

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



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: Leon High School	District Name: Leon
Principal: Billy Epting	Superintendent: Jackie Pons
SAC Chair: Mindy Fulton	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

[High School Feedback Report](#)

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

Administrators

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	William Epting	MS, Ed Leadership	Starting 6 th year at Leon including 5 years as AP.	17	<p>Principal: Canopy Oaks School 2011-12 Grade A Mastery: (at or above grade level) Reading 66%, Math 68%, Writing 78% Science 66%</p> <p>Principal: Canopy Oaks School 2010-2011 Grade A Mastery: Reading 87%, Math 89%, Writing 78%, Science 74%</p> <p>AP: Leon 2009-10 School Grade: B Mastery: Reading 58%, Math 82%, Writing 90%, Science 57%; Lowest 25% : Reading 40%; Math 58%; The following subgroups did not make AYP: Black--Reading & Math</p>

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

					<p>Economically Disadvantaged--Reading, Math, & Writing AP Leon H.S. 2008-09 Grade: C Mastery: Reading 60%, Math 83%, Science 56%, Writing 84%; Lowest 25%: Reading 44%; The following subgroups did not make AYP: Black--Reading & Math Economically Disadvantaged--Reading, Math, & Writing.</p>
Assistant Principal	Sarah Hembree	Specialist Degree Certified Ed. Leadership (All Levels)	2	5	<p>AP Leon H.S. 2011-12 School Grade: TBA Reading 63%, Math 78%, Writing 84%, Science N/A Lowest 25%: Reading 57%, Math 63% AP Leon H.S. 2010-11 School Grade: B Reading 60%, Math 85%, Science 49%, Writing Mastery 83% Lowest 25%: Reading 39%; Math 65% The following subgroups did not make AYP: Black—Reading & Math; Economically Disadvantaged—Reading & Math 2007-10 Leon County A district Served as an administrator at the district office</p>
Assistant Principal	Deshone D. Hedrington	Master's of Science Certified Ed. Leadership (All Levels)	2	9	<p>AP Leon H.S. 2011-12 School Grade: TBA Reading 63%, Math 78%, Writing 84%, Science N/A Lowest 25%: Reading 57%, Math 63% AP Leon H.S. 2010-11 School Grade: B Reading 60%; Math 85%; Science 49%; Writing 83% Lowest 25%: Reading 39%; Math 65% The following subgroups did not make AYP: Black—Reading & Math; Economically Disadvantaged—Reading & Math AP Cobb Middle School 09-10 Grade A AYP: NO * Reading: 74% Proficient * Math: 70% Proficient AP Belle Vue Middle School 08-09 Grade C AP Belle Vue Middle School 07-08 Grade D AP Lincoln High School 06-07 Grade A</p>
Assistant Principal	Ricky Ardley	School Principal Masters Degree Certified School Principal	5	9	<p>AP Leon H.S. 2011-12 School Grade: TBA Reading 63%, Math 78%, Writing 84%, Science N/A Lowest 25%: Reading 57%, Math 63% AP Leon H.S. 2010-11 School Grade: B Reading 60%; Math 85%; Science 49% Writing Mastery 83% Lowest 25%: Reading 39%; Math 65% The following subgroups did not make AYP: Black—Reading & Math; Economically Disadvantaged—Reading & Math</p>

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

					<p>AP Leon H.S. 2009-10 School Grade: B Reading 58%, Math 82% Writing 90%, Science 57%; Lowest 25% : Reading 40%; Math 58%; The following subgroups did not make AYP: Black--Reading & Math Economically Disadvantaged--Reading, Math, & Writing AP Leon H.S. 2008-09 Grade: C Reading 60%, Math 83%, Science 56%, Writing 84%; Lowest 25%: Reading 44%; The following subgroups did not make AYP: Black--Reading & Math Economically Disadvantaged--Reading, Math, & Writing. AP Rickards H.S. 2007-08 Grade: C AP Rickards 2006-07 Grade: C</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

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	Rebecca Kirhharr	Reading Endorsement English 6-12	2yrs	1 st year	AP Leon H.S. 2011-12 School Grade: TBA Reading 63%, Math 78%, Writing 84%, Science N/A Lowest 25%: Reading 57%, Math 63%

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

Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1. Regular meetings of new teachers with school administration	Principal	On-going	
2. Partnering new teachers with veteran teachers	Assistant Principal	On-going	
3. Participation in District teacher recruitment day	Principal	May 2013	
4. PATS Application System	Principal and Principal's Assistant	As needed (only applicants who are directly qualified or in-process can be considered for employment)	

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
None	

Staff Demographics (Allison)

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]).

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

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
97	3 (3.1%)	22 (22.7%)	30 (30.9%)	42 (43.3%)	49 (50.5%)	97 (100%)	9 (9.3%)	11 (11.3%)	3 (3.1%)

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
Sylvia Crews	Richard Hufty Brett Pikuritz	<p>The following criteria was used during the selection process to ensure matching the most appropriate and qualified mentor with each BT.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Professional Services Contract. ▪ Clinical Educator training. ▪ Experience in supervising interns. ▪ Documented excellence in classroom teaching.* ▪ Demonstrated leadership skills. ▪ Demonstrated planning, organizational and time management skills. <p>Willingness to participate in training</p>	<p>The school-based mentor is responsible for coordinating and encouraging the BT's completion of program requirements by providing the following services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Set up and maintain a documentation folder for the BT. ▪ Maintain a Mentor's Log to document services provided. • Ascertain needs of the BT. ▪ Coordinate the activities of the School Support Team in progress monitoring and assessing the BT's mastery of the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices. • Prepare BT for the

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

			<p>administrator's evaluations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct Teacher Assessment-Part A (Classroom Observations). • Conduct Teacher Assessment—Part B (Face-to-Face Conference). • Monitor BT's completion of the online courses and provide assistance when requested. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Design and coordinate On-Site Training sessions for BT, based on his/her needs and program requirements. ▪ Be actively engaged in BT's daily learning experiences. ▪ Be available in person and by email to answer questions and offer guidance on issues related to academic content, classroom management, and school culture/expectations. ▪ Periodically BT's progress in maintaining required documentation. ▪ Help BT develop a network of additional resources and support—including other beginning teachers when possible. ▪ Coordinate the School Support Team's verification of program completion. ▪ Submit required documents to the Staff Development
--	--	--	--

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

			Department.
		<p>The following criteria was used during the selection process to ensure matching the most appropriate and qualified mentor with each BT.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Professional Services Contract. ▪ Clinical Educator training. ▪ Experience in supervising interns. ▪ Documented excellence in classroom teaching.* ▪ Demonstrated leadership skills. ▪ Demonstrated planning, organizational and time management skills. <p>Willingness to participate in training</p>	<p>The school-based mentor is responsible for coordinating and encouraging the BT's completion of program requirements by providing the following services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Set up and maintain a documentation folder for the BT. ▪ Maintain a Mentor's Log to document services provided. • Ascertain needs of the BT. ▪ Coordinate the activities of the School Support Team in progress monitoring and assessing the BT's mastery of the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices. • Prepare BT for the administrator's evaluations. • Conduct Teacher Assessment-Part A (Classroom Observations). • Conduct Teacher Assessment—Part B (Face-to-Face Conference). • Monitor BT's completion of the online courses and provide assistance when requested. ▪ Design and coordinate On-Site Training sessions for BT, based on his/her needs and program requirements.

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

			<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Be actively engaged in BT's daily learning experiences.▪ Be available in person and by email to answer questions and offer guidance on issues related to academic content, classroom management, and school culture/expectations.▪ Periodically BT's progress in maintaining required documentation.▪ Help BT develop a network of additional resources and support—including other beginning teachers when possible.▪ Coordinate the School Support Team's verification of program completion.▪ Submit required documents to the Staff Development Department.

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

Multi-Tiered Support System (MTSS)/Response to Instruction/Intervention RtI School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Principal and administrative team: Provides vision, ensures the school-based team is implementing RTI, ensures implementation of intervention support, ensures adequate professional development is provided to support RTI and communicates with outside stakeholders regarding school-based RTI.

School RTI coordinator (Sam Norris): Sets the agenda for meetings, informs all stakeholders of the meetings, and facilitates the meetings. In addition she participates in data collection, interpretation and analysis of data; facilitates implementation of intervention plans, and provides follow up with parents and students as needed.

General Education Teachers: The RTI leadership team will consist of one representative from each grade level who will provide information about core instruction, participates in student data collection and collaborates with other staff to ensure implementation of interventions and support for students.

ESE Teachers: Provides information about intervention instruction, participates in data collection, collaborates with general education teachers.

Instructional Coaches: Participate in data collection and evaluation of data, collaborates with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidenced-based intervention strategies and assists with design and delivery of professional development relative to implementation of effective reading and writing strategies in all content areas.

School Psychologist: Participates in data collection, interpretation and analysis of data; facilitates implementation of intervention plans. Provides technical assistance and professional development for problem-solving activities as needed.

Program Specialist: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates implementation of intervention plans. Provides technical assistance and professional development for problem-solving activities as needed.

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 school RTI Leadership team focuses on developing and maintaining a problem-solving system to ensure optimal students achievement for all students. The team meets once a month. Examples of activities during monthly meetings include reviewing students data (screening, progress monitoring). The review of data will facilitate identification of students who are at moderate or high risk for not achieving benchmarks/standards. Based on evaluation of data and identification of students needs, the team will identify strategies for the student and identify professional development and resources needed for teachers.

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?

Members of the RIT Leadership Team met with administration and other staff members to help develop the SIP. The team also collaborated with the SAC to obtain input from the council. The team provided data, helped set goals and expectations, and suggested strategies that would ensure attainment of instructional goals as set forth by the school improvement plan.

MTSS Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.

Baseline data is obtained through FAIR assessment, Riverside/Data Director reports, and previous test information. The data is made available through use of Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRM) and Riverside Publishing. Progress Monitoring for reading is obtained through the administration of FAIR and curriculum based measurements. Progress monitoring for Algebra I, Geometry, and Biology I are obtained through progress monitoring assessments in Data Director.

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Writing progress monitoring is provided through Writes Upon Request assessments Midyear data is obtained through FAIR assessments, Achieve Data Systems (Riverside) and other FCAT simulation assessments. End of the year data is obtained through FAIR assessments, Achieve Data Systems (Riverside) and FCAT. Data for behavior is obtained at any time through the automated Educator's Handbook discipline files.
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. Professional development in RTI has been done previously with ninth and tenth grade core teachers in grade level professional learning communities; this will now be expanded to the remainder of the faculty. Professional development will continue to be provided during teachers' common planning time, during lunch periods, after school, and small sessions will occur throughout the year.
Describe the plan to support MTSS. Small group training is offered; monthly meetings are held with district Psychologist to review plans and to meet with students as needed. RTI meets twice a month on Wednesdays - one to address advanced cases and the other attendance and discipline concerns.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT), Leon High's "Target Team": Billy Epting, Sarah Hembree, Rebecca Kirchharr, Stacy Fabrega, Sarah Harris, Laurel Lemley, Danielle Mazza, Stephanie Toliver, Renee Edwards, Libby Olk, Erica Sears, Travis Laffitte, Laura Louwsma, Amy McDowell, Sam Norris

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). Our team meets once a month to discuss the progress of our bottom quartile. We analyze school wide interventions and modify as appropriate.

Literacy instruction and professional development at Leon High School are centered around four basic Instructional Constants:

- a. Research –based, high-yield strategies are modeled, practiced, and utilized across all disciplines.
- b. All subject area teachers embed reading & writing strategies and practice in their curriculum.
- c. Essential learnings are the focus in all disciplines.
- d. Emphasis on rigor (Webb's Depth of Knowledge).

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?

- a. Achieve3000 implementation (English, reading, 9th grade science, 10th grade world history)
- b. Common classroom routines
- c. Elite Eight (reading club)
- d. Curriculum Instructional Sequence
- e. Next Generation Content Area Reading Professional Development (NGCARPD) training and certification

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

***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?

Department level PLC meetings for literacy PD of content literacy is in place. Teachers will learn and implement research-based literacy strategies which may include Content Area Reading Strategies (C.A.R.S.), SREB literacy strategies across the curriculum, Strategic Instruction Model (SIM) strategies, Rick Shelton writing strategies, NGCAR-PD strategies, etc.

***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?

Leon HS offers students elective courses in art, business, dance, music, English, social studies, science, PE and technology. Many of these courses focus on job skills and offer students job experience.

Teachers consistently ask themselves “why are we learning this” to ensure instruction is relevant. Teachers utilize bell ringers that are based on current learning.

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](#).

Each eleventh grade student not already demonstrating college readiness is administered the PERT test (Postsecondary Education Readiness Test). Math and English courses for the student’s senior year are planned from these test results or from other indicators of college readiness. Students who are not yet demonstrating college readiness by the end of their junior year are scheduled for English and/or math classes that will remediate their deficiencies. For those students who are demonstrating readiness in either math or English, we offer dual enrollment courses on our campus for ENC 1101, ENC 1145, MAC 1105, AMH 2010, and AMH 2020. In cooperation with Tallahassee Community College, Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, and Florida State University, we offer off campus dual enrollment options for students who are ready academically

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

and personally for the college learning environment.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.			1A.1. Student complacency.	1A.1. Teachers will provide clear learning goals and rubrics, track student progress and celebrate success	1A.1. Principal/Asst. Principal	1A.1. Monitoring of progress toward goals	1A.1. Appropriate benchmark assessment; classroom observation tools; various classroom assessments
Reading Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Students achieving reading proficiency (FCAT Level 3) or above (FCAT Level 4 or 5) increased from 56% on the 2011 FCAT Reading test to 63% on 2012 Reading test.	24% scored level 3	At least 25% will achieve a 3 in 2013					
			1A.2. Ability to use cognitive strategies in reading & in writing.	1A.2. Include higher order questions in lessons to be used for discussion of text meaning and interpretation	1A.2. Principal, AP's, and Literacy Coach	1A.2. Lessons will be reviewed during literacy classroom walkthroughs	1A.2. Classroom walk-through log and focused walkthroughs.
			1A.3. Teachers not comfortable with embedding literacy strategies in the teaching of content	1A.3. Content area teachers will explicitly infuse content specific reading strategies as initiated by department PLCs in lesson plans & in instructional delivery. Teachers will begin to implement or increase CIS implementation as a way to teach content knowledge.	1A.3. Principal, AP's, and Literacy Coach, & content teachers	1A.3. During classroom walkthroughs, administrators and literacy coach will focus attention on the explicit teaching of strategies in content classes; participation in content literacy PLCs	1A.3. Teacher targeted assessments, course grades, 2011 FCAT student data
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Reading Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The percentage of identified students proficient in reading will increase by at least 1% as evidenced by	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in					

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

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

performance on FAA.	<i>this box.</i>	<i>this box.</i>					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.			2A.1. Ability to use cognitive strategies in reading & in writing	2A.1. Include higher order questions in lessons to be used for discussion of text meaning and interpretation	2A.1. Principal, AP's, and Literacy Coach	2A.1. Lessons will be reviewed during literacy classroom walkthroughs	2A.1. Classroom walk-through log and focused walkthroughs
Reading Goal #2A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>Last year, 39% of the students achieved above proficiency (FCAT levels 4&5). The goal is to have at least 40% of the school population tested score level 4 or 5 on 2013 FCAT reading test.</i>	39% of students scored at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.	40% of students will score at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.					
			2A.2. Teachers not comfortable with embedding literacy strategies in the teaching of content	2A.2. Content area teachers will explicitly infuse content specific reading strategies as initiated by department PLCs in lesson plans & in instructional delivery	2A.2. Principal, AP's, and Literacy Coach	2A.2. Lessons will be reviewed during literacy classroom walkthroughs	2A.2. Classroom walk-through log and focused walkthroughs
			2A.3. Students compliant, but not necessarily engaged.	2A.3. Provide students with the opportunity to explain understandings and discuss interpretations of texts read at least once a week.	2A.3. Principal, AP's, and Literacy Coach	2A.3. During classroom walkthroughs administration and literacy coach will focus attention on students' engagement as opposed to compliance	2A.3. Focused classroom walkthroughs
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Reading Goal #2B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The percentage of identified students proficient in reading will increase by at least 1% as evidenced by	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in</i>					

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

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

performance on FAA.	<i>this box.</i>	<i>this box.</i>					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3A.1. Lack of strategies to comprehend a broad range of instructional materials	3A.1. All teachers at Leon across the content areas will explicitly infuse research-based literacy strategies in lesson plans and in instructional delivery as initiated by Professional Learning Communities	3A.1. Principal, AP's, and Literacy Coach & content teachers	3A.1. During classroom walkthroughs, administrators and literacy coach will focus attention on the explicit teaching of strategies in content classes.	3A.1. Targeted teacher assessments, FAIR assessments, and focused walkthroughs.
Reading Goal #3A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
On 2013 FCAT Reading test, 66% of students will make learning gains.	65% of students made learning gains in 2012 (up from 54% in 2011)	66% of students will make learning gains in 2013					
			3A.2. Lack of strategies to comprehend a broad range of instructional materials	3A.2. Determine comprehension strategy instructional needs by reviewing Achieve3000 and 2011 FCAT assessment data	3A.2. Literacy coach, Reading & English teachers, teachers implementing Achieve in their classrooms	3A.2. Achieve progress monitoring assessments	3A.2. Targeted teacher assessments, Achieve assessments, 2012 FCAT Reading assessment
			3A.3. Lack of background knowledge for comprehending text	3A.3. Teachers will learn & use frontloading strategies prior to reading to help students build background or access prior knowledge	3A.3. Principal, APC, literacy coach & reading teachers	3A.3. Teacher participation in PLC and teacher use of frontloading strategies in introduction of concepts/lessons	3A.3. Teacher targeted assessments, FAIR assessments, 2012 FCAT reading test
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
The percentage of identified students making learning gains in reading will increase by at least 1% as evidenced by performance on FAA.	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4A.1. Disconnect/lack of generalization of reading & writing skills across all content areas.	4A.1. Reading & English teachers will plan together to develop and implement an integrated English curriculum of reading, literature, and writing skills.	4A.1. Principal, APC, literacy coach, & English department chair	4A.1. Achieve3000 progress monitoring assessments, monitor course grades	4A.1. Teacher targeted assessments, Achieve3000 assessments, course grades
Reading Goal #4A: We will continue to have 50% or more of our lowest quartile students making learning gains in reading	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 57% made learning gains, up from 39% in 2011	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* At least 57% of lowest quartile will make learning gains in reading					
			4A.2. Lack of ability to gain meaning, understanding, & knowledge from print materials.	4A.2. Identify strategy instructional needs of students in the lowest 35% from Achieve3000 assessments & 2011 FCAT Reading data. b. Literacy coach will model specialized strategies in classrooms.	4A.2. Principal, APC, literacy coach, & English department chair	4A.2. . Review Achieve 3000 data after each assessment; reading teachers & literacy coach attendance at Reading Department PLC meetings. b. Modeling, coaching, & follow up of specialized strategies.	4A.2. Teacher targeted assessments, Achieve3000 assessments b. Achieve3000 assessments, PMRN Literacy Coach's log, 2012 FCAT Reading test data
			4A.3. Disconnect between reading skills and content learning	4A.3. Content area teachers will explicitly infuse content specific reading strategies as initiated by department PLCs in lesson plans & in instructional delivery	4A.3. Principal, AP's, and Literacy Coach, department chairs, & content teachers	4A.3. During classroom walkthroughs, administrators and literacy coach will focus attention on the explicit teaching of strategies in content classes; participation in content literacy PLCs	4A.3. Teacher targeted assessments, Achieve3000 assessments, course grades
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.
Reading Goal #4B: The percentage of identified students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading will increase by at least 1% as evidenced by performance on FAA.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			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 60% of students scored level 3 or above in reading	63%	67%	70%	74%	77%	80%
	Reading Goal #5A: <i>To increase the students scoring at proficiency in reading to 80% by school year 2016-17.</i>						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.		5B.1. White: Students lack background knowledge to understand new content Black: Students lack background knowledge to understand new content. Hispanic: N/A Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A	5B.1. Teachers will use strategies for previewing new content	5B.1. Principal/ Assistant Principals; Instructional coaches	5B.1. Explicitly teach words, provide repeated exposure to words in multiple contexts, & provide students with multiple opportunities to use the new vocabulary in reading, writing, & speaking Classroom assessments; progress monitoring	5B.1. Teacher targeted assessments, Achieve3000 assessments, 2012 FCAT reading test Classroom Walk-through; observation; teacher lesson plans	
Reading Goal #5B: Students in the identified subgroups not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease by 10%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White: 22% Black: 67% Hispanic: 51% Asian: 51% American Indian: n/a	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White: 20% or fewer Black: 61% or fewer Hispanic: 46% or fewer Asian: 46% or fewer American Indian: n/a (decrease by 10%)					
			5B.2. Time to work with social studies teachers on Achieve 3000	5B.2. Implementation of Achieve 3000 in 9 th grade English and Integrated Science classes and in 10 th grade English and World History classes as well as in 9 th and 10 th grade Reading classes to increase comprehension of content material.	5B.2. Principal, Assistant Principals; Instructional coaches	5B.2. Explain the purpose of the strategy, model how to use the specific strategy, provide guided and independent practice using the strategies with appropriate texts Students will complete a	5B.2. Teacher targeted assessments, Achieve3000 assessments, 2011 FCAT reading test Performance/ Achievement Management reports

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

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

					minimum of one Achieve 3000 activity per week aligned to the current unit of study, and student reports will be monitored for improvement.	
		5B.3. Student apathy resulting from year after year of failure	5B.3. Teachers will provide opportunities for students to practice skills, interact with text, and talk about what they learn	5B.3. Principal/ Assistant Principals; Instructional coaches	5B.3. Teacher participation in PLC and teacher use of frontloading strategies in introduction of concepts/lessons. Classroom assessments; student time on task/ engagement	5B.3. Teacher targeted assessments, Achieve3000 assessments, 2012 FCAT reading test Classroom Walk-through; observation; teacher lesson plans

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
Reading Goal #5C: <i>The percentage of ELL students not making satisfactory progress in reading will increase by at least 1% as indicated by performance on the CELLA.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			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 reading.			5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
Reading Goal #5D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5E.1. Engaging students in activities beyond the worksheet assignments.	5E.1. Teachers will work to increase student engagement by providing opportunities for students to practice skills, interact with text, and talk about what they learn	5E.1. Principal/ Assistant Principals; Instructional coaches	5E.1. Classroom assessments; student time on task/ engagement	5E.1. Classroom Walk-through; observation; teacher lesson plans
Reading Goal #5E:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Students not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease by 10%.	75% (52) students did not make satisfactory progress in reading.	68% (47) students not making progress in reading will decrease by 10%					
			5E.2. Understanding and training on how to involve students in deepening content knowledge.	5E.2. Communicating learning goals, tracking student progress, and celebrating success through the Leon 9 th /10 th grade Target Team for unsuccessful students.	5E.2. Principal/ Assistant Principals; Instructional coaches	5E.2. Review or instructors' individualized professional development plans.	5E.2 Professional Development documentation
			5E.3. Student apathy resulting from year after year of failure	5E.3. Communicating learning goals, tracking student progress, and celebrating success through the Leon 9 th /10 th grade Target Team for unsuccessful students.	5E.3 Principal/ Assistant Principal; Instructional coaches	5E.3. Monitoring student progress toward goals	5E.3 Progress monitoring; classroom observation tools; classroom assessments

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

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Achieve 3000	9 th , 10 th teachers	Instructional Coaches	Selected English, social studies, and science teachers at 9 th & 10 th grade	Team Meetings and district and school based inservice	iObservation documentation;	Principal/Assistant Principal
Target Team for Student Success	9 th , 10 th teachers	Instructional Coach	Selected English, social studies, and science teachers at 9 th & 10 th grade	Team meetings - ongoing throughout the year (2 nd and 4 th Thursdays of the month)	iObservation documentation	Principal/Assistant Principal
NGCAR-PD	9 th , 10 th teachers	Instructional Coach	Selected science, world history, and math teachers at 9 th and 10 th	Team Meetings ongoing throughout the year;	iObservation documentation; lesson plans	Principal/Assistant Principal

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
Cross-curricular vocabulary instruction	science vocabulary workbooks for English classrooms		
Elite Eight Book Club	240 Paperback books for student consumption		5,000
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Achieve3000 Differentiated Instruction	Internet-based literacy program	A-school money	15,000
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Professional Development for Achieve 3000	Substitutes for teachers involved; time for planning and collaboration.	Title II; School Based Professional Learning money.	\$2400
			Subtotal:

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

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

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.		1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
CELLA Goal #1: <i>The percentage of ELL students proficient in listening and speaking English will increase by at least 1% as indicated by performance on the CELLA.</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					
	59% (10)					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.

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

CELLA Goal #2: <i>The percentage of ELL students proficient in reading English will increase by at least 1% as indicated by performance on the CELLA.</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:					
	29% (5)					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
CELLA Goal #3: <i>The percentage of ELL students proficient in writing English will increase by at least 1% as indicated by performance on the CELLA.</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :				
	41% (7).				
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

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

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:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The percentage of identified students proficient in math will increase by at least 1% as evidenced by	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in</i>					

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

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

performance on the FAA.	<i>this box.</i>	<i>this box.</i>					
			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:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
The percentage of identified students proficient in math will increase by at least 1% as evidenced by performance on the FAA.	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.
Mathematics Goal #3:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
The percentage of identified students proficient in math will increase by at least 1% as evidenced by performance on the FAA.	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					

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

		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: The percentage of identified students proficient in math will increase by at least 1% as evidenced by performance on the FAA.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>				
			4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.		1.1. Students have merely adequate mathematical, knowledge, background and reasoning skills.	1.1. Teachers will engage students in activities and lessons providing opportunities for students to increase pre-requisite skills while acquiring higher level thinking skills.	1.1. Principal or designee	1.1 Classroom observations Progress Monitoring tests	1.1.iObservation, classroom observations, student Progress Monitoring scores
Algebra 1 Goal #1: At the end of 2012-2013 academic year 54% of the Algebra 1 students will achieve a level 3 on the end	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 53%(221) achieved a level 3 score in 2012	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 54% (273) will achieve a level 3 score in 2013.				

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

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

<i>of course exam.</i>		1.2. Students have merely adequate experience with complex tasks	1.2. Teachers will continue to engage students in complex tasks that require them to generate and test hypotheses.	1.2. Principal or designee	1.2. Classroom observations Progress Monitoring tests	1.2. iObservation, classroom observations, student Progress Monitoring scores
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.		2.1. Students have proficient mathematical, knowledge, background and reasoning skills.	2.1. Teachers will engage students in activities and lessons providing opportunities for students to acquire higher level thinking skills.	2.1. Principal or designee	2.1. Classroom observations Progress Monitoring tests	2.1. iObservation, classroom observations, student Progress Monitoring scores
Algebra Goal #2:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>				
<i>At the end of 2012-2013 academic year 21% of the Algebra 1 students will achieve a level 4 or 5 on the end of course exam.</i>	20% (60) achieved a level 4 or 5 score in 2012	21% (106) will achieve a level 4 or 5 score in 2013.				
		2.2. Students have proficient experience with complex tasks	2.2. Teachers will engage students in complex tasks that require them to generate and test hypotheses.	2.2. Principal or designee	2.2. Classroom observations Progress Monitoring tests	2.2. iObservation, classroom observations, student Progress Monitoring scores
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3A. In six years, the school will reduce its achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011 85% scored level 3 or higher in Math	27% (84) of Algebra 1 students failed to show proficiency on the 2011-2012 end of course exam.	No more than 25% (127) of Algebra 1 students will fail to show proficiency on the 2012-2013 end of course exam.	No more than 22% (114) of Algebra 1 students will fail to show proficiency on the 2013-2014 end of course exam.	No more than 20% (103) of Algebra 1 students will fail to show proficiency on the 2014-2015 end of course exam.	No more than 18% (93) of Algebra 1 students will fail to show proficiency on the 2015-2016 end of course exam.	No more than 16% (84) of Algebra 1 students will fail to show proficiency on the 2016-2017 end of course exam.
Algebra 1 Goal #3A: <i>No more than 25% (127) of Algebra 1 students will fail to show proficiency on the 2012-2013 end of course exam.</i>							

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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: Students have inadequate mathematical, knowledge, background and reasoning skills.	3B.1. Teachers will engage students in activities and lessons providing opportunities for students to attain pre-requisite skills while acquiring higher level thinking skills.	3B.1. Principal or designee	3B.1. Classroom observations Progress Monitoring tests	3B.1. iObservation, classroom observations, student Progress Monitoring scores
Algebra 1 Goal #3B: No more than 15% of White Algebra 1 students will fail to show proficiency on the 2012-2013 end of course exam. No more than 35% of Black Algebra 1 students will fail to show proficiency on the 2012-2013 end of course exam. No more than 30% of Hispanic Algebra 1 students will fail to show proficiency on the 2012-2013 end of course exam.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White:17% (25) Black:40%(49) Hispanic:33%(6)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White:15% Black: 35% Hispanic:30%	Black: Students have inadequate mathematical, knowledge, background and reasoning skills. Hispanic: Students have inadequate mathematical, knowledge, background and reasoning skills.	Students who have been identified as level 1 or 2 students have been placed in an Algebra 1 support class. Level 1 and 2 students are provided opportunities to increase their skills and knowledge by using the Success Maker computer tool.			
			3B.2. Students have inadequate experience with complex tasks	3B.2. Teachers will continue to engage students in complex tasks that require them to generate and test hypotheses.	3B.2. Principal or designee	3B.2. Classroom observations Progress Monitoring tests	3B.2. iObservation, classroom observations, student Progress Monitoring scores
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3C: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. N/A	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.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3D.1. Students have inadequate mathematical, knowledge, background and reasoning skills.	3D.1. Teachers will engage students in activities and lessons providing opportunities for students to attain pre-requisite skills while acquiring higher level thinking skills. Students who have been identified as level 1 or 2 students have been placed in an Algebra 1 support class. Level 1 and 2 students are provided opportunities to increase their skills and knowledge by using the Success Maker computer tool.	3D.1. Principal or designee	3D.1. Classroom observations Progress Monitoring tests	3D.1.iObservation, classroom observations, student Progress Monitoring scores
Algebra 1 Goal #3D: <i>No more than 48% of Algebra 1SWD students will fail to show proficiency on the 2012-2013 end of course exam.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>50% (11) of Algebra 1 SWD students failed to show proficiency on the 2011-2012 end of course exam.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>No more than 48% of Algebra 1SWD students will fail to show proficiency on the 2012-2013 end of course exam.</i>	3D.2. Students have inadequate experience with complex tasks	3D.2. Teachers will continue to engage students in complex tasks that require them to generate and test hypotheses.	3D.2. Principal or designee	3D.2. Classroom observations Progress Monitoring tests	3D.2. iObservation, classroom observations, student Progress Monitoring scores
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3E.1. Students have inadequate mathematical, knowledge, background and reasoning skills.	3E.1. Teachers will engage students in activities and lessons providing opportunities for students to attain pre-requisite skills while acquiring higher level thinking skills. Students who have been identified as level 1 or 2 students have been placed in an Algebra 1 support class. Level 1 and 2 students are provided opportunities to increase their skills and knowledge by using the Success Maker computer tool.	3E.1. Principal or designee	3E.1. Classroom observations Progress Monitoring tests	3E.1.iObservation, classroom observations, student Progress Monitoring scores
Algebra 1 Goal #3E: <i>No more than 34% of Algebra 1Economically disadvantaged students will fail to show proficiency on the 2012-2013 end of course exam.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>36% (38) of Algebra 1 Economically disadvantaged students failed to show proficiency on the 2011-2012</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>No more than 34% of Algebra 1Economically disadvantaged students will fail to show proficiency on the 2012-2013</i>					

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

	<i>end of course exam.</i>	<i>end of course exam.</i>					
			3.E.2.Students have inadequate experience with complex tasks	3E.2. Teachers will continue to engage students in complex tasks that require them to generate and test hypotheses.	3E.2. Principal or designee	3E.2. Classroom observations Progress Monitoring tests	3E.2. iObservation, classroom observations, student Progress Monitoring scores
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

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

Geometry EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring in the Middle 3rd in Geometry.			1.1. Students have merely adequate mathematical knowledge, background and reasoning skills.	1.1. Teachers will engage students in activities and lessons providing opportunities for students to increase pre-requisite skills while acquiring higher level thinking skills.	1.1.Principal or designee	1.1. Classroom observations Progress Monitoring tests	1.1.iObservation, classroom observations, student Progress Monitoring scores
Geometry Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>At the end of 2012-2013 academic year 35% (150)of the Geometry students will score in the middle 3rd achievement level on the end of course exam</i>	<i>At the end of 2011-2012 academic year 33% (131) of the Geometry students scored in the middle 3rd achievement level on the end of course exam</i>	<i>At the end of 2012-2013 academic year 35% (150) of the Geometry students will score in the middle 3rd achievement level on the end of course exam</i>					
			1.2. Students have merely adequate experience with complex tasks	1.2. Teachers will continue to engage students in complex tasks that require them to generate and test hypotheses.	1.2.Principal or designee	1.2. Classroom observations Progress Monitoring tests	1.2.iObservation, classroom observations, student Progress Monitoring scores

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

			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 in the top 3rd in Geometry.			2.1. Students have proficient mathematical knowledge, background and reasoning skills.	2.1. Teachers will engage students in complex tasks that require them to generate and test hypotheses	2.1. Principal or designee	2.1. Classroom observations Progress Monitoring tests	2.1. iObservation, classroom observations, student Progress Monitoring scores
Geometry Goal #2:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>At the end of 2012-2013 academic year 58% (289) of the Geometry students will score in the top 3rd achievement level on the end of course exam</i>	<i>At the end of 2011-2012 academic year 57% (228) of the Geometry students scored in the top 3rd achievement level on the end of course exam</i>	<i>At the end of 2012-2013 academic year 58% (289) of the Geometry students will score in the top 3rd achievement level on the end of course exam</i>					
			2.2. Students have proficient experience with complex tasks	2.2. Teachers will engage students in complex tasks that require them to generate and test hypotheses.	2.2. Principal or designee	2.2. Classroom observations Progress Monitoring tests	2.2. iObservation, classroom observations, student Progress Monitoring scores
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3A. In six years, the school will reduce its achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2011-2012	<i>No more than 25% (107) of geometry students will fail to show proficiency on the 2012-2013 end of course exam.</i>	<i>No more than 22% (93) of geometry students will fail to show proficiency on the 2013-2014 end of course exam.</i>	<i>No more than 19% (81) of geometry students will fail to show proficiency on the 2014-2015 end of course exam.</i>	<i>No more than 16% (69) of geometry students will fail to show proficiency on the 2015-2016 end of course exam.</i>	<i>No more than 13% (56) of geometry students will fail to show proficiency on the 2016-2017 end of course exam.</i>

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

<p>Geometry Goal #3A: <i>25% (107) of geometry students will fail to show proficiency on the 2012-2013 end of course exam.</i></p>							
<p>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:</p>			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<p>3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.</p>			<p>3B.1. White: Students have inadequate mathematical, knowledge, background and reasoning skills.</p> <p>Black: Students have inadequate mathematical, knowledge, background and reasoning skills.</p> <p>Hispanic: Students have inadequate mathematical, knowledge, background and reasoning skills.</p>	<p>3B.1. Teachers will engage students in activities and lessons providing opportunities for students to attain pre-requisite skills while acquiring higher level thinking skills.</p> <p>Students who have been identified as deficient in Algebra have been placed in a Liberal Arts class to enhance their Algebraic perspectives and prepare them to take Geometry in the fall.</p>	3B.1. Principal or designee	3B.1. Classroom observations Progress Monitoring tests	3B.1. iObservation, classroom observations, student Progress Monitoring scores
<p>Geometry Goal #3B: <i>No more than 25% of white geometry students will fail to show proficiency on the 2012-2013 end of course exam.</i></p> <p><i>No more than 30% of Black geometry students will fail to show proficiency on the 2012-2013 end of course exam.</i></p> <p><i>No more than 28% of Hispanic geometry students will fail to show proficiency on the 2012-2013 end of course exam.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> <p>White: 10% (42)</p> <p>Black: 24% (22)</p> <p>Hispanic: 13% (2)</p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> <p>White: 25%</p> <p>Black: 30%</p> <p>Hispanic: 28%</p>	3B.2. Students have inadequate experience with complex tasks	3B.2. Teachers will continue to engage students in complex tasks that require them to generate and test hypotheses.	3B.2. Principal or designee	3B.2. Classroom observations Progress Monitoring tests	3B.2. iObservation, classroom observations, student Progress Monitoring scores
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

<p>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:</p>			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<p>3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.</p>			3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.

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

Geometry Goal #3C: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			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. Students have inadequate mathematical, knowledge, background and reasoning skills	3D.1. Teachers will engage students in activities and lessons providing opportunities for students to attain pre-requisite skills while acquiring higher level thinking skills.	3D.1. Principal or designee	3D.1. Classroom observations Progress Monitoring tests	3D.1. iObservation, classroom observations, student Progress Monitoring scores
Geometry Goal #3D: <i>No more than 25% of SWD geometry students will fail to show proficiency on the 2012-2013 end of course exam.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>10% of SWD geometry students failed to show proficiency on the 2012-2013 end of course exam.</i>	<i>No more than 25% of SWD geometry students will fail to show proficiency on the 2012-2013 end of course exam.</i>		Students who have been identified as deficient in Algebra have been placed in a Liberal Arts class to enhance their Algebraic perspectives and prepare them to take Geometry in the fall.			
			3D.2. Students have inadequate experience with complex tasks	3D.2. Teachers will continue to engage students in complex tasks that require them to generate and test hypotheses.	3D.2. Principal or designee	3D.2. Classroom observations Progress Monitoring tests	3D.2. iObservation, classroom observations, student Progress Monitoring scores
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.

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

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3E.1. Students have inadequate mathematical, knowledge, background and reasoning skills	3E.1. Teachers will engage students in activities and lessons providing opportunities for students to attain pre-requisite skills while acquiring higher level thinking skills. Students who have been identified as deficient in Algebra have been placed in a Liberal Arts class to enhance their Algebraic perspectives and prepare them to take Geometry in the fall.	3E.1. Principal or designee	3E.1. Classroom observations Progress Monitoring tests	3E.1. iObservation, classroom observations, student Progress Monitoring scores
Geometry Goal #3E: <i>No more than 30% of Economically Disadvantaged geometry students will fail to show proficiency on the 2012-2013 end of course exam.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>20% (16) of Economically Disadvantaged geometry students will fail to show proficiency on the 2012-2013 end of course exam</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>No more than 30% of Economically Disadvantaged geometry students will fail to show proficiency on the 2012-2013 end of course exam</i>					
			3E.2. Students have inadequate experience with complex tasks	3E.2. Teachers will continue to engage students in complex tasks that require them to generate and test hypotheses.	3E.2. Principal or designee	3E.2. Classroom observations Progress Monitoring tests	3E.2. iObservation, classroom observations, student Progress Monitoring scores
			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
Algebra 1 Pacing	Algebra 1	Stacey Raley	All Algebra 1 teachers	Weekly	Comparison of student performance on unit tests	Principal or designee
Geometry Pacing	Geometry	Art Skelly	All geometry teachers	Weekly	Comparison of student performance on unit tests	Principal or designee

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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
Provide students with ample opportunities to use the specific calculators allowed by state	TI 30 XS (30 calculators)	School Improvement Funds	\$480.00
			Subtotal:480.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			480.00 Subtotal:
			Total:480.00

End of Mathematics Goals

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. Difficulty of science subject matter.	1.1a. Teachers will use hands on activities & labs to engage students in real world applications of science. 1.1b. Science teachers will attend science department meetings and professional development.	1.1. Principal or designee	1.1. Analysis of Florida Alternative Assessment; analysis of classroom assessment	1.1. Observations; Classroom Walk-throughs; assessment evidence.
Science Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The goal is to improve science comprehension in students taking the Florida Alternative Assessment by 1%.	33% (1) of students taking the Florida Alternative Assessment at Leon High School scored at levels 4, 5, & 6.	50% of students taking the Florida Alternative Assessment at Leon High School will score at levels 4, 5, & 6. students					
			1.2. Difficulty with technical science terminology.	1.2. Teachers will teach students strategies for comprehending science vocabulary.	1.2. Principal or designee	1.2. Analysis of Florida Alternative Assessment; analysis of classroom assessment	1.2. Observations; Classroom Walk-throughs; assessment evidence.
			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. Difficulty of science subject matter.	2.1.a. Teachers will use hands on activities & labs to engage students in real world applications of science. 2.1b. Science teachers will attend science department meetings and professional development.	2.1. Principal or designee	2.1. Analysis of Florida Alternative Assessment; analysis of classroom assessment	2.1. Observations; Classroom Walk-throughs; assessment evidence.
Science Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The goal is to assist students taking the Florida Alternative Assessment in reaching the highest level of comprehension in science.	67% (2) of students taking the Florida Alternative Assessment at Leon High School scored at level 7.	75% of students taking the Florida Alternative Assessment at Leon High School will score at level 7.					

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

		2.2. Difficulty with technical science terminology.	2.2. Teachers will teach students strategies for comprehending science vocabulary.	2.2. Principal or designee	2.2. Analysis of Florida Alternative Assessment; analysis of classroom assessment	2.2. Observations; Classroom Walk-throughs; assessment evidence.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

Biology 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student 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. Students lack the ability to think scientifically when solving complex science problems.	1.1. The teacher will engage students in Argument Driven Inquiry (ADI) tasks which will engage students in real world applications of science, and at the same time embed Common Core standards in the teaching of science.	1.1. Classroom teacher; Department Chair; Administration	1.1. Analysis of classroom assessments and regular progress monitoring.	1.1. Progress monitoring assessments & 2012-2013 Biology EOC
Biology 1 Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>Based on the 2011-2012 Biology EOC baseline data, 32% of students at Leon High School scored in the middle third on the assessment.</i>	<i>32% (153) of Biology students at Leon High School scored in middle third on Biology EOC.</i>	<i>37% (175) of the Biology students at Leon High School will score in the middle third on the Biology EOC.</i>					
			1.2. Students do not practice in order to deepen their knowledge of science.	1.2. Teachers will utilize organized study groups for students to review information and practice science skills.	1.2. Classroom teacher; Department Chair; Administration	1.2. Analysis of classroom assessments and regular progress monitoring.	1.2. Progress monitoring assessments & 2012-2013 Biology EOC
			1.3. Lack of consistency across science teachers in teaching Biology.	1.3. Biology teachers will meet regularly to discuss, maintain and revise the instructional pacing guide and activities.	1.3. Classroom teacher; Department Chair; Administration	1.3. Biology teachers are using the instructional pacing guide and engaging students in ADIs.	1.3. Observations; classroom walk-throughs
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.			2.1. Students lack the ability to think critically to complete complex scientific tasks.	2.1. The teacher will engage students in Argument Driven Inquiry (ADI) tasks which will engage students in real world applications of science, and at the same time embed Common Core standards in the teaching of science	2.1. Classroom teacher; Department Chair; Administration	2.1. Analysis of classroom assessments and regular progress monitoring.	2.1. Progress monitoring assessments & 2012-2013 Biology EOC
Biology 1 Goal #2: <i>Based on the 2011-2012 Biology EOC baseline data, 43% of students at Leon High School scored in the top third on the assessment.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>43% (205) of the Biology students at Leon High School scored in the top third on the Biology EOC.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>48% (227) of the Biology students at Leon High School will score in the top third on the Biology EOC.</i>					
			2.2. Students do not practice nor know how to talk about science.	2.2. Teachers will plan and organize class to discuss complex scientific topics.	2.2. Classroom teacher; Department Chair; Administration	2.2. Analysis of classroom assessments and regular progress monitoring.	2.2. Progress monitoring assessments & 2012-2013 Biology EOC
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Inquiry Method through Argument Driven Inquiry (ADI)	9 – 12	Science team & District personnel	All science teachers grades 9 – 12.	Throughout the year	Science department meeting & course specific meetings	Principal; assistant principal; department chair
Common Core Standards in the teaching of science	9 - 12	Science team & District personnel	All science teachers grades 9 – 12.	Throughout the year	Science department meeting & course specific meetings	Principal; assistant principal; department chair
Development of a instructional pacing guide and ADI tasks for chemistry.	9 - 12	Chemistry teachers	All chemistry teachers	Throughout the year	Chemistry course meetings	Principal; assistant principal; department chair

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

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

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
Teachers develop skills in producing ADIs for their science course.	Training on the process & how it is applied across science courses.	SIP/Title II	1500.00
Common Core Standards in the teaching of Science	Training on Common Core Standards specific to science	SIP/Title II	1500.00
Developing an instructional pacing guide and ADI tasks for Chemistry.	Training on developing a pacing guide	SIP/Title II	1200.00
			Subtotal: \$4200.00
Technology			

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.Lack of student readiness and understanding of expected writing conventions	1A.1.Teachers will provide frequent instruction in the writing process and in writing conventions and will require a variety of written assignments to include expository and persuasive topics.	1A.1. Classroom teacher	1A.1.Teachers will assess writing products to verify their compliance with the rubric. Assessment is to include focus on a given topic, the use of proper conventions and sufficient elaboration.	1A.1. Teachers will use the scores on practice WURs to determine students' writing levels and will adjust their classroom instruction to address identified writing deficits.
Writing Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
85% (425) of 10 th grade students will score at 3.0 or higher on the 2013 administration of the FCAT writing test.	85% (373) of 10 th grade students achieved proficiency with a score of 3.0 or above on the 2012 FCAT writing test	86% (430) of 10 th grade students will score a 3.0 or above on the 2013 FCAT writing test.					
			1A.2. Lack of teacher familiarity with the new scoring rubric	1A.2. Two teachers will attend a two day long workshop to learn the new scoring rubric and will then	1A.2. Stacy Fabrega	1A.2. self evaluation	1A.2.When grading WUR, teachers will employ the new rubric and self assess their level

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

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

			share with the department			of confidence in using the rubric and the need for further training.
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
IB. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.		1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Writing Goal #1B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>				
<i>This box left blank intentionally</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>				
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.

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
WUR training	9-10	Cathy Korder	Kaycee Giglio and Sarah Harris	Sept. 10-11, 2012	Teachers to discuss their difficulties in grading after first WUR administration in October. Ongoing discussions planned for monthly department meeting.	Stacy Fabrega
Core Benchmark training	9-12	TBA- Training provided by Leon County	Rebecca Kirchharr and Stacy Fabrega	Sept. 24, Nov. 5, Dec. 10, January 18, February 18, March 11, April 8, Friday May 3	Rebecca and Stacy will share information with the English department during monthly meetings. Follow up training will be scheduled as needed.	Stacy Fabrega

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

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
FCAT writing and progress monitoring	Teacher developed plans and materials, anchor sets of WUR	N/A	N/A
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
FCAT writing and Progress monitoring	Teacher developed plans and materials, Anchor sets of WUR	N/A	N/A
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Monthly grade level meeting	Teacher developed plans and materials, anchor sets of WUR	N/A	N/A
Additional grade level training as needed	Teacher developed plans and materials, Anchor sets of WUR	N/A	N/A
Substitutes for teachers attending PD?			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

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: N/A Will be included in the 2013-14 plan	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			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: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.

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:

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

End of U.S. History Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			1.1. Individual/family in crisis Personal mental health/emotional concerns	1.1. Refer students to Response to Intervention Team, Target Team and/or Guidance for appropriate counseling	1.1 Assistant Principal for Attendance	1.1. Use attendance reports in Genesis to track changes in attendance Use Pinpoint to inform parents about attendance patterns	1.1. Genesis and Pinpoint Reports
Attendance Goal #1:	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					
To increase the average daily attendance for each grading period to 94% and above for the 2012/13 school year (The average daily attendance increased from 93.04% in 2011 to 93.41% in 2012)	93.41% 1733 <i>Based on 1855 enrolled</i>	94% 1821.72 <i>Based on 1937enrolled</i>					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>					
	427(23%) <i>(includes both excused & unexcused absences)</i> <i>(106 unexcused abs)</i>	397 (20%) <i>(decrease by 30 students with 10 or more unexcused absences)</i>					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive</u>					

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

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

	Tardies (10 or more)	Tardies (10 or more)					
	208 (11%) <i>Targeted periods 1st & 5th</i>	168 (9%) <i>Targeted periods 1st & 5th</i>					
			1.2. Difficulty in garnering parent support of students who are under age 16 and are truant (15 or more days unexcused absent)	1.2. Initiate the Attendance Tracking Form (ATF) process to include the intervention team, attendance contracts, truancy letters and the social worker as needed	1.2. Assistant Principal for Attendance	1.2. Attendance conferences; Intervention services home visits	1.2. CSAP (Compulsory School Attendance Packet)
			1.3 Low performing students are often apathetic/unmotivated toward school	1.3 Target Team will make referrals to APA of students with a pattern of non-attendance; offer Oasis and Guys Council sessions; SGA incentives to increase attendance; offer opportunities for students to belong to a social/academic or athletic club	1.3 Assistant Principal for Attendance	1.3 Collegial conversations with Target Team; review attendance reports; weekly review updates with Oasis and Guys Council (CCYS) counselors	1.3 Genesis Reports Educator's Handbook Target Team data Oasis and CCYS data

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/Discipline Training	9-12	Dr. Rodgers Community presenters/LCS leadership	APA's	Every month on the 3 rd Thursday	Monthly review of Genesis reports	Dr. Kathleen Rodgers

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
N/A			
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
Subtotal:			
Other			

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Suspension Goal #1: To decrease the number of out of school suspensions by 20%	2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions	Zero tolerance for major incidences such as bullying, fighting, drugs, alcohol, etc.	SRD/APA visits classroom to inform students on the signs of bullying and other discipline violations relative to major incidences Check for OCP (Off Campus Passes) as students leave campus for lunch	1.1. Assistant Principal for Student Affairs	1.1. Open door policy for students to report these type incidences to Student Affairs Staff to include, APA, SRD and hall monitors	1.1. Educator’s Handbook and Genesis Discipline Reporting System
	16 (.86%) Based on 1855 enrolled)	16 or below Based on 1937 enrolled					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School					
	15 (.80%)	15 or below					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	211 (11%)	169 (8.7%)					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School					
151 (8.1%)	127 (6.2%)						
			1.2. Skipping and/or truant students may increase disciplinary incidents off campus	1.2. Hall monitors & SRO routinely walk the halls and the perimeter of the campus	1.2. APA for Student Affairs	1.2. Track the number of students caught skipping on or off campus	1.2. Genesis and Educator’s Handbook

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

		1.3. A systematic ISS program was not in operation for the last two years	1.3. Hired person to run ISS program which keeps students in school and allows them to work on assignments.	1.3. APA for Student Affairs and ISS personnel	1.3. Track students in ISS to determine recidivism in disciplinary actions; refer repeat offenders to guidance or community agencies	1.3. Educator's Handbook
--	--	---	---	--	--	--------------------------

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
Attendance/Discipline Training	9-12	Dr. Rodgers/Community presenters/LCS leadership	APA's	3 rd Thursday each month	Monthly review of Genesis and Educator's Handbook reports	Dr. Kathleen Rodgers

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
N/A			

Subtotal:

Technology

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			

Subtotal:

Professional Development

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			

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

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

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Dropout Prevention			1.1. Student apathy resulting from scoring below proficiency on the FCAT reading	1.1. Developed a Target team of teachers that consists of 9 th & 10 th grade English, social studies, & Hope/PE teachers)	1.1. APC/Target Team Teachers	1.1. Target teams meets bi-monthly to review student performance in academic, discipline and attendance; teachers will work towards building commonality in lesson planning for target students	1.1. Progress Monitoring programs (Academic 3000)
<u>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</u> To identify struggling students earlier and provide appropriate interventions.	2012 Current Dropout Rate:*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*					
	TBA	<i>Enter numerical data for expected dropout rate in this box.</i>					
Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.	2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*					
	TBA	<i>Enter numerical data for expected graduation rate in this box.</i>					
			1.2. Discouragement due to failure on classroom benchmark assessments.	1.2. Teachers develop and implement a retake policy that assure student accountability and learning. Students are given additional opportunities to show proficiency.	1.2. A.P.C./Target Team teachers	1.2. Target Team meets bi-monthly to review student performance in academics, discipline and attendance; teachers will work towards building commonality in assessment and retake policies.	1.2. progress Monitoring programs (Achieve 3000) and 9-weeks grades
						1.3.	1.3.

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

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

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement			1.1. Number of parents available to volunteer may not have LCS volunteer forms on file.	1.1. Provide school updates and information on a regular basis via the school list serve. Hold a drive to have parents sign-up for list serve and complete a volunteer form at events.	1.1. PTO President	1.1. . Track the number of parent signed up at various events; Collect input from parents from the same. Track the number of volunteer forms on file	1.1. Parents sign in sheets; Parents feedback forms;
Parent Involvement Goal #1: Increase cross communication among school committees and/or organizations to keep parents and guardians informed regarding the work of these crucial school committees: SITE, School Advisory Council (SAC), and Parent Teacher Organization (PTO).	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:* <i>210 parents (volunteer forms turned in)</i>	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:* <i>231 To increase by at least 10% each yr.</i>	1.2.	1.2. Provide regular written communication via PTO newsletter to inform and involve parents/guardians in school activities.	1.2.PTO President	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3. Keep school website up-to-date with relevant dates, activities, and information.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

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

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: <i>Based on the 2011-2012 Biology EOC baseline data, 32% (153) of students at Leon High School scored in the middle third on the assessment.</i>	1.1. Students lack the ability to think scientifically when solving complex science problems.	1.1. The teacher will engage students in Argument Driven Inquiry (ADI) tasks which will engage students in real world applications of science, and at the same time embed Common Core standards in the teaching of science.	1.1. Classroom teacher; Department Chair; Administration	1.1. Analysis of classroom assessments and regular progress monitoring.	1.1. Progress monitoring assessments & 2012-2013 Biology EOC

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

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

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

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

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

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: 35% of students currently enrolled in CTE courses will complete a National Certification prior to graduation	1.1. Lack of student readiness	1.1. Increase student enrollment in CTE programs.	1.1. Classroom Teacher	1.1. Teachers will assess projects with compliance with teacher rubrics and National certifications	1.1. 35% of students enrolled in CTE classes will receive a national certificate prior to graduation.
	1.2. Teacher training with NEW National Certifications	1.2. Teacher enrollment and completion in subject area skills certification programs/course	1.2. Classroom Teacher	1.2. self evaluation	1.2. certificates
	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
National Certifications	9 th -12 th	Athena Gill	All CTE instructors	Quarterly	Teachers to discuss any difficulties of various new program certifications, Ongoing discussions planned for monthly department meetings.	Athena Gill
Conferences/classes for teachers in subject area skills	9 th -12 th		All CTE instructors		Teachers will incorporate rigor in technical career programs to prepare students of the world of work	Administration

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
National Tests	Certiport Exams	Internal funds	\$2000.00
	NCCER tests	Internal funds	\$4000.00
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
FETC Conference		Internal funds	\$1000.00
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			7,000.00 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. Progress Monitoring: AP exam is administered at the close of the school year (May 2013)	1.1 Implement progress check of AP student grade at the end of each grading period (Oct 2012 & Dec 2012)	1.1 AP teacher	1.1. Teacher recommendations submitted to the Guidance Dept regarding students who are continually failing to meet course objectives.	1.1. Student Progress reports and Student Report Cards
Additional Goal #1:	<u>2012 Current Level</u> :*	<u>2013 Expected Level</u> :*					
Advanced Placement Success Rate At least 60% of all students enrolled in 2012-13 AP courses will receive a score of 3 or higher on his/her AP exam(s). 1,168 AP exams were administered in May 2012.	Leon HS: 53% (327 of 612 AP students) FL: 51% Global: 61%	60% (379 of 633 students) = 1,195 exams					
			1.2. New Teachers to AP program	1.2. Create opportunities/provide funding for AP teachers to participate in Professional Development training/workshops	1.2 Principal/AP Coordinator	1.2. Classroom observations with opportunity for feedback and support	1.2. AP score report (received in July 2012)

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
AP & Pre-AP PLC	AP	College Board rep or designee	AP & Pre-AP teachers	Quarterly	Feedback collected at each meeting	AP Coordinator

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

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
AP Workshops and trainings	College Board	Advanced Placement	\$5,000.00
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			5,000.00 Total:

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	22,400.00 Total:
CELLA Budget	

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

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

	0.00 Total:
Mathematics Budget	
	480.00 Total:
Science Budget	
	4,200.00 Total:
Writing Budget	
	0.00 Total:
Civics Budget	
	n/a Total:
U.S. History Budget	
	n/a Total:
Attendance Budget	
	0.00 Total:
Suspension Budget	
	0.00 Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget	
	0.00 Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	
	0.00 Total:
STEM Budget	
	Total:
CTE Budget	
	7,000.00 Total:
Additional Goals	
	5,000.00 Total:
	39,080.00 Grand Total:

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

Please choose the school's DA Status. (To activate the checkbox: 1. Double click the desired box; 2. When the menu pops up, select *Checked* under "Default value" header; 3. Select *OK*, this will place an "x" in the box.) **Not applicable this year**

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

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

Yes No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.	
Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.	
The School Advisory Council composes and monitors the implementation of the School Improvement Plan. Teacher needs, and enhancements for FCAT preparation, End of Course Exams, and school improvement are provided through SAC dollars. SAC serves as a liaison to our community to address issues with surrounding neighborhoods, helping our school to be a good neighbor. Committees also address issues relating to academics, attendance, communication, health, fitness, crime, violence, and safety.	
Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
SAC operation expenses	\$150.
Academic Enhancement Grants	\$5000.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
	\$5,150.