Sequence and/or NGCAR-pd through the Literacy Coach	3E.1. Literacy Coach, Literacy Leadership Team, Administration.	3E.1. Class Assessments, grades, benchmark assessments, student tracking and self assessment.	3E.1. . data review, classroom walk through, lesson plan review. Review of Peer Observation Form
Algebra 1 Goal #3E: Economically Disadvantaged students will improve in performance on the Algebra 1 EOC in 2012-13	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 89% (54) of students who took the Algebra 1 EOC made satisfactory progress in 2011-12	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 92% of Economically Disadvantaged students taking Algebra 1 will make satisfactory progress in 2012-13.					
			3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

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

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

Geometry EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Geometry Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Geometry Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *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.*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2011-2012**					
Geometry Goal #3A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*						

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.**		3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Geometry Goal #3B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

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

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

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

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Comprehension Instructional Sequence and/or NGCAR-pd	6-8	Literacy Coach	All Math Teachers	Every Thursday – PLC Meetings	Lesson Plans, Classroom Observation, Peer Coaching, PLC Meeting Notes	Administration, Literacy Coach, PLC Leaders
Cooperative Learning GAPS Common Core State Standards implementation Springboard Marzano's Teaching Framework	6-8	FDLRS, District PD Trainer PLC Leader District – Program Specialist PLC Leader	All Math Teachers	Each Thursday July 31, Aug 1 & Aug 2 and Sept. 19 & 21 (Initial Math) Each Thursday	Lesson Plans, CWT's, Peer Coaching, Observation, PLC Meeting Notes	Administration, PLC Meeting Notes

Technology Integration for Math	608	ILS – District Trainers	All Math Teachers	August 17, Sept. 27, October 25, 2012; January 24, February 28, April 25, and May 23, 2013	Lesson Plans, Observation, PLC Meeting Notes	Administration, Tech Contacts

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

<u>Mathematics Budget</u> (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

<table>
<tr>
<th colspan="2">Elementary and Middle Science Goals</th>
<th colspan="5">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</th>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="2">Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:</td>
<td>Anticipated Barrier</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td>
<td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td>
<td>Evaluation Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="2">**1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.**</td>
<td>1A.1. Teachers need to improve skills for teaching reading of the science text – informational text</td>
<td>1A.1. . Professional development for Comprehension Instructional Sequence and/or NGCAR-pd through the Literacy Coach</td>
<td>2A.1. . Literacy Coach, Literacy Leadership Team, Administration.</td>
<td>2A.1. Class Assessments, grades, benchmark assessments, student tracking and self assessment.</td>
<td>2A.1. data review, classroom walk through, lesson plan review.
Review of Peer Observation Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Goal #1A:

Increase the percentage of students scoring at level 3 in science from 66% to 69%</td>
<td>
2012 Current Level of Performance:*
66% (653) students scored at or above level 3 in science

2013 Expected Level of Performance:*
69% (683) will score at or above level 3 in 2013
</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1A.2. Students need to improve ability to process and complete complex tasks.
. Teachers need to improve ability to provide support and differentiated learning opportunities for tasks at higher levels of complexity –</td>
<td>1A.2 Professional development including PLC work and lesson study.
Cooperative Learning
Common Core State Standards implementation

Peer classroom observations</td>
<td>1A.2. Literacy Coach, PLC Leader, administration,</td>
<td>1A.2. . Class Assessments, grades, benchmark assessments, student tracking and self assessment.

Observation of student use of academic vocabulary</td>
<td>1A.2. data review, classroom walk through, lesson plan review.
Review of Peer Observation Form

Informal – teacher report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1A.3.</td>
<td>1A.3.</td>
<td>1A.3.</td>
<td>1A.3.</td>
<td>1A.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="2">**1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.**</td>
<td>1B.1.</td>
<td>1B.1.</td>
<td>1B.1.</td>
<td>1B.1.</td>
<td>1B.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Goal #1B:</td>
<td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*

2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1B.2.</td>
<td>1B.2.</td>
<td>1B.2.</td>
<td>1B.2.</td>
<td>1B.2.</td>
</tr>
</table>

		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.			2A.1. Teachers need to improve skills for teaching reading of the science text – informational text	2A.1. . Professional development for Comprehension Instructional Sequence and/or NGCAR-pd through the Literacy Coach	2A.1. . Literacy Coach, Literacy Leadership Team, Administration.	2A.1. Class Assessments, grades, benchmark assessments, student tracking and self assessment.	2A.1. data review, classroom walk through, lesson plan review. Review of Peer Observation Form
Science Goal #2A: 20% of students scored at Level 4or 5 in Science	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **18% or 54 students scored at Level 4 or 5 in Science**	2013Expected Level of Performance:* **21% or 66 students will score at Level 4 or 5 in 2013**					
			2A.2 Students need to improve ability to process and complete complex tasks. . Teachers need to improve ability to provide support and differentiated learning opportunities for tasks at higher levels of complexity –	2A.2. Professional development including PLC work and lesson study. Cooperative Learning Common Core State Standards implementation Peer classroom observations	2A.2. Literacy Coach, PLC Leader, administration,	. 2A.2Class Assessments, grades, benchmark assessments, student tracking and self assessment. Observation of student use of academic vocabulary	2A.2.. data review, classroom walk through, lesson plan review. Review of Peer Observation Form Informal – teacher report
			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.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Science Goal #2B: "Providing this data violates student confidentiality."	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
			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

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

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

High School Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Science Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Science Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *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.*					
			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

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

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

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

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

Biology 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student 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.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Biology 1 Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Biology 1 Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *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.*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

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

Science Professional Development

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

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Science Goals

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

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.			1A.1. Teachers need to be able to teach students to use conventions and support details and arguments in writing across the curriculum.	1A.1. . Professional development and coaching to support application of new strategies.	1A.1.LLT, Literacy Coach, Administration	1A.1.Lesson Plans, CWT, Student Writing Samples,	1A.1. Lesson Plan Check, CWT data,
Writing Goal #1A: To increase the percentage of students meeting the writing standard in FCAT Writes from 80% to83%	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **80% (790) of students met the FCAT writing standard in 2012.**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **83% of students will meet the FCAT writing standards in 2013**					
			1A.2. Teachers must be equipped in effectively motivating students to write.	1A.2. PBS, teacher/student data chats. Writing from personal experience.	1A.2. PBS teams, PLC leaders, classroom teachers	1A.2. Teacher feedback, data chat records, PBS data	1A.2. Student data chat records, PLC notes, PBS data
			1A.3. New Social Studies teachers need to utilize the DBQ process	1A.3. Professional Development for the DBQ process through the Social Studies Dept. Head.	1A.3. Administrators, Social Studies Dept. Head, Literacy Coach	1A.3. CWT's, monitoring of lesson plans, peer coaching, observation	1A.3. DBQ data, FCAT data
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: "Providing this data violates student confidentiality."	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.

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

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

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Changes in FCAT Writing	6-8	Literacy Coach PLC leaders	PLC participants in all content areas	PLC's meet each Thursday	Lesson Plans, CWT's, Peer Coaching, Observation	Administration, Literacy Coach, Department Chairs
Authentic Writing in the Content Areas	6-8	Literacy Coach	PLC participants in all content areas	District Professional Development Day	Lesson Plans, CWT's, Peer Coaching, Observation	Administration, Literacy Coach, Department Chairs
DBQ Writing	6-8	Social Studies Dept. Head	PLC participants in Social Studies	PLC's meet each Thursday	Lesson Plans, CWT's, Peer Coaching, Observation	Administration, Literacy Coach, Department Chairs

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.				
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	Descript of Resourc
Wow! I'm a Writer	Writing Program	SAI funds	$1,1000.00	
Write Score	Scores student writing samples	SAI funds	$8,200.00	
			Subtotal: $9,300.00	
Technology				
Strategy				Descript of Resourc

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

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

Professional Development		
Strategy		Descript of Resourc

Other		
Strategy		Descript of Resourc

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

Civics EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Civics Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Civics Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *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.*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

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

Civics Professional Development

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

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Civics Goals

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

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

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

U.S. History EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
U.S. History Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
U.S. History Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *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.*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

U.S. History Professional Development

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

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

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

End of U.S. History Goals

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			1.1.Long term health issues	1.1. child study meetings,	1.1. guidance counselor, Assistant Principal responsible for guidance department,	1.1. attendance reports show improved attendance, grades improve	1.1. AS400 reports, eSembler
Attendance Goal #1: **Improve attendance rate from 93.6% to 95%.**	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
	The average daily rate of attendance for 2011-12 was 93.6% (925)	**For 2012-13 the average daily rate of attendance will be 95%**					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	9.3% (106) students had excessive absences (10) or more in 2011-12	**No more that 8% (79) students will have excessive absences in 2012-13**					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	3% (33) students had 10 or more tardies in 2012	**2% (19.8) students will have 10 or more tardies in 2013**					
			1.2. Poor communication with parents (no working phone numbers, parents not attending meetings)	1.2. Teacher notifying guidance counselors of multiple absence, letters home to parents, tier of contact (teacher then counselor then letter home, then Social Worker visit)	1.2. guidance counselor, Assistant Principal responsible for guidance department,	1.2. attendance reports show improved attendance, grades improve	1.2. AS400 reports, eSembler

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

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

		1.3. Difficulty motivating students to attend school	1.3. PBS – rewards for good attendance, daily check in with guidance, child study meetings	1.3. Guidance counselor, PBS team	1.3. review of attendance reports	1.3. AS400 attendance reports, eSembler

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

Attendance Professional Development

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

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Attendance Goals

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

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)).

<table>
<tr>
<th colspan="3">Suspension Goal(s)</th>
<th colspan="5">Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension</th>
</tr>
<tr>
<th colspan="3">Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:</th>
<th>Anticipated Barrier</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</th>
<th>Evaluation Tool</th>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="3">1. Suspension</td>
<td>1.1.Teachers need to consistently use of positive behavior management.</td>
<td>1.1. Professional Development on Positive Behavior Support School Wide Strategies.</td>
<td>1.1. PBS team, administration</td>
<td>1.1. Regular review of discipline data.</td>
<td>1.1. AS400 data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td rowspan="6">Suspension Goal #1: We will decrease the number of students receiving in-school suspensions from 281 to 253 and the number of students receiving out-of-school suspensions from 160 to 144</td>
<td>2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions</td>
<td>2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions</td>
<td rowspan="6"></td>
<td rowspan="6"></td>
<td rowspan="6"></td>
<td rowspan="6"></td>
<td rowspan="6"></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of in-school suspensions for 2012-12 was 621</td>
<td>Goal for number of in-school suspensions for 2013 is 602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</td>
<td>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 2011-12 there were 281 students suspended in-school</td>
<td>In 2012-13 is this expected that this number well be reduced to 253 students suspended in- school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</td>
<td>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of Out-of-school suspensions for 2011-12 was 298</td>
<td>Goal for number of Out-of-school suspensions for 2013 is 268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td rowspan="2"></td>
<td>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School</td>
<td>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School</td>
<td rowspan="2"></td>
<td rowspan="2"></td>
<td rowspan="2"></td>
<td rowspan="2"></td>
<td rowspan="2"></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 2011-12 there were 160 students suspended out- of- school</td>
<td>In 2012-13 is this expected that this number well be reduced to 144 students suspended out- of- school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.Teachers need to be able to recognize and de-escalate</td>
<td>1.2. Professional Development on verbal de-escalation – Crisis</td>
<td>1.2.PBS team,</td>
<td>1.1. Regular review of discipline data. Teacher feedback</td>
<td>1.1. AS400 data</td>
</tr>
</table>

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

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

		situations leading to student disruptions.	Prevention Intervention			
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.		

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

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PBS Strategies	6-8	PBS Team	School Wide	Faculty Meeting	Lesson plan check, suspension data	Assistant Principal for PBS – Stephanie Rhodes

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Provide an alternative to suspensions for level 1-3 violations that may not require suspension.	Salary for staff for 32 Wednesday sessions from 3:10 to 6:00 p.m.	Safe Schools Department	$3650.00
			Subtotal:$3650.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

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

End of Suspension Goals

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.* **Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*	2012 Current Dropout Rate:* *Enter numerical data for dropout rate in this box.*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:* *Enter numerical data for expected dropout rate in this box.*	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:* *Enter numerical data for graduation rate in this box.*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:* *Enter numerical data for expected graduation rate in this box.*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Increase the number of volunteers from233 to 240** *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated*.	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:* **The number of parent volunteers in 2011-12 was 233.**	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:* **The number of parent volunteers in 2012-13 will be 240**	Parents need to be informed of volunteer opportunities.	1.1. Encourage parents to volunteer more at school through the Newsletter, Website, Marquee, and Call Out System	1.1. Volunteer Coordinator	1.1. Collect Participation Data, Climate Survey	1.1. Parent/Volunteer Sign In Sheets
				1.2. Post Parent Newsletter on School's Website to keep parents up-to-date	1.2. Newsletter Coordinator, Web Manager, AP in charge of Technology	1.2. Collect Participation Data, Climate Survey	1.2. Parent/Volunteer Sign In Sheets
				1.3. Post up-coming events on School's Message Board	1.3. AP in charge of Facilities	1.3. Collect Participation Data, Climate Survey	1.3. Parent/Volunteer Sign In Sheets

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: Begin developing STEM activities to incorporate into our science instruction.	1.1. There is currently limited understanding of STEM initiatives within our school.	1.1. Provide professional development through PLCs	1.1. PLC leaders, Admin	1.1. Lesson Plan review, Classroom Walkthrough, Teacher feedback, Review of student work , Progress Monitoring	1.1 Classroom Walkthrough, PLC Agenda Notes, Marzano TEAM
	1.2.	1.2. Members of Science PLC begin to develop lessons that include STEM strategies.	1.2. PLC leaders, Admin	1.2. Lesson Plan review, Classroom Walkthrough, Teacher feedback, Review of student work , Progress Monitoring	1.2. Classroom Walkthrough, PLC Agenda Notes,
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity					
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.					
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Introduction to STEM	6-8	Napoles	School Wide	PLC Meetings	PLC Meeting Notes,	Admin

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

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
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: Establish a CAP Academy to help students be more prepared for high school, college and career. • This will be the planning year for adding a new Middle School CTE Stem program (agriscience) • Strengthen the connection between Middle School and High School teachers/programs. • Increase the number of CTE programs offered	1.1. The teacher needs to learn and implement new standards, learn about CAP Certification Exam. 1.2.	1.1. Research more data on CAP 1.2. Research on set up and testing of students for the certification exam.	1.1. CTE Teacher – Mr.Ferguson, Assistant Principal responsible for CTE – Mr. Skelton	1.1. Successful implementation of the first course. Students will successfully complete the class and pass the certification exam.	1.1. Grades, Certification Exam Results
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

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

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

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

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Additional Goal			1.1.	1.1. Provide training for teachers on technology tools which promote student collaboration, including Edmodo and technology centers.	1.1. Adminstration, PLC leaders	1.1. Teacher feedback 1.1.1 Training sign-in sheets	1.1. Teacher feedback 1.1.1 Training sign-in sheets
Additional Goal #1: To increase student engagement through use of technology and prepare for Common Core .	2012 Current Level :* No documentation of student collaboration	2013 Expected Level :* Student collaboration as a regular part of each class					
			1.2.	1.2. Provide follow-up support as teachers implement new tools for student collaboration.	1.2.. Adminstration, PLC leaders	1.2. Teacher feedback 1.2.1 Training sign-in sheets	1.2. Teacher feedback 1.2.1 Training sign-in sheets
			1.3.	1.3. Share innovative student collaboration strategies with colleagues through grade level and/or department meetings.	1.3.. Adminstration, PLC leaders	1.3. CWT Data 1.3.1 Training sign-in sheets	1.3. CWT Data 1.3.1 Reports from grade level and/or department meetings

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

Additional Goal(s)			School-wide Bullying Prevention Training				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Additional Goal			1.1. Finding adequate time to train all staff and students in bullying prevention strategies.	1.1. Provide training for teachers and students on bullying prevention strategies which promote student citizenship.	1.1. Administration, PLC leaders, Teachers, PBS Team	1.1. Teacher & student feedback 1.1.1 Training sign-in sheets	1.1. Teacher & student feedback 1.1.1 Training sign-in sheets 1.1.2 Faculty meeting agendas
Additional Goal #2: To promote a safe environment where all staff and students can correctly identify, and proceed with the reporting of cases where bullying is taking place.	2012 Current Level :* 0 reports of bullying	2013 Expected Level :* Less than 5 reports of bullying					
			1.2.	1.2. Bi-weekly guidance activities focused on reducing risk-taking behaviors.	1.2.. Guidance, Administration, PBS Team, Teachers	1.2. Teacher & student feedback 1.2.1 Samples of activities/plans	1.2. Teacher & student feedback 1.2.1 student exemplars 1.2.2 Safe Schools Documentation of training
			1.3.	1.3. Homeroom teachers will share Safe Schools Resources with students and explore the following government website together. http://www.stopbullying.gov	1.3.. Administration, guidance, PBS Team	1.3. Student training homeroom sign-in sheets 1.3.1 Teacher & student feedback	1.3. CWT Data 1.3.1 School-wide discipline

Additional Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
School-wide Discipline/Resources/ School House Bullies Preventive Strategies	ALL	Rhodes, Skelton, Golay,Guidance/PBS	School-wide	Early release monthly faculty meetings, Professional Development day	Discipline data-monitoring	Administration, PBS Team

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

for Professional Educators						

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

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	
	Total:
CELLA Budget	
	Total:
Mathematics Budget	
	Total:
Science Budget	
	Total:
Writing Budget	
	Total:
Civics Budget	
	Total:
U.S. History Budget	
	Total:
Attendance Budget	
	Total:
Suspension Budget	
	Total: $3650.42
Dropout Prevention Budget	
	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	
	Total:
STEM Budget	
	Total:
CTE Budget	
	Total:
Additional Goals	
	Total:
	Grand Total: $3650.42

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

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

☒ Yes   ☐ No

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

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

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount