

# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



## DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

**School Information**

School Name: Odessa Elementary School	District Name: Pasco County School Board
Principal: Teresa Love	Superintendent: Heather Fiorentino
SAC Chair: Les Sterns	Date of School Board Approval:

**Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:**

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

[High School Feedback Report](#)

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

**Administrators**

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

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Teresa Love	Degrees: Masters in Educational Leadership, Bachelors in Elementary Education Certificates: School Principal, Educational Leadership K-12, Elementary Education 1-6	2	10	CES: 2009-2010 -B, AYP –No ODES: 2011-2012 -A
Assistant Principal	John Thomas	Degrees: Masters in Educational Leadership, Bachelors in Elementary Education Certificates: Educational Leadership, Guidance K12, Elementary Education 1-6	0	0	NA

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

### Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Joy Milner	Degree: Masters in Reading Certificates: Primary Education K-3, Reading Education K-12, Elementary Education 1-6	2	3	DBES: 2009-2010 A, AYP –No ODES: 2011-2012 A

### Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Hire only highly qualified teachers.	Administration	NA
2. Meetings will be held with new teachers to offer support.	Administration	Ongoing
3.		
4.		

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

***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
5% (57)	Teacher will obtain certification for gifted endorsement and ESOL.

***Staff Demographics***

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
57	0% (0)	46% (26)	32% (18)	23% (13)	12% (7)	72% (41)	5% (3)	1% (1)	44% (25)

***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
Ryan Ketterer	Lisa Grimsley	Proximity and both employees are on the same team.	Weekly meetings.

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

### Additional Requirements

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

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

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

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

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

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

### School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

- Teresa Love, Principal
- John Thomas, Assistant Principal
- Joy Milner, Literacy Coach
- Sarah Quispe, Guidance Counselor
- Wendy Belfield, School Social Worker
- Mary Davis, School Nurse
- Michelle Hartman, Teacher
- Lourdes Plunkett, Teacher
- Mary Rozycki, Teacher
- Billie Sass, Teacher
- Emily Barnes, Teacher
- Aubrey Testoni, Teacher
- Lisa Grimsley, Music Teacher
- Elyse Centonze, Speech Pathologist
- Audra Tuetken, ESE Support Facilitator
- Kathy Wieczorek, ESE Support Facilitator
- Jamie Nienhouse, Teacher
- Kim Ashton, Teacher

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?

MTSS/RtI leadership team meets monthly and focuses on:

- identifying school-wide common assessments
- continuously developing a common understand regarding the score and potential impact of the MTSS/RtI implementation
- supporting facilitator training
- holding weekly grade level meetings that focus on the MTSS/RtI process
- creating a guided plan for meetings, agendas and action plans based on the needs of the school
- planning for interventions

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?

- Analysis of relevant demographic/school profile data for the purpose of problem analysis and hypothesis generation
- Analysis of school wide and grade level data in order to identify trends and groups in need of interventions
- Development of assessment strategies and calendars
- Development of data review plans, supports and calendars
- Development of processes to ensure intervention fidelity
- Review of progress monitoring data and planning for interventions
- Assessment of MTSS/RtI implementation progress
- Assessment of school staff's skill development

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011



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

-Development of professional development/ technical assistance plan to support MTSS/RtI implementation
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. Reading: FAIR data, running records, curriculum assessments, FCAT Writing: monthly demand prompts, curriculum assessments, FCAT Math: Core K-12 assessments, pre/post assessments, FCAT Science: Core K-12 assessments, curriculum assessments, FCAT
Describe the plan to support MTSS. ODES' MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will continue with year 3 of district professional development and coaching. Teachers and staff will receive support to understand the MTSS/RtI model and differentiate between the three tiers of support as well as collaborate to provide targeted interventions with fidelity to maximize the impact on student performance. Teachers will continue to receive resources to provide assistance in data collection and planning for interventions. The Literacy Coach will work through individual coaching cycles with teachers to meet their needs in increasing student achievement.

### *Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)*

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

### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

- Teresa Love, Principal
- John Thomas, Assistant Principal
- Joy Milner, Literacy Coach
- Lisa Grimsley, Music Teacher
- Elyse Centonze, Speech Pathologist
- Cathy Smith, Teacher
- Michelle Hartman, Teacher
- Michele Rigoglioso, Teacher
- Nicole Gleichowski, Teacher
- Jaime Nienhouse, Teacher
- Lourdes Plunkett, Teacher
- Matt Testoni, Teacher
- Dara Tucker, Teacher
- Danielle Shimer, Teacher
- Chris Grant, Teacher

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

- initiate and sustain change efforts in literacy instruction
- implement and monitor school-wide professional development plan
- continually analyze student performance data in reading
- continually analyze instructional practices of teachers to identify professional development needs (individually and collectively)
- make SIP adjustments based on the progress monitoring of literacy goals and objectives
- meet monthly
- implement and monitor our literacy program
- communicate with the school stakeholders

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

Our focus will be on deepening teacher understanding of the Common Core State Standards.

An additional focus will be on student self-selecting text at an independent level and daily designated time for independent reading for all classrooms and all students.

Another focus will be on the implementation of the Research and Inquiry activities within the MMH reading series.

Last focus will be providing various instructional opportunities for students to read, write, discuss and listen to text for different specific purposes.

### ***Public School Choice***

- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**

*Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.*

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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

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

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

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

***\*High Schools Only***

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

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

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

***Postsecondary Transition***

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

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



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

<i>proficiency (scoring level 5 or 6) in reading will be 33 percent.</i>		Student time and engagement during independent reading is limited.	Teachers will incorporate peer buddies into independent reading to provide models and increase motivation and engagement.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration, Team Leader, Media Coach	Observations and data analysis	Student Outcome Data (BRIDGE)
		The PCI and MEville to WEville does not provide student engagement needed.	Teachers will integrate technology to increase student engagement.	IB.3. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration, Team Leader	PCI and Teacher Developed Assessments	Florida Alternative Assessment

## 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
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.</b>			Classroom instruction is not meeting the needs of all learners.	Teachers will provide clear and focused learning goals and analyze data to differentiate instruction in order to meet the needs of all students.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration, Team Leaders	Walkthroughs and data analysis	Lesson plans
Reading Goal #2A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>The percentage of students above proficiency (scoring 4 or 5) in reading will increase from 44% to 55%</i>							
<i>Census</i>			The MMH does not provide the rigor of questioning needed.	Teachers will develop high-level text dependent questions.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration, Team Leaders	MMH Unit assessments	FAIR
<i>Gr</i>	<i>Lev4</i>	<i>Lev5</i>					
<i>3</i>	<i>31 %</i>	<i>13 %</i>					
<i>4</i>	<i>23 %</i>	<i>12 %</i>					
<i>5</i>	<i>34 %</i>	<i>18 %</i>					
<i>Total</i>	<i>29 %</i>	<i>14 %</i>					
<i>Total</i>	<i>22%</i>						
			Student time and engagement during independent reading is limited.	Teachers will incorporate time for daily independent reading.  Teachers will monitor students' selection of text at their instructional level through conferencing.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration, Media Specialist	Student conferencing, reading logs.	Student outcome data, FAIR
			Lack of time and lack of teacher understanding.	Teachers will provide opportunities for students to read, write, discuss and listen to text for different specific purposes.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration, Team Leaders	Walkthroughs, data analysis	Lesson plans
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.</b>			Classroom instruction is not meeting the needs of all learners.	Teachers will provide clear and focused learning goals and analyze data to differentiate instruction in order to meet the needs of all students.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration, Team Leader	Data analysis	Lesson plans
Reading Goal #2B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>The percentage of students above proficiency (scoring 7 or higher) in reading will increase from 25% to 33%.</i>							
			Student time and engagement during independent reading is limited.	Teachers will incorporate peer buddies into independent reading to provide models and increase motivation and engagement.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration, Team Leader, Media Coach	Observations and data analysis	Student Outcome Data (BRIDGE)
			The PCI and MEville to WEville does not provide student engagement needed.	Teachers will integrate technology to increase student engagement.	1B.3. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration, Team Leader	PCI and Teacher Developed Assessments	Florida Alternative Assessment

## 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
<b>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</b>			Instructional routine is not meeting the needs of all learners.	Teachers will provide clear and focused learning goals and analyze data to differentiate instruction in order to meet the needs of all students.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	Walkthroughs and data analysis	Lesson plans
<b>Reading Goal #3A:</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>The percentage of students making learning gains in reading will increase from 76% to 81%.</i>	76%	81%					
			The MMH does not provide the rigor of questioning needed.	Teachers will develop high-level text dependent questions.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	MMH Unit assessments	FAIR
			Student time and engagement during independent reading is limited.	Teachers will incorporate time for daily independent reading.  Teachers will monitor students' selection of text at their instructional level through conferencing.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration, Media Specialists	Student conferencing, reading logs.	Student outcome data, FAIR
			Lack of time and lack of teacher understanding.	Teachers will provide opportunities for students to read, write, discuss and listen to text for different specific purposes.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration, Team Leaders	Walkthroughs, data analysis	Lesson plans
<b>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</b>			Instructional routine is not meeting the needs of all learners.	Teachers will provide clear and focused learning goals and analyze data to differentiate instruction in order to meet the needs of all students.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	Observations from team members	Lesson plans
<b>Reading Goal #3B:</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>The percentage of students making learning gains in reading will increase from 25% to 33%</i>	25%	33%					
			PCI and MEville and WEville do not meet the needs of all of our students.	Teachers will develop high-level text dependent questions, as well as integrate technology.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	PCI and Teacher Developed Assessments	FAA
			Student engagement during group reading is limited.	Teachers will monitor students' interaction with text at their instructional level through observation and informal assessment.	Teachers, Literacy Coach	Student conferencing, reading logs.	Student outcome data, PCI

## 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
<b>4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b>			Intervention time is inconsistent. Students lack reading stamina.	Teachers will utilize their extra 30 minutes for student intervention time.  Teachers will embed a minimum of 10-15 minutes for scaffolding independent reading.	Teachers, Administration, Literacy Coach, Support Facilitators	Intervention logs	Student outcome data
Reading Goal #4A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading will increase from 74% to 79%.	74%	79%	Students are not responding to Tier I instruction.	Teachers will implement TBITs and monthly grade level data meeting structures with the problem-solving model to match instruction with student's needs.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration, RTI Team, Leadership Team	TBIT minutes, RTI minutes, team meeting minutes	Student outcome data, FAIR, MMH Weekly and Unit assessments, progress monitoring
			Lack of time and lack of teacher understanding.	Teachers will provide opportunities for students to read, write, discuss and listen to text for different specific purposes.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration, Team Leaders	Walkthroughs, data analysis	Lesson plans
<b>4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b>			Instructional routine and diverse level(s) of the students makes it difficult to meet the needs of all learners.	Teachers will provide clear and focused learning goals and analyze data to differentiate instruction in order to meet the needs of all students.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	Observations from team members	Lesson plans
Reading Goal #4B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
NA	NA	NA	PCI and MEville and WEville do not adequately address the needs of our lowest performing students (nonverbal, engage in highly repetitive behaviors, off-task).	Age development activities and items will be integrated into reading time, as well as the use of technology.	Teachers, Peers, Literacy Coach, Administration	PCI and Teacher Developed Assessments	Student outcome data
			Student engagement during group reading is limited.	Circle Time logistics will be evaluated, as well as data collected. Integrate technology and music.	Teachers, Peers, Literacy Coach, Administration	PCI and Teacher Developed Assessments	Student outcome data



## 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				
<b>5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b> <b>Reading Goal #5A:</b>  In June 2013, the number of level 1 and level 2 students will decrease by 2% each year.	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>		The percentage of students maintaining proficiency (scoring a level 3) or moving to above proficiency (scoring level 4 or 5) in reading will increase from 72% (Census report) to 79%.  The percentage of students above proficiency (scoring 4 or 5) in reading will increase from 44% to 55%.  The percentage of students making learning gains in reading will increase from 76% to 81%.  The percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading will increase from 74% to 79%.								
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool					
<b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b> <b>Reading Goal #5B:</b>  The number of Hispanic students scoring at a level 1 or 2 will decrease from 40% to 22%.	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</th> <th>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Hispanic: 40% (75)</td> <td>Hispanic: 22%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	Hispanic: 40% (75)	Hispanic: 22%	Intervention time is inconsistent.  Students lack reading stamina.	Teachers will utilize their extra 30 minutes for student intervention time.  Teachers will embed a minimum of 10-15 minutes for scaffolding independent reading.	Teachers, Administration, Literacy Coach, Support Facilitators	Intervention logs	Student outcome data	
	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*									
	Hispanic: 40% (75)	Hispanic: 22%									
	Students are not responding to Tier I instruction.	Teachers will implement TBITs and monthly grade level data meeting structures with the problem-solving model to match instruction with student's needs.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration, RTI Team, Leadership Team	TBIT minutes, RTI minutes, team meeting minutes	Student outcome data, FAIR, MMH Weekly and Unit assessments, progress monitoring						
	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.					

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			Intervention time is inconsistent. Students lack reading stamina.	Teachers will utilize their extra 30 minutes for student intervention time.  Teachers will embed a minimum of 10-15 minutes for scaffolding independent reading.	Teachers, Administration, Literacy Coach, Support Facilitators	Intervention logs	Student outcome data
<b>Reading Goal #5C:</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>In 2013 the number of ELL-LY students not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease 10%.</i>	LY 92% LZ 25%	Decrease LY by 10% and LZ by 5%.					
<i>In 2013 the number of ELL-LZ students not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease 5%.</i>			Students are not responding to Tier I instruction.	Teachers will implement TBITs and monthly grade level data meeting structures with the problem -solving model to match instruction with student's needs.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration, RTI Team, Leadership Team	TBIT minutes, RTI minutes, team meeting minutes	Student outcome data, FAIR, MMH Weekly and Unit assessments, progress monitoring
			Lack of time and lack of teacher understanding.	Teachers will provide opportunities for students to read, write, discuss and listen to text for different specific purposes.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration, Team Leaders	Walkthroughs, data analysis	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
<b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			Intervention time is inconsistent. Students lack reading stamina.	Teachers will utilize their extra 30 minutes for student intervention time.  Teachers will embed a minimum of 10-15 minutes for scaffolding independent reading.	Teachers, Administration, Literacy Coach, Support Facilitators	Intervention logs	Student outcome data
<b>Reading Goal #5D:</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>In 2013 the number of SWD students not making satisfactory progress, scoring a level 1 or 2, in reading will decrease by 10%.</i>	27% are scored a level 1 or level 2.	Decrease level 1 or level 2 by 10%					
			Students are not responding to Tier I instruction.	Teachers will implement TBITs and monthly grade level data meeting structures with the problem -solving model to match instruction with student's needs.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration, RTI Team, Leadership Team	TBIT minutes, RTI minutes, team meeting minutes	Student outcome data, FAIR, MMH Weekly and Unit assessments, progress monitoring
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			Classroom instruction is not meeting the needs of all learners.	Teachers will provide clear and focused learning goals and analyze data to differentiate instruction in order to meet the needs of all students.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration, Team Leaders	Walkthroughs and data analysis	Lesson plans
Reading Goal #5E:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>In 2013 Economically Disadvantage students not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease 10%.</i>	<i>Lunch Codes: Code 0 = 19% Code 1 = 40% Code 2 = 42% Code 3 = 39%</i>	<i>Lunch Codes: Code 0 = 9% Code 1 = 30% Code 2 = 32% Code 3 = 29%</i>					
			The MMH does not provide the rigor of questioning needed.	Teachers will develop high-level text dependent questions.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration, Team Leaders	MMH Unit assessments	FAIR
				Student time and engagement during independent reading is limited.	Teachers will incorporate time for daily independent reading.  Teachers will monitor students' selection of text at their instructional level through conferencing.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration, Media Specialist	Student conferencing, reading logs
			Lack of time and lack of teacher understanding.	Teachers will provide opportunities for students to read, write, discuss and listen to text for different specific purposes.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration, Team Leaders	Walkthroughs, data analysis	Lesson plans

## 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
Building Under of the CCSS for ELA	All	Literacy Coach, Administration	School-wide	Weekly	See TEF (staff) Evaluation section	Literacy Coach, Administration, Lead Literacy Team

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

**Reading Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
All reading strategies	MacMillan /McGraw-Hill MMH Treasures	School textbook budget	\$2,104.91
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total: \$2,104.91</b>

*End of Reading Goals*

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

**Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals**

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

CELLA Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
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
<b>1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.</b>			Intervention time is inconsistent. Students lack reading stamina.	Teachers will utilize their extra 30 minutes for student intervention time.  Teachers will embed a minimum of 10-15 minutes for scaffolding independent reading.	Teachers, Administration, Literacy Coach, Support Facilitators	Intervention logs	Student outcome data
CELLA Goal #1: <i>The percentage of students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking will increase from 40% to 67%.</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:  40% of students scored Proficient in Listening/Speaking.						
CELLA LIST/SPEA			Students are not responding to Tier I instruction.  Lack of time and lack of teacher understanding.	Teachers will implement TBITs and monthly grade level data meeting structures with the problem -solving model to match instruction with student's needs.  Teachers will provide opportunities for students to read, write, discuss and listen to text for different specific purposes.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration, RTI Team, Leadership Team  Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration, Team Leaders	TBIT minutes, RTI minutes, team meeting minutes  Walkthroughs, data analysis	Student outcome data, FAIR, MMH Weekly and Unit assessments, progress monitoring  Lesson plans
Gr	#Stud	Prof					
K	5	2					
1	4	3					
2	2	2					
3	4	0					
4	7	3					
5	3	0					
Total	25	10					
%	100%	40%					
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
<b>2. Students scoring proficient in reading.</b>			Intervention time is inconsistent. Students lack reading stamina.	Teachers will utilize their extra 30 minutes for student intervention time.  Teachers will embed a minimum of 10-15 minutes for scaffolding independent reading.	Teachers, Administration, Literacy Coach, Support Facilitators	Intervention logs	Student outcome data
CELLA Goal #2: <i>The percentage of students scoring proficient in reading will increase from 20% to 47%.</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:  20% of students scored Proficient in Reading						
CELLA READING			Students are not responding to Tier I instruction.	Teachers will implement TBITs and monthly grade level data meeting structures with the problem -solving model to match instruction with student's needs.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration, RTI Team, Leadership Team	TBIT minutes, RTI minutes, team meeting minutes	Student outcome data, FAIR, MMH Weekly and Unit assessments, progress monitoring
Gr	#Stud	Prof					
K	5	0					

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

1	4	1		Lack of time and lack of teacher understanding.	Teachers will provide opportunities for students to read, write, discuss and listen to text for different specific purposes.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration, Team Leaders	Walkthroughs, data analysis	Lesson plans
2	2	2						
3	4	0						
4	7	1						
5	3	1						
Total	25	5						
%	100%	20%						

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool																												
<b>3. Students scoring proficient in writing.</b>			Teachers do not have time to collaborate and plan for writing instruction. Also limited time to focus on standards and student data.	Structured and collaborated time for grade level PLCs to examine standards, analyze samples of student writing using common rubrics and plan with the end in mind.	Classroom Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	Documented minutes of PLCs, Student rubrics	Lesson plans, student work samples																												
<b>CELLA Goal #3:</b> <i>The percentage of students scoring proficient in Writing will increase from 28% to 55%.</i>																																			
<b>CELLA WRITING</b> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Gr</th> <th>#Stud</th> <th>Prof</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>K</td> <td>5</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>4</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>2</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>7</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>25</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>%</td> <td>100%</td> <td>28%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Gr	#Stud	Prof	K	5	0	1	4	2	2	2	2	3	4	0	4	7	1	5	3	2	Total	25	7	%	100%	28%	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : 28% of students scored Proficient in writing	Grammar lessons are not consistently and pervasively taught.	Teachers will implement weekly grammar MMH focus lessons.	All teachers	MMH Weekly and Unit Grammar Assessments	Students writing samples
Gr	#Stud	Prof																																	
K	5	0																																	
1	4	2																																	
2	2	2																																	
3	4	0																																	
4	7	1																																	
5	3	2																																	
Total	25	7																																	
%	100%	28%																																	
			Not enough time for students to apply writing skills.	Teachers will provide increased opportunities for students to summarize their learning through writing.	All teachers	Student work samples	Student work samples																												

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

**CELLA Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
None			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total: \$0.00</b>

*End of CELLA Goals*



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

### Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.</b>		Lack of materials/resources Meeting all student's needs	Provide clear and focused learning goals. Provide direct instruction in problem solving/critical thinking strategies on a daily basis.  Specific problem solving/critical thinking strategies will be identified and utilized across all grade levels by teachers, staff and students.  Teachers will differentiate instruction in order to meet the needs of all students based on current student data. (Pre test/Post test and CORE K12)	Teachers, Administrators, District Support	Lesson Plans, Administrator observations, informal observations by teachers, PLC discussions and data sharing	Go Math assessments, Pre and Post test, Spreadsheets, Core K12	
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>						<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>
<i>By 2013, 40% of students will achieve proficiency (level 3) on math FCAT.</i>	71%						79%
Gr	Lev 3 or above						
3	63						
4	74						
5	76						
Total	71						
1A.2.		Lack of consistency using assessments among grade level teachers.	Teachers will administer common assessments. Data from these tests will be analyzed in order to plan instruction.	Teachers, Grade level groups	Math spreadsheets, progress monitoring, PLC discussions and data sharing	Go Math assessments, Pre and Post test, Spreadsheets, Core K12	
1A.3. Pacing and new teachers to the grade level		Pacing and new teachers	Review and adjust math district pacing guides	Teachers, Grade level groups, PLC facilitators, math committee	Lesson plans, updated pacing guide, Administration observations	Go Math assessments, Pre and Post test, Core K12	
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</b>		Lack of materials/resources Meeting all student's needs	Provide clear and focused learning goals. Provide direct instruction in problem solving/critical thinking strategies on a daily basis.  Specific problem solving/critical thinking strategies will be identified and utilized at the student's developmental level by teachers and staff.  Teachers will differentiate instruction in order to meet the needs of all students based on current student data. (Equals)	Teachers, Administrators, District Support	Lesson Plans, Administrator observations, informal observations by teachers, team discussions and data sharing	Equals math assessments, informal math assessments.	
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>						<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>
<i>By 2013, 66% of students will achieve proficiency (level 4) on the Math FAA.</i>	50%						66%
		Students are performing at vastly different levels, as well as have different personal learning abilities.	Teachers will administer common assessments. Data from these tests will be analyzed in order to plan instruction.	Teachers, team data meetings	Team discussions and data sharing	Unit assessments, observaions.	

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

		Pacing of curriculum	Review and adjust math district pacing guides	Teachers, Grade level groups	Lesson Plans, Administrator observations, informal observations by teachers, team discussions and data sharing	Unit assessments and observation.
--	--	----------------------	---	------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------

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

## 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																				
<p><b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.</b></p> <p><b>Mathematics Goal #2A:</b></p> <p><i>By 2013, 61% of students will preform a level 4 or 5 on the math FCAT.</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin-top: 10px;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 10%;">Grade</th> <th style="width: 10%;">Lev 4</th> <th style="width: 10%;">Lev 5</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>19%</td> <td>12%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>24%</td> <td>16%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>26%</td> <td>16%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td><b>23%</b></td> <td><b>15%</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Over all</i></td> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">19%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Grade	Lev 4	Lev 5	3	19%	12%	4	24%	16%	5	26%	16%	<b>Total</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<i>Over all</i>	19%		<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p> <p>38%</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p> <p>61%</p>	<p>Not enough sufficient enrichment activities</p> <p>Limited technology integrated in math</p>	<p>Students will participate in project based learning through technology integration.</p>	<p>Teachers, Administration, Technology Specialist</p>	<p>Evidence of teaching in math notebooks</p>	<p>Lesson Plans, walkthrough and data</p>
	Grade	Lev 4	Lev 5																						
	3	19%	12%																						
	4	24%	16%																						
5	26%	16%																							
<b>Total</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>15%</b>																							
<i>Over all</i>	19%																								
<p>2A.2.</p> <p>2A.3. Generic Differentiated Instruction for upper end</p>			<p>Not enough time to cover math skills</p>	<p>Special Area Teachers and other non-classroom personnel will incorporate math concepts.</p>	<p>Special area teachers, Administration, Team Leaders</p>	<p>Lesson plans, Administration observation</p>	<p>Formative Assessments</p>																		
			<p>Generic differentiated instruction</p>	<p>Teachers will implement math stations to meet the needs of the students based on student's data.</p>	<p>Teachers, PLC Facilitators, Grade level groups</p>	<p>Student/Teacher conferences,</p>	<p>Rubrics</p>																		
<p><b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.</b></p> <p><b>Mathematics Goal #2B:</b></p> <p><i>By 2013, 66% of students will preform a level 4 or 5 on the math FCAT.</i></p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p> <p>50%</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p> <p>66%</p>	<p>Not enough sufficient enrichment activities</p> <p>Limited technology integrated in math</p>	<p>Students will participate in project based learning through technology integration.</p>	<p>Teachers, Administration</p>	<p>Evidence of teachers imbedding the use of math manipulatives and students using math manipulatives appropriately.</p>	<p>Lesson plans, data</p>																		
			<p>Not enough time to cover math skills</p> <p>Needs of the students is vast and difficult to differentiate</p>	<p>Special Area Teachers will incorporate math concepts.</p>	<p>Special area teachers, Administration, Team Leader</p>	<p>Lesson plans, peer/administrative observation</p>	<p>Informal assessments</p>																		
				<p>Teachers will implement math stations to meet the needs of the students based on student's data.</p>	<p>Teachers, Team meetings</p>	<p>Team data meetings</p>	<p>Lesson plans, data</p>																		

## 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
<b>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			Resources for math stations	Teachers will provide clear and focused learning goals.  Teachers will differentiate instruction in order to meet the needs of all students based on current student data.	Teachers, PLC Facilitators, Grade level groups	Evidence of essential questions posted and referenced, pre and post math tests	Post test, Big Idea and CORE K12 Math Data
<u>Mathematics Goal #3A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>By 2013, 90% of students will make learning gains on the math FCAT.</i>	85%	90%					
				Special Area teachers and other non-classroom personnel will incorporate math concepts	Special Area Teachers, Administration, Team Leaders	Lesson plans, Administration observation	Formative Assessments
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
<b>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			Lack of resources for math stations	Teachers will provide clear and focused learning goals.  Teachers will differentiate instruction in order to meet the needs of all students based on current student data.	Teachers, PLC Facilitator, Grade level group	Evidence of essential questions posted and referenced, pre and post math tests	Big idea and CORE k12, when possible
<u>Mathematics Goal #3B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>NA</i>	<i>NA</i>	<i>NA</i>					
			Not enough time to cover needed math concepts for all ability levels	Special Area teachers will incorporate math concepts	Special Area Teachers, Administration, Team Leaders	Lesson plans, observations	Formative assessments
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			Students are unable to read key math terms and vocabulary	<p>Teachers will provide clear and focused learning goals.</p> <p>Teachers will differentiate instruction in order to meet the needs of all students based on current student data.</p> <p>Teachers will identify key math vocabulary and key terms when used in word problems.</p>	Teachers, PLC Facilitators, Grade level groups, Math Committee members	Frequent progress monitoring of vocabulary terms, posting of vocabulary of words, including visuals of words	Post test Big Idea and CORE Data
<u>Mathematics Goal #4A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>By 2013, 78% of the lowest 25% of students will make learning gains on the math FCAT.</i>	70%	78%					
			Lack of math vocabulary instruction and practice.	Implement math word wall, review chapter vocabulary, math journals, including visuals of words	Teachers, PLC Facilitators, Grade level groups, Math Committee members	Frequent progress monitoring of vocabulary terms, posting of vocabulary of words, including visuals of words	Post test Big Idea and CORE Data
			Students need more time to learn and practice math concepts.	Special Area teachers and other non-classroom personnel will incorporate math concepts	Special Area Teachers, Administration, Team Leaders	Lesson plans, Administration observation	Formative Assessments
<b>4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			Students are unable to read key math terms and vocabulary	<p>Teachers will use visuals, paired with visuals to provide an additional resource.</p> <p>Teachers will differentiate instruction in order to meet the needs of all students based on current student data.</p> <p>Teachers will identify key math vocabulary and key terms when used in word problems.</p>	Teachers, Grade level groups, Math Committee members	Progress monitoring of vocabulary terms, posting of vocabulary of words, including visuals of words	Equals math data
<u>Mathematics Goal #4B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>NA</i>	<i>NA</i>	<i>NA</i>					
			Students need more time to learn and practice math concepts	Implement math word wall, review chapter vocabulary, math journals, including visuals of words	Teachers, Grade level groups, Math Committee members	Progress monitoring of vocabulary terms, posting of vocabulary of words, including visuals of words	Equals math data
			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
<b>5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b> <u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u> See 2012-2013	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>			By 2013, 40% of students will achieve proficiency (level 3) on math FCAT.  By 2013, 61% of students will perform a level 4 or 5 on the math FCAT.  By 2013, 90% of students will make learning gains on the math FCAT.  By 2013, 78% of the lowest 25% of students will make learning gains on the math FCAT.				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
<b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b> <u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u> <i>The number of Hispanic students scoring at a level 1 or 2 will decrease from 48% to 32%.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	Students are unable to read key math terms and vocabulary.  Teachers will provide clear and focused learning goals.  Teachers will differentiate instruction in order to meet the needs of all students based on current student data.  Teachers will identify key math vocabulary and key terms when used in word problems.	Teachers, PLC Facilitators, Grade level groups, Math Committee members	Frequent progress monitoring of vocabulary terms, posting of vocabulary of words, including visuals of words	Post test Big Idea and CORE Data		
	Hispanic: 48%	Hispanic: 32%						
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			Not enough time to learn math concepts.	Special Area teachers and other non-classroom personnel will incorporate math concepts.	Special Area Teachers, Administration, Team Leader	Lesson plans, Administration observation	Formative Assessments
<b>Mathematics Goal #5C:</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>					
<i>In 2013 the number of all ELL students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease 10%.</i>	LF 67% LY 100% LZ 25%	Decrease by 10%					
	5C.2. Students are unable to read key math terms and vocabulary	Students are unable to read key math terms and vocabulary					
5C.3. Lack of math vocabulary			Teachers will differentiate instruction in order to meet the needs of all students based on current student data.  Teachers will identify key math vocabulary and key terms when used in word problems.				
			Lack of math vocabulary.	Implement math word wall, review chapter vocabulary, math journals, including visuals of words	Teachers, PLC Facilitators, Grade level groups, Math Committee members	Frequent progress monitoring of vocabulary terms, posting of vocabulary of words, including visuals of words	Post test, Big Idea and CORE K12 Data
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
<b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			Not enough time to learn math concepts.	Special Area teachers and other non-classroom personnel will incorporate math concepts.	Special Area Teachers, Administration, Team Leader	Lesson plans, Administration observation	Formative Assessments
<b>Mathematics Goal #5D:</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>					
<i>In 2013 the number of SWD students not making satisfactory progress, scoring a level 1 or 2, in mathematics will decrease by 10%.</i>	25%	15%					



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

			vocabulary and key terms when used in word problems.			
		Lack of math vocabulary.	Implement math word wall, review chapter vocabulary, math journals, including visuals of words	Teachers, PLC Facilitators, Grade level groups, Math Committee members	Frequent progress monitoring of vocabulary terms, posting of vocabulary of words, including visuals of words	Post test, Big Idea and CORE K12 Data

## 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
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			Not enough time to learn math concepts.	Special Area teachers and other non-classroom personnel will incorporate math concepts.	Special Area Teachers, Administration, Team Leader	Lesson plans, Administration observation	Formative Assessments
<b>Mathematics Goal</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>					
<b>#5E:</b>	<i>Lunch Codes:</i> Code 0 = 21% Code 1 = 40% Code 2 = 42% Code 3 = 39%	<i>Lunch Codes:</i> Code 0 = 11% Code 1 = 30% Code 2 = 32% Code 3 = 29%					
<i>In 2013 Economically Disadvantage students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease 10%.</i>	Students are unable to read key math terms and vocabulary	Students are unable to read key math terms and vocabulary	Teachers will provide clear and focused learning goals.	Teachers, PLC Facilitators, Grade level groups, Math Committee members	Frequent progress monitoring of vocabulary terms, posting of vocabulary of words, including visuals of words	Post test, Big Idea and CORE K12 Data	
	Lack of math vocabulary.		Teachers will differentiate instruction in order to meet the needs of all students based on current student data.  Teachers will identify key math vocabulary and key terms when used in word problems.				
	Lack of math vocabulary.		Implement math word wall, review chapter vocabulary, math journals, including visuals of words	Teachers, PLC Facilitators, Grade level groups, Math Committee members	Frequent progress monitoring of vocabulary terms, posting of vocabulary of words, including visuals of words	Post test, Big Idea and CORE K12 Data	

*End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals*

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

**Middle School Mathematics Goals**

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.</b>			1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
<b>Mathematics Goal #1A:</b>  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</b>			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
<b>Mathematics Goal #1B:</b>  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

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
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.</b>			2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.
<b>Mathematics Goal #2A:</b>  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.</b>			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
<b>Mathematics Goal #2B:</b>  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.
<b>Mathematics Goal #4A:</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.
<b>4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.
<b>Mathematics Goal #4B:</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			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
<b>5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>							
	<b>Mathematics Goal #5A:</b>  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
<b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>	<b>Mathematics Goal #5B:</b>  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.
				5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.
				5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.

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

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



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

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

*End of Middle School Mathematics Goals*

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

**Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals**

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

<b>High School Mathematics Goals</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
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
<b>1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</b>			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
<b>Mathematics Goal #1:</b> Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.</b>			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
<b>Mathematics Goal #2:</b> Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.
<b>Mathematics Goal #3:</b>  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			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
<b>4. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.
<b>Mathematics Goal #4:</b>  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.
			4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.

*End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals*

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

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

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.</b>			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #1:  <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>					
			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
<b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.</b>			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Algebra 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.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<b>3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>  Algebra 1 Goal #3A:  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>							
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	
<b>3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.</b>  Algebra 1 Goal #3B:  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*  <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*  <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.</b>			3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3E:  <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>					
			3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

*End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals*

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

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

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

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



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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<b>3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>  Geometry Goal #3A:  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<b>Baseline data 2011-2012</b>						
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
<b>3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.</b>  Geometry Goal #3B:  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*  <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*  <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.</b>			3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.
<b>Geometry Goal #3E:</b>  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

*End of Geometry EOC Goals*

## Mathematics Professional Development

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities</b> 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
Marzano's Best Practices	K-5/ All Including all Special Area Teachers	Administration	School-wide	Ongoing	Teacher Evaluation, Grade Level Meetings and Data Review Meetings will be held throughout the year to monitor progress.	Administration

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

**Mathematics Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
All math strategies	Textbooks – Houghton Mifflin	School Textbook Budget	\$992.61 \$716.80
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total: \$1,709.41</b>

*End of Mathematics Goals*

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

**Elementary and Middle School Science Goals**

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

<b>Elementary and Middle Science Goals</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>									
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					
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.</b>			Time constraints Budget Proper training on Interactive Notebook Assembling of kits for Picture Perfect	Teachers will continue implementing the 5 E’s (engage, explore, explain, elaborate, evaluate) through the use of Fusion Science Series and Interactive Notebook and Picture Perfect.	Administration, Science committee, Team Leaders, Teachers	District and school level training Develop interactive notebooks for each Body of Knowledge	Science pre and post-test and spreadsheets Core K-12 Samples of student work					
<b>Science Goal #1A:</b>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*										
<i>By 2013 at least 74% of 5<sup>th</sup> grade students will achieve proficiency in Science FCAT.</i>	60%	74%										
								Team meeting time for organization and implementation	Teachers will continue to utilize District Pacing Guides and Curriculum Maps to ensure students receive science instruction daily.	Administration, Science committee, Team Leaders, Teachers	Team binder with District Pacing Guides and Curriculum Maps	Science pre and post tests and spreadsheets, Core K-12, samples of student work
								Team meeting time District and school level training on use of KUD’s	Teachers will educate parents and students on unit goals through the use of what students should know, understand and do.	Administration, Science committee, Team Leaders, Teachers	Team binder with KUD’s District and school level training	
			Scheduling the Computer Lab District and school level training on enrichment projects Scheduling time for enrichment	Based on Pre-Tests, Science Core K-12 data, and classroom observations, students will produce an end of Big Idea project utilizing the KUD distributed at the beginning of the quarter during enrichment time.	Administration, Science committee, Team Leaders, Teachers	Student data analysis support	Science pre and post-test and spreadsheets, Core K-12, samples of student work					
			Students with PMP’s Time to remediate	Analyzing district science maps through vertical planning and evaluating priorities to plan for instruction	Administration, Science committee, Team Leaders, Teachers	Vertical planning Team planning						

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

<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.</b>		Students are unable to read key science terms and vocabulary	Teachers will provide clear and focused learning goals.	Teachers, Administration	Lesson Planning	ULC Unit Assessment
Science Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	Teachers will differentiate instruction in order to meet the needs of all students based on current student data.  Teachers will identify key science vocabulary and key terms when used in real life applications.			
NA	NA	NA				
		Lack of materials/resources  Meeting all student's needs	Provide clear and focused learning goals. Provide direct instruction in problem solving/critical thinking strategies on a daily basis.  Specific problem solving/critical thinking strategies will be identified and utilized at the student's developmental level by teachers and staff.  Teachers will differentiate instruction in order to meet the needs of all students based on current student data. (ULC)	Teachers, Administrators, District Support	Lesson Planning	ULC Unit Assessment
		IB.3.	IB.3.	IB.3.	IB.3.	IB.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool									
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.</b>			2A.1. Time constraints Budget Proper training on Interactive Notebook Assembling of kits for Picture Perfect	Teachers will continue implementing the 5 E's (engage, explore, explain, elaborate, evaluate) through the use of Fusion Science Series and Interactive Notebook and Picture Perfect.	Administration, Science committee, Team Leaders, Teachers	District and school level training Develop interactive notebooks for each Body of Knowledge	Science pre and post-test and spreadsheets, Core K-12, Samples of student work									
<b>Science Goal #2A:</b> By 2013 at least 67% of 5 <sup>th</sup> grade students will achieve proficiency in Science FCAT.																
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td> <td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>62% (87)</td> <td>67%</td> </tr> </table>			2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	62% (87)	67%										
2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*															
62% (87)	67%															
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Gr</td> <td>Lev 4</td> <td>Lev 5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5th</td> <td>10%</td> <td>8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td colspan="2">9% (about 8 students out of 87)</td> </tr> </table>			Gr	Lev 4	Lev 5	5th	10%	8%	Total	9% (about 8 students out of 87)		2A.2. Team meeting time for organization and implementation	Teachers will continue to utilize District Pacing Guides and Curriculum Maps to ensure students receive science instruction daily.	Administration, Science committee, Team Leaders, Teachers	Team binder with District Pacing Guides and Curriculum Maps	Science pre and post tests spreadsheets, Core K-12, Samples of student work
Gr	Lev 4	Lev 5														
5th	10%	8%														
Total	9% (about 8 students out of 87)															
			2A.3. Team meeting time District and school level training on use of KUD's	Teachers will educate parents and students on unit goals through the use of what students should know, understand and do.	Administration, Science committee, Team Leaders, Teachers	Team binder with KUD's District and school level training	Science pre and post-test and spreadsheets, Core K-12, Samples of student work, Lesson Plans									
			2A.4.													
			2A.5.													
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.</b>			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.									
<b>Science Goal #2B:</b> N/A																
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td> <td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table>			2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	N/A	N/A	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.					
2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*															
N/A	N/A															
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.									

*End of Elementary and Middle School Science 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
<b>1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.</b>			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
<b>Science Goal #1:</b>  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>  <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>  <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
<b>2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.</b>			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
<b>Science Goal #2:</b>  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>  <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>  <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.

*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)*



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

\* 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
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.</b>			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
<b>Biology 1 Goal #1:</b>  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>  <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
<b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.</b>			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
<b>Biology 1 Goal #2:</b>  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>  <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.

*End of Biology 1 EOC Goals*

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

**Science Professional Development**

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

**Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)**

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
All science goals	Fusion Textbooks	School Textbook Budget	\$1,249.32
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total: \$1,249.32</b>

*End of Science Goals*

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

**Writing Goals**

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

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.</b>			Teachers do not have time to collaborate and plan for writing instruction. Also limited time to focus on standards and student data.	Structured and collaborated time for grade level PLCs to examine standards, analyze samples of student writing using common rubrics and plan with the end in mind.	Classroom Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	Documented minutes of PLCs, Student rubrics	Lesson plans, student work samples
<b>Writing Goal #1A:</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>					
<i>An increase of statistical value according to the Vassar Scales-97 students +77% proficient- would be 87% -10% increase)</i>	77% (74)	87%					
			Grammar lessons are not consistently and pervasively taught.	Teachers will implement weekly grammar MMH focus lessons.	All teachers	MMH Weekly and Unit Grammar Assessments	Students writing samples
			Not enough time for students to apply writing skills.	Teachers will provide increased opportunities for students to summarize their learning through writing.	All teachers	Student work samples	Student work samples
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.</b>			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
<b>Writing Goal #1B:</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

**Writing Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
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
Understanding the Common Core and including writing responses across all subject areas	K-5/ All Including Special Area Teachers	Literacy Coach PLC Leaders	School-wide	Ongoing	Teacher Evaluations, Grade Level Meetings and Data Review Meetings will be held throughout the year to monitor progress.	Administration
Marzano's Best Practices	Administration	Administration	School-wide	Ongoing	Teacher Evaluations, Grade Level Meetings and Data Review Meetings will be held throughout the year to monitor progress.	Administration

**Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)**

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
None			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>

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

**Total:\$0.00**

*End of Writing Goals*

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

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

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

Civics EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.</b>			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Civics Goal #1:  <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>					
			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
<b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.</b>			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Civics 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.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

**Civics Professional Development**

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

**Civics Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

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

*End of Civics Goals*

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

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

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

U.S. History EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.</b>			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
U.S. History Goal #1:  <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>					
			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
<b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.</b>			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.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.



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

**U.S. History Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
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
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*End of U.S. History Goals*

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

**Attendance Goal(s)**

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

<b>Attendance Goal(s)</b>			<b>Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance</b>				
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
<b>1. Attendance</b>			New students to Odessa.	Administration will meet on a regular basis with the data entry clerk to identify students with excessive tardies and / or absences and consult with the school social worker to develop a plan of action. Creation of Attendance Monitoring Plan.	Administration, Data Entry Clerk, school social worker.	Absence and tardy rates.	TERMS, Esembler
<b>Attendance Goal #1:</b>	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					
<i>We will increase our average daily membership from 96% to 97% during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>	96%	97%					
	<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>					
	217	175					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>					
	66	55					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

**Attendance Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Positive Behavior Support	K-5	Administration and Guidance Counselor	School-wide	Ongoing	Progress Monitoring (October, January and April)	Administration and Guidance Counselor

**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
None			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:\$0.00</b>

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

*End of Attendance Goals*

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

### 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
<b>1. Suspension</b>			New students to school.	School-wide behavior plan is reviewed and reinforced by teams through class/team meetings.	Teachers, Administrators, Discipline Committee, Behavior Specialist	ROAR tickets	Discipline referrals, suspension reports
Suspension Goal #1:	2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions					
	6	6					
<i>By June 2013 ODES will show no increase in out of school or in school suspensions over that as indicated for the previous school year.</i>	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School					
		6					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
		0					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School					
	0						
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

**Suspension Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
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
None						

**Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)**

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
<b>Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
None			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
<b>Technology</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
<b>Professional Development</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
<b>Other</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:\$0.00</b>

*End of Suspension Goals*

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

**Dropout Prevention Goal(s)**

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

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

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

**Dropout Prevention Professional Development**

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

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

**Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)**

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

*End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)*



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

### Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1. Parent Involvement</b>			May not get the necessary participation in SAC meetings, All hours may not be logged by volunteers	Send reminders for SAC meetings, Use Raptor to monitor volunteer hours	Administration, Volunteer Coordinator	Attendance sign-ins, volunteer hour reports	Raptor Reports and sign-in sheets.
<b>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</b>					
<i>The percentage of parental involvement for the 2012/2013 school year will allow our school to be recognized as a 5 Star School and to receive the Golden School Award.</i>	<i>1500 Hours</i>	Maintain or increase					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	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
Parents / Volunteers / Business Partner Training	K-% / All subjects	Assistant Principal and PTA Board	School-wide and interested parents	September 2012	Meeting Agenda / Sign-in sheets	Administration

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

**Parent Involvement Budget**

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
None			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:\$0.00</b>

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1:	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

**STEM Professional Development**

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

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

**STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)**

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

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

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

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

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
<b>CTE Goal #1:</b>  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

**CTE Professional Development**

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

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

**CTE Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

**Subtotal:**

Technology

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

**Subtotal:**

Professional Development

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

**Subtotal:**

Other

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

**Subtotal:**

**Total:**

*End of CTE Goal(s)*

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

**Additional Goal(s)**

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

<b>Additional Goal(s)</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
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
<b>1. Additional Goal</b>			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
<b>Additional Goal #1:</b>  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<b>2012 Current Level :*</b>  <i>Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.</i>	<b>2013 Expected Level :*</b>  <i>Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

**Additional Goals Professional Development**

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

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

**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
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*End of Additional Goal(s)*



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

**Final Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
<b>Reading Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$2,104.91</b>
<b>CELLA Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
<b>Mathematics Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$1,709.41</b>
<b>Science Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$1,249.32</b>
<b>Writing Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
<b>Civics Budget</b>	<b>Total: NA</b>
<b>U.S. History Budget</b>	<b>Total: NA</b>
<b>Attendance Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
<b>Suspension Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
<b>Dropout Prevention Budget</b>	<b>Total: NA</b>
<b>Parent Involvement Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
<b>STEM Budget</b>	<b>Total: NA</b>
<b>CTE Budget</b>	<b>Total: NA</b>
<b>Additional Goals</b>	<b>Total: \$5,053.64</b>
	<b>Grand Total: \$5,053.64</b>

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

**Differentiated Accountability**

**School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance**

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

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

X Yes       No

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

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
The main purpose of the School Advisory Council is to assist in the preparation of the School Improvement Plan. Input will be based on data collected from the previous school year and the perspective of the stakeholders involved in the process. In addition, if the SAC receives lottery funds, they will determine how the money should be used in the school.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount