FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

2012-2013

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

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: University HS	District Name: Orange
Principal: Michael Armbruster	Superintendent: Barbara Jenkins
SAC Chair: Steven Shelnutt	Date of School Board Approval: January 29, 2013

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	Michael Armbruster	BA in Vocational Technical Education MS in Educational Leadership EdD in Educational Leadership Certified Horticulture Certified Principal Certified Local Director	2 years	18 years	**SY11-12 University HS School Grade of B** Proficiency or higher (R/M) – 56% (R) / 57% (M) Proficiency Writing – 89% Learning Gains – 65 points (R) / 61 points (M) Lowest 25% - 68% (R) / 65% (M) **SY10-11 University HS School Grade of A** Proficiency (R/M) - 51% (R) / 81% (M) Learning Gains – 49% (R) / 74% (M) Lowest 25% - 40% (R) / 74% (M) AYP – Subgroups that Met AYP: White – 87% Math **SY09-10 Ocoee HS School Grade of C** Proficiency (R/M) - 40% (R) / 67% (M) Learning Gains – 45% (R) / 68% (M) Lowest 25% - 43% (R) / 55% (M) AYP – Subgroups that Met AYP: White – 77% Math **SY08-09 Ocoee HS School Grade of D** Proficiency (R/M) - 44% (R) / 72% (M) Learning Gains – 49% (R) / 75% (M) Lowest 25% - 41% (R) / 70% (M) AYP - Subgroups that Met AYP: Total – 69% Math White – 80% Math Hispanic – 68% Math
Assistant Principal	Ryan Barth	MA Social Sciences Certified Educational Leadership All Levels	0 year	2 years	**SY11-12 Apopka HS School Grade of C** Proficiency or higher (R/M) – 47% (R) / 39% (M) Proficiency Writing – 89% Learning Gains – 61 points (R) / 51 points (M) Lowest 25% - 62% (R) / 62 % (M) **SY10-11 Apopka HS School Grade of B** Proficiency (R/M) – 46% (R) / 70% (M) Learning Gains – 49% (R) / 70% (M)

					Lowest 25% - 44% (R) / 63% (M) AYP – 74%
Assistant Principal	Paul Bryant	BS Physical Education MS Education Leadership Certified Educational Leadership All Levels	1 year	4 years	**SY11-12 University HS School Grade of B** Proficiency or higher (R/M) – 56% (R) / 57% (M) Proficiency Writing – 89% Learning Gains – 65 points (R) / 61 points (M) Lowest 25% - 68% (R) / 65% (M) **SY10-11 East River HS School Grade of A** Proficiency (R/M) - 45% (R) / 72% (M) Learning Gains – 46% (R) / 69% (M) Lowest 25% - 41% (R) / 55% (M) AYP - No subgroups earned AYP in reading or math **SY09-10 East River HS School Grade of D** Proficiency (R/M) – 40% (R) / 71% (M) Learning Gains – 45% (R) / 69% (M) Lowest 25% - 42% (R) / 53% (M) AYP - No subgroups earned AYP in reading or math **SY08-09 Avalon Middle School Grade of A** Proficiency (R/M) – 80% (R) / 81% (M) Learning Gains – 65% (R) / 70% (M) Lowest 25% - 65% (R) / 58% (M) AYP – Subgroups that Met AYP: Total – 73% Reading and 74% Math White – 82% Reading and 82% Math
Assistant Principal	Nancy Palermo	BA Geography MS Geography Certified Geography K-12 Certified Educational Leadership All Levels	1 year	10 years	**SY11-12 University HS School Grade of B** Proficiency or higher (R/M) – 56% (R) / 57% (M) Proficiency Writing – 89% Learning Gains – 65 points (R) / 61 points (M) Lowest 25% - 68% (R) / 65% (M) SY 10-11 District Staff SY 09-10 District Staff SY 08-09 District Staff
Assistant Principal	Marlene West	BA English MS Educational Leadership Certified English 6-12	7 years	20 years	**SY11-12 University HS School Grade of B** Proficiency or higher (R/M) – 56% (R) / 57% (M) Proficiency Writing – 89% Learning Gains – 65 points (R) / 61 points (M)

		Certified Educational Leadership All Levels Certified Principal			Lowest 25% - 68% (R) / 65% (M) **SY10-11 University HS School Grade of A** Proficiency (R/M) - 51% (R) / 81% (M) Learning Gains – 49% (R) / 74% (M) Lowest 25% - 40% (R) / 74% (M) AYP – Subgroups that Met AYP: White – 87% Math **SY09-10 University HS School Grade of B** Proficiency (R/M) - 52% (R) / 79% (M) Learning Gains – 50% (R) / 71% (M) Lowest 25% - 38% (R) / 55% (M) AYP – Subgroups that Met AYP: Total – 74% Math White – 87% Math **SY08-09 University HS School Grade of B** Proficiency (R/M) - 49% (R) / 77% (M) Learning Gains – 52% (R) / 75% (M) Lowest 25% - 49% (R) / 62% (M) AYP – Subgroups that Met AYP: Total – 71% Math White – 82% Math Asian – 69% Reading and 92% Math

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

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Karla Owens	BA in English MEd in English Education Certified English 6-12 Reading Endorsed	17 years	6 years	**SY11-12 University HS School Grade of B** Proficiency or higher (R/M) – 56% (R) / 57% (M) Proficiency Writing – 89% Learning Gains – 65 points (R) / 61 points (M) Lowest 25% - 68% (R) / 65% (M) **SY10-11 University HS School Grade of A** Proficiency (R/M) - 51% (R) / 81% (M) Learning Gains – 49% (R) / 74% (M) Lowest 25% - 40% (R) / 74% (M) AYP – Subgroups that Met AYP: White – 87% Math **SY09-10 University HS School Grade of B** Proficiency (R/M) - 52% (R) / 79% (M) Learning Gains – 50% (R) / 71% (M) Lowest 25% - 38% (R) / 55% (M) AYP – Subgroups that Met AYP: Total – 74% Math White – 87% Math **SY08-09 University HS School Grade of B** Proficiency (R/M) - 49% (R) / 77% (M) Learning Gains – 52% (R) / 75% (M) Lowest 25% - 49% (R) / 62% (M) AYP – Subgroups that Met AYP: Total – 71% Math White – 82% Math Asian – 69% Reading and 92% Math

Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

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

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Provide job-embedded professional development focused on Marzano strategies	Karla Owens Robin Simmons	June 2013
2. Seek highly qualified candidates based on OCPS HR policies.	Assistant Principals	June 2013
3. Peer collaboration in a supportive environment – subject area collaborative groups.		June 2013

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
1 teacher is out-of-field* In SY1112, Category 1- 28 teachers scored effective and 2 scored at developing. Category 2A- 113 teachers scored effective and 4 scored needs improvement. Category LOA – 3 teachers were not scored due to late hire or leave of absence. *teacher is working on reading endorsement.	Embedded on-the-job training of Marzano strategies along with peer-to-peer coaching are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective.

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]).

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

Total number of Instructional Staff	% of first-year teachers	% of teachers with 1-5 years of experience	% of teachers with 6-14 years of experience	% of teachers with 15+ years of experience	% of teachers with Advanced Degrees	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
158	12% (19)	34% (54)	32% (50)	24% (37)	27% (42)	91% (141)	11% (17)	3% (4)	11% (17)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Sylvia Nelson	Monica Austin	Alternative Certification Program	Monthly mentor/mentee meetings
Karla Owens	Ryan Douglass	Alternative Certification Program	Monthly mentor/mentee meetings
Robin Simmons	Stephen Hellwege	Alternative Certification Program	Monthly mentor/mentee meetings
Robin Simmons	Christopher Mayer	Alternative Certification Program	Monthly mentor/mentee meetings
Amanda Newcomer	Kristen Mendoza	Alternative Certification Program	Monthly mentor/mentee meetings
Robin Simmons	Keegan Schlake	Alternative Certification Program	Monthly mentor/mentee meetings
Karena Chunoo	Samantha Schneider	Alternative Certification Program	Monthly mentor/mentee meetings
Amanda Newcomer	Patricia Stewart	Alternative Certification Program	Monthly mentor/mentee meetings
Robin Simmons	Daniel Harris	Alternative Certification Program	Monthly mentor/mentee meetings
Danielle Miller	Emily Heckman	Beginning Teacher Program	Monthly mentor/mentee meetings
Karena Chunoo	Antonio Hernandez	Alternative Certification Program	Monthly mentor/mentee meetings
Danielle Miller	Sally Jarvis	Alternative Certification Program	Monthly mentor/mentee meetings
Amanda Newcomer	Melinda Curran	Beginning Teacher Program	Monthly mentor/mentee meetings

Lea Bolves	Mia Gianelli	Beginning Teacher Program	Monthly mentor/mentee meetings
Jack Morse	Paul Scott	Beginning Teacher Program	Monthly mentor/mentee 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)

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. Mike Armbruster, Paul Bryant, Ryan Barth, Karena Chunoo, Robin Simmons, Karla Owens, Ana Ramos, Lynn Riggle, Charles Baldwin, Henry Kauhane, Nancy Norman, Nicolle Campbell, Juan Colon, and Denice Bradley.
Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts? The team meets monthly in person or online. The team collects and analyzes data based on student achievement from benchmark testing and from data received from the PLC Collaborative groups. Interventions are put in place and are monitored frequently and modified to meet student needs.
Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? The members of the MTSS bring their areas of expertise from ESE, ELL, behavior and social emotional support background to determine the SIP focus for academic, behavioral, and social services interventions. The initiatives are embedded in the Collaborative group process, PLACE, and parental involvement.
MTSS Implementation
Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior. Baseline Data for Academics: Florida Assessment in Reading (FAIR), Benchmark Data, Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) EOC Baseline Data for Behavior: OCPS education data warehouse (EDW) summary of attendance, discipline, and well as monthly school based data Progress Monitoring: FAIR, Curriculum based measurement(formative and summative) Benchmark Data, Mini Assessments End of Year: FAIR, FCAT, EOC English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA), Benchmark Data: All data will be made available to teachers via the district's Instructional Management System and examined/analyzed in professional development and PLC groups on a regular basis. Students in subgroups, as well as the lowest 30%, will be targeted for interventions. Collaborative groups by subject area meet weekly regarding instruction for Tier 1 students as well as interventions needed for Tier 2 and 3 students. Deans and ESE Behavioral Specialist work together to develop the behavior intervention plans. The SAFE coordinator along with ESE Staffing Specialist, ELL Compliance Teacher, and ESE Inclusion Coach work together with community based social/emotional organizations to provide students and families external support along with school-based crisis intervention with the guidance team.
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. During preplanning the staffulty were trained on level 2 of the ACHIEVE plan, understanding of PLACE, and overall strategies for developing a classroom environment of high expectations. In addition, the staffulty received a review of the PLC overview and expectations of the Collaborative groups to develop academic interventions and enrichment activities. During the school year this process will be reinforced to instructional staff via small group professional development during teachers' common planning time and small sessions throughout the year. The team will evaluate additional staff professional development needs during the year.
Describe the plan to support MTSS. The behavior component is supported through the school-wide ACHIEVE and PLACE plans which include high expectations and three-tier intervention. The academic component is supported through the weekly Collaborative group meetings and monthly professional development. The social/ emotional support is provided through the SAFE referral process.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).   Mike Armbruster, Marlene West, Karla Owens , Robin Simmons, Karena Chunoo, Carla Jones, Amanda Newcomer, Josh Katz, Abbey Chwalisz, Suzy Bough, Cheryl Donovan, Deborah Gregory, Jennifer Karp, Ella Mattle, Gretchen Robinson, Barbara Stone, and Kimbra Thenn.
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).   The LLT meets bi-monthly.   The classroom teachers lead the process of selecting and designing follow- up activities for summer reading.   The literacy coach writes the annual campus-wide literacy plan with input from the administration and LLT members.   The LLT provides the school with the Literacy Focus Calendar.   The team as a whole provides literacy functions for the whole campus such as school-wide literacy events and monthly book clubs.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?   Continue content literacy training to include social studies department with emphasis on ACHIEVE 3000.

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.

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.

Not 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?

The UHS Literacy Plan lists and explains the responsibilities of every content area teacher for incorporating reading strategies daily. Administrators will check daily lesson plans for inclusion of the reading strategy instruction and use observation tools to verify such instruction. Teachers will visit classrooms where reading strategies are modeled.

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?

Regardless of whether course is considered applied or integrated by FDOE definition, faculty at UHS continue to provide examples of content relevancy to students' future directly as well as by providing project/problem based learning opportunities for students to practice academic and 21st century skills for post-secondary and/or employment opportunities.

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?

The UHS Comprehensive Guidance Plan includes the activities for students' course selections, exploration of collegiate and employment opportunities through small group and large group activities such as college visits, Teach In, scholarship night, and parental outreach through the school website and newsletter.

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.

The UHS Comprehensive Guidance Plan contains academic advising strategies designed by the counselors based on data from the High School Feedback Report.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1A: *In SY1213, 52% of students will score at level 3 in grades 9 and 10 FCAT 2.0.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 49% (347/1416)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 52%	1A.1. • Limited exposure to informational text.	1A.1. • Provide Reading and History classes with informational text through Achieve 3000. • Provide all content area teachers with the school-wide literacy plan than includes tested standards and incorporation of informational texts.	1A.1. • Literacy Coach and Assistant Principals	1A.1. • Analyze reports from Achieve 3000 on the use of informational texts. • Analyze and evaluate teacher-generated common assessments for the incorporation of informational texts.	1A.1. • Common Assessments and OCPS Benchmark Assessments
			1A.2. • Limited exposure to text complexity	1A.2. • Provide content area classes with strategies to increase text complexity that uses on-grade level texts. • Create collaborative assessments using more complex texts.	1A.2. • Literacy Coach and Assistant Principals	1A.2. • Identify Lexile levels used in content area classes. • Evaluate if content area texts used are more complex texts. • Evaluate common assessments for text complexity.	1A.2. • Common Assessment and OCPS Benchmark Assessments
			1A.3. • Difficulty taking reading tests using computer-based format	1A.3. • Provide test-taking strategies to content area classes for computer-based testing. • Provide multiple opportunities for students to practice computer-based reading and test-taking. • Implementation of Achieve 3000 in reading and history classes.	1 A.3. • Content-area teachers, Literacy Coach, Assistant Principals	1A.3. • Analyze Achieve 3000 reports. • Monitor students taking computer-based assessments using test-taking strategies • Analyze OCPS benchmark assessments	1A.3. • Achieve 3000 Assessments • Teacher-generated Common Assessments • OCPS Benchmark Assessments
			1.A.4. • Continuous progress monitoring in core classes for	1.A.4. • Use of OCPS IMS to monitor reading progress	1.A.4. • Faculty • Collaborative groups	1.A.4. • Analyze and evaluate lesson plans and instruction	1.A.4 • OCPS IMS

| | | | | | | Assistant Principals | Analyze and evaluate student assessment results. | |

| **1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.** | | | 1B.1.
• Need for consistent curriculum and monitoring towards FAA and IEP standards | 1B.1.
• Provide opportunity for faculty PD on FAA and best practices | 1B.1.
• ESE faculty, Inclusion Coach, Staffing Specialist and Assistant Principal | 1B.1.
• Weekly Collaborative group meetings to define essential outcomes.
• Identify and align instructional resources
• Identify various instructional strategies to meet essential outcomes | 1B.1.
• Common assessment
• Data chats based on IEP
• FAA |
| Reading Goal #1B:

Increase performance of students scoring at these levels. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*

Data not entered since number of students is less than 10. | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*

Data not entered since number of students is less than 10. | | | | | |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.			2A.1. • Limited exposure to text complexity.	2A.1. • Provide content area classes with strategies to increase text complexity that uses on or above grade level texts. • Create collaborative assessments using more complex texts that increase the rigor of questions and tasks.	2A.1. • Literacy Coach and Assistant Principals	2A.1. • Identify Lexile levels used in content area classes. • Evaluate if content area texts used are on or above grade level • Evaluate common assessments for text complexity and higher cognitive tasks.	2A.1 • Teacher-generated Common Assessments • OCPS Benchmark Assessments • Advanced Placement and IB Practice Assessments.
Reading Goal #2A: *In SY1213, 30% of students will score at or above level 4 in grades 9 and 10 FCAT 2.0.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *20% (277/1416)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *23%*					
			2A.2. • Difficulty taking reading tests using computer-based format.	2A.2. • Provide test-taking strategies to content area classes for computer-based testing. • Provide multiple opportunities for students to practice computer-based reading and test-taking. • Implementation of Achieve 3000 in AP history classes	2A.2. • Content-area teachers, Literacy Coach, Assistant Principals	2A.2. • Analyze Achieve 3000 reports. • Monitor students taking computer-based assessments using test-taking strategies • Analyze computer-based reading assignments and assessments.	2A.2. • Achieve 3000 Assessments • Teacher-generated Common Assessments • OCPS Benchmark Assessments
			2.A.3. • Continuous progress monitoring in core classes for students' reading skills	2.A.3. • Use of OCPS IMS to monitor reading progress	2.A.3. • Faculty • Collaborative groups • Assistant Principals	2.A.3. • Analyze and evaluate lesson plans and instruction • Analyze and evaluate	2.A.3. • OCPS IMS

					student assessment results.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.			2B.1. • Need for consistent curriculum and monitoring towards FAA and IEP standards	2B.1. • Provide opportunity for faculty PD on FAA and best practices	2B.1. • ESE faculty, Inclusion Coach, Staffing Specialist and Assistant Principal	2B.1. • Weekly Collaborative group meetings to define essential outcomes. • Identify and align instructional resources • Identify various instructional strategies to meet essential outcomes	2B.1 • Common assessment • Data chats based on IEP • FAA.
Reading Goal #2B: *Maintain performance of students scoring at these levels.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Data not entered since number of students is less than 10.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Data not entered since number of students is less than 10.*					

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	3A.1. • Limited exposure to informational text	3A.1. • Provide Reading and History classes with informational text through Achieve 3000. • Provide all content area teachers with the school-wide literacy plan than includes tested standards and incorporation of informational texts.	3A.1. • Literacy Coach and Assistant Principals	3A.1. • Analyze reports from Achieve 3000 on the use of informational texts. • Analyze and evaluate teacher-generated common assessments for the incorporation of informational texts.	3A.1. • Common Assessments and OCPS Benchmark Assessments
Reading Goal #3A: *In SY1213, 68% of students will make learning gains in reading.* / 2012 Current Level of Performance:* 65% / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 68%					
	3A.2. • Difficulty taking reading tests using computer-based format.	3A.2. • Provide test-taking strategies to content area classes for computer-based testing. • Provide multiple opportunities for students to practice computer-based reading and test-taking. • Implementation of Achieve 3000 in AP US History classes.	3A.2. • Content-area teachers, Literacy Coach, Assistant Principals	3A.2. • Analyze Achieve 3000 reports. • Monitor students taking computer-based assessments using test-taking strategies • Analyze computer-based reading assignments and assessments.	3A.2. • Achieve 3000 Assessments • Teacher-generated Common Assessments • OCPS Benchmark Assessments
	3A.3. • Continuous progress monitoring in core classes for students' reading skills	3A.3. • Use of OCPS IMS to monitor reading progress	3A.3. • Faculty • Collaborative groups • Assistant Principals	3A.3. • Analyze and evaluate lesson plans and instruction • Analyze and evaluate student assessment results.	3A.3. • OCPS IMS
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	3B.1. • Need for consistent curriculum and monitoring towards FAA and IEP standards	3B.1. • Provide opportunity for faculty PD on FAA and best practices	3B.1. • ESE faculty • Inclusion Coach • Staffing Specialist • Assistant Principals	3B.1. • Weekly Collaborative group meetings to define essential outcomes. • Identify and align instructional resources • Identify various instructional strategies to meet essential outcomes	3B.1. • Common assessment • Data chats based on IEP • FAA
Reading Goal #3B: *Increase performance of students..* / 2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Data not entered since number of students is less than 10.* / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Data not entered since number of students is less than 10.*					

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
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4: *In SY1213, 70% of students will make learning gains in reading.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *68%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *70%*	4A.1. • Limited opportunities for students to receive Tier 3 interventions.	4A.1. • Incorporate differentiated instruction in reading classes • Incorporate reading centers and small group rotations where teachers have an opportunity to lead small groups based on performance data	4A.1. • Literacy Coach and Assistant Principals	4A.1. • Analyze and evaluate standard-based assessments • Restructure small groups and revise instruction based on student results of assessments	4A.1. • Common Assessments and OCPS Benchmark Assessments
			4A.2. • Limited exposure to text complexity	4A.2. • Provide content area classes with strategies to increase text complexity that uses on or above grade level texts. • Create collaborative assessments using more complex texts that increase the rigor of questions and tasks.	4A.2. • Literacy Coach and Assistant Principals	4A.2. • Identify Lexile levels used in content area classes. • Evaluate if content area texts used are on or above grade level • Evaluate common assessments for text complexity and higher cognitive tasks	4A.2. • Teacher-generated Common Assessments • OCPS Benchmark Assessments • Advanced Placement and IB Practice Assessments
			4A.3. • Continuous progress monitoring in core classes for students' reading skills	4A.3. • Use of OCPS IMS to monitor reading progress	4A.3. • Faculty • Collaborative groups • Assistant Principals	4A.3. • Analyze and evaluate lesson plans and instruction • Analyze and evaluate student assessment results.	4A.3. • OCPS IMS

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**	In SY1112, 55% of students met scored satisfactory.	By SY12-13, 64% of students will score satisfactory.	By 2013-2014, 68% of students will score satisfactory.	By 2014-2015, 71% of students will score satisfactory..	By 2015-2016, 75% of students will score satisfactory.	By 2016-2017, 79% of students will score satisfactory.
Reading Goal #5A: *In SY2010-2011, 57% of students in grade 9 and grade 10 scored satisfactory.*							

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**		5B.1. • Limited exposure to text complexity	5B.1. • Provide Reading and History classes with informational text through Achieve 3000. • Provide all content area teachers with the school-wide literacy plan that includes tested standards and incorporation of informational texts.	5B.1. • Literacy Coach and Assistant Principals	5B.1. • Analyze reports from Achieve 3000 on the use of informational texts. • Analyze and evaluate teacher-generated common assessments for the incorporation of informational texts.	5B.1. • Teacher-generated Common Assessments	
Reading Goal #5B: *By SY1213, students subgroups will meet reading proficiency by scoring at level 3 or higher in the following percentages:* White: 73% Black: 56% Hispanic: 56% Asian: 86% American Indian: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White: 71% Black:51% Hispanic: 51% Asian:84% American Indian: N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White: 76% Black: 60% Hispanic: 60% Asian: 87% American Indian: N/A					
		5B.2. • Difficulty taking reading tests using computer-based format.	5B.2. • Provide test-taking strategies to content area classes for computer-based testing. • Provide multiple opportunities for students to practice computer-based reading and test-taking. • Implementation of Achieve 3000 in AP history classes.	5B.2. • Content-area teachers, Literacy Coach, Assistant Principals	5B.2. • Analyze Achieve 3000 reports. • Monitor students taking computer-based assessments using test-taking strategies • Analyze computer-based reading assignments and assessments	5B.2. • Achieve 3000 Assessments • Teacher-generated Common Assessments • OCPS Benchmark Assessments	
		5B.3. • Continuous progress monitoring in core classes for students' reading skills	5B.3. • Use of OCPS IMS to monitor reading progress	5B.3. • Faculty • Collaborative groups • Assistant Principals	5B.3. • Analyze and evaluate lesson plans and instruction • Analyze and evaluate	5B.3. • OCPS IMS	

					• student assessment results.
		5B.4. • Need for students to take comprehensive academic notes	5B.4. • Use of AVID strategies including WICOR	5B.4. • Faculty • Collaborative groups • Assistant Principals	5B.4. • Analyze and evaluate student assessment results.	5B.4. • Student academic grades • OCPS IMS • OCPS Benchmark Assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C: *By SY 1213, 42% of ELL students will meet reading proficiency by scoring level 3 or higher on FCAT 2.0.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *13%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *35%*	5C.1. • Additional time and resources needed for English language acquisition.	5C.1. • Provide multi-level ELL reading and English courses. • Use a variety of resources and materials for each level of language acquisition.	5C.1. • Curriculum Compliance Teacher and Literacy Coach	5C.1. • Analyze and evaluate lesson plans and instruction. • Analyze and evaluate the resources and tools (Rosetta Stone, Achieve 3000, Keystone) • Analyze and evaluate student assessment results.	5C.1. • Achieve 3000 Assessments • Keystone Assessments • Teacher-generated reports for Rosetta Stone • Teacher-generated Common Assessments • OCPS Benchmark Assessments
			5C.2. • Limited exposure to text complexity at Lexile level	5C.2. • Provide Reading and English classes with strategies to increase text complexity that uses on or above grade level texts. • Create collaborative assessments using more complex texts	5C.2. • Curriculum Compliance Teacher and Literacy Coach	5C.2. • Identify Lexile levels. • Evaluate if text complexity is evident in Lexile-leveled texts. • Evaluate common assessments for text complexity.	5C.2. • Achieve 3000 Reports • Teacher-generated Common Assessments • OCPS Benchmark Assessments
			5C.3. • Continuous progress monitoring in core classes for students' reading skills	5C.3. • Use of OCPS IMS to monitor reading progress	5C3.3. • Faculty • Collaborative groups • Assistant Principals	5C.3. • Analyze and evaluate lesson plans and instruction • Analyze and evaluate student assessment results.	5C.3. • OCPS IMS
			5C.4. • Limited resources at home	5C.4. • Each ELL student in danger of not performing on grade level is placed on an	5C.4. • Compliance Teacher Bilingual paraprofessionals	5C.4. • ELL student meetings during 5th period to monitor progress, and document	5C.4. • OCPS IMS • ELLs progress report. • ELLs report card.

				Academic Needs Identification Plan (ANI) based on data mentioned above among other input: grades, teacher request, and student's request for help. • Provide On-Campus opportunities for ELL students to receive coaching in the area of need: tutoring, organizational skills, and vocabulary enhancement.		input for weaknesses or strengths. Teachers/ELL students will generate appointments on a weekly basis. • Tracking of ELL student attendance to receive tutoring services at the Academic Resource Center (ARC). This input will generate areas of most need: Math, English, Science, or History. • ELL student classwork monitored by faculty facilitators during 5th period meetings. • Review of Academic Needs Improvement plan every marking period to add/reinforce strategies and accommodations as needed.	• October FCAT testing. • Benchmark testing. • Re-evaluation testing using Idea Proficiency Test (IPT). • Annual CELLA scores. • ELL Committee input based on teacher generated assessments.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D: *In SY1213, 39% of SWD students will meet reading proficiency by scoring level 3 or higher on FCAT 2.0.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *25%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *39%*	5D.1. • Limited opportunities for students to receive Tier 3 interventions to increase comprehension.	5D.1. • Incorporate differentiated instruction in reading classes • Incorporate reading centers and small group rotations where teachers have an opportunity to lead small groups based on performance data	5D.1. • Literacy Coach and Assistant Principals	5D.1. • Analyze and evaluate standard-based assessments for comprehension • Restructure small groups and revise instruction based on student results of assessments	5D.1. • Common Assessments • OCPS Benchmark Assessments
			5D.2. • Limited exposure to text complexity at Lexile level	5D.2. • Provide Reading and English classes with strategies to increase text complexity that uses on or above grade level texts. • Create collaborative	5D.2. • Curriculum Compliance Teacher and Literacy Coach	5D.2. • Identify Lexile levels. • Evaluate if text complexity is evident in Lexile-leveled texts. • Evaluate common assessments for text	5D.2. • Achieve 3000 Reports • Teacher-generated Common Assessments • OCPS Benchmark Assessments

			assessments using more complex texts			complexity.	
			5.D.3. • Consistent support to student's learning strategies	5D.3. • Provide support facilitation strategies in the classroom for both core faculty and ESE student. • Provide student support through inclusion coach.	5D.3. • ESE Support Facilitator • Core faculty • Inclusion Coach	5D.3. • Student classwork progress	5D.3. • Student academic grades • OCPS IMS • OCPS Benchmark Assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E: *By SY1213, 57% of economically disadvantaged students will meet reading proficiency by scoring level 3 or higher on FCAT 2.0.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *45%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *57%*	5E.1. • Limited opportunities to practice reading comprehension activities and test-taking on computers	5E.1. • Provide multiple opportunities for students to practice computer-based reading and test-taking. • Provide test-taking strategies to content area classes for computer-based testing. • Implementation of Achieve 3000 in reading and history classes.	5E.1. • Content-area teachers, Literacy Coach, Assistant Principals	5E.1. • Analyze Achieve 3000 reports • Monitor students taking computer-based assessments using test-taking strategies • Analyze computer-based reading assignments and assessments.	5E.1. • Achieve 3000 Assessments • Teacher-generated Common Assessments • OCPS Benchmark Assessments
			5E.2. • Limited exposure to informational text	5E.2. • Provide Reading and History classes with informational text through Achieve 3000. • Provide all content area teachers with the school-wide literacy plan than includes tested standards and incorporation of informational texts.	5E.2. • Literacy Coach and Assistant Principals	5E.2. • Analyze reports from Achieve 3000 on the use of informational texts. • Analyze and evaluate teacher-generated common assessments for the incorporation of informational texts.	5E.2. • Common Assessments and OCPS Benchmark Assessments
			5E.3. • Limited resources at home	5E.3. • Provide interventions during school time	5E.3. • Content-area teachers • PLC Facilitator	5E.3. • Number of students referred to the Academic Resource Center during lunch hours • Number of students participating in after-	5E.3. • Student academic grades • Teacher-generated Common Assessments • OCPS Benchmark Assessments

					school tutorial sessions	

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
Reading Collaborative group	9-12	Literacy Coach PLC Facilitator	All Reading faculty	Weekly	Review of minutes Review of lesson plans Observations Review of Common Assessments Review of Data	Literacy Coach, PLC Facilitator and Assistant Principal
Social Studies Collaborative group	9-12	Literacy Coach PLC Facilitator	US History faculty World History faculty AP European History faculty	Weekly	Review of minutes Review of lesson plans Observations Review of Common Assessments Review of Data	Literacy Coach, PLC Facilitator and Assistant Principal
School-wide literacy PD	9-12	LLT	All	Monthly	Review of lesson plans Observations Review of Common Assessments Review of Data	Literacy Coach, PLC Facilitator, Learning Resource Specialist, Compliance Specialist, IB Coordinator and Assistant Principals
School-wide PD on Data Analysis	9-12	Literacy Coach PLC Facilitator Learning Resource Teacher	All	Monthly	Collaborative Meeting Minutes Data meetings with administrator	Literacy Coach, PLC Facilitator, Learning Resource Specialist, Compliance Specialist, IB Coordinator and Assistant Principals
School-wide PD on AVID strategies	9-12	AVID Coordinator PLC Facilitator Learning Resource Teacher	All	Quarterly	Review of lesson plans Observations Review of Data	AVID Coordinator, PLC Facilitator, Learning Resource Specialist and Assistant Principals

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
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Achieve 3000	Web-based resource for informational texts and monitoring		$22,978.30
			Subtotal: $22,978.30
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: $22,978.30

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
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1: *Decrease by 2% the number of students scoring at beginner's level* 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: ELLs at the beginner's level in the area of listening/speaking: Ninth grade-9% or seven out of seventy-nine students tested. Tenth grade-6% or four out of sixty-three students tested.	1.1. • Limited resources at home	1.1. • Each ELL student in danger of not performing on grade level is placed on an Academic Needs Identification Plan (ANI) based on data mentioned above among other input: grades, teacher request, and student's request for help. • Provide On-Campus opportunities for ELL students to receive coaching in the area of need: tutoring, organizational skills, and vocabulary enhancement.	1.1. • Compliance Teacher • Bilingual paraprofessionals	1.1. • ELL student meetings during 5th period to monitor progress, and document input for weaknesses or strengths. Teachers/ELL students will generate appointments on a weekly basis. • Tracking of ELL student attendance to receive tutoring services at the Academic Resource Center (ARC). This input will generate areas of most need: Math, English, Science, or History. • ELL student classwork monitored by faculty facilitators during 5th period meetings. • Review of Academic Needs Improvement plan every marking period to add/reinforce strategies and accommodations as needed.	1.1. • ELLs progress report. • ELLs report card. • October FCAT testing. • Benchmark testing. • Re-evaluation testing using Idea Proficiency Test (IPT). • Annual CELLA scores. • ELL Committee input based on teacher generated assessments.
	1.2. • Need to increase parental awareness of school procedures and available academic options.	1.2. • Survey ELL parents to determine most needed area of knowledge. • Provide workshops during Parent Leadership Council time to remedy the gap.	1.2. • Compliance Teacher • Parent Leadership Council	1.2. • Parent Leadership Council review of the data and workshops	1.2. • Survey data • Workshop feedback

		1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
		• ELL students new to the country need language acquisition time.	• Placed eligible students into Developmental Language Arts specifically for language acquisition	• Compliance Teacher • DLA teacher	• Compliance Teacher and DLA teacher review student needs weekly. • Compliance Teacher provides best strategies and resource support to DLA teacher.	• ELLs progress report. • ELLs report card. • Benchmark testing. • Re-evaluation testing using Idea Proficiency Test (IPT). • Annual CELLA scores.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2: *Decrease by 2% the number of students scoring at beginner's level*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: ELLs at the beginner's level in the area of reading: Ninth grade-30% or twenty-four out of seventy-nine students tested. Tenth grade-14% or nine out of sixty-three students tested.	2.1. • Limited resources at home	2.1. • Each ELL student in danger of not performing on grade level is placed on an Academic Needs Identification Plan (ANI) based on data mentioned above among other input: grades, teacher request, and student's request for help. • Provide On-Campus opportunities for ELL students to receive coaching in the area of need: tutoring, organizational skills, and vocabulary enhancement.	2.1. • Compliance Teacher • Bilingual paraprofessionals	2.1. • ELL student meetings during 5th period to monitor progress, and document input for weaknesses or strengths. Teachers/ELL students will generate appointments on a weekly basis. • Tracking of ELL student attendance to receive tutoring services at the Academic Resource Center (ARC). This input will generate areas of most need: Math, English, Science, or History. • ELL student classwork monitored by faculty facilitators during 5th period meetings. • Review of Academic Needs Improvement plan every marking period to add/reinforce strategies and accommodations as needed.	2.1. • ELLs progress report. • ELLs report card. • October FCAT testing. • Benchmark testing. • Re-evaluation testing using Idea Proficiency Test (IPT). • Annual CELLA scores. • ELL Committee input based on teacher generated assessments.
		2.2. • Need to increase parental awareness of school procedures and available academic options.	2.2. • Survey ELL parents to determine most needed area of knowledge • Provide workshops during Collaboration time to remedy	2.2. • Compliance Teacher • Parent Leadership Council	2.2. • Parent Leadership Council review of the data and workshops	2.2. • Survey data • Workshop feedback

		2.3 the gap			
		2.3 Limited exposure to informational text at appropriate levels for language development	2.3 • Provide Reading and History classes with informational text through Achieve 3000 • Use the Achieve 3000 functionality for reading to the student as well as the pronunciation function.	2.3 • Literacy Coach and Assistant Principals .	2.3 • Analyze reports from Achieve 3000 on the use of informational texts. • Analyze and evaluate teacher-generated common assessments for the incorporation of informational texts.	2.3 • Common Assessments and OCPS Benchmark Assessments
Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3: *Decrease by 2% the number of students scoring at beginner's level*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : ELLs at the beginner's level in the area of writing: Ninth grade-10% or eight out of seventy-nine students tested. Tenth grade-8% or 5 out of sixty-two students tested.	2.1. • Limited resources at home	2.1. • Each ELL student in danger of not performing on grade level is placed on an Academic Needs Identification Plan (ANI) based on data mentioned above among other input: grades, teacher request, and student's request for help. • Provide On-Campus opportunities for ELL students to receive coaching in the area of need: tutoring, organizational skills, and vocabulary enhancement.	2.1. • Compliance Teacher • Bilingual paraprofessionals	2.1. • ELL student meetings during 5th period to monitor progress, and document input for weaknesses or strengths. Teachers/ELL students will generate appointments on a weekly basis. • Tracking of ELL student attendance to receive tutoring services at the Academic Resource Center (ARC). This input will generate areas of most need: Math, English, Science, or History. • ELL student classwork monitored by faculty facilitators during 5th period meetings. • Review of Academic Needs Improvement plan every marking period to add/reinforce strategies and accommodations as needed.	2.1. • ELLs progress report. • ELLs report card. • October FCAT testing. • Benchmark testing. • Re-evaluation testing using Idea Proficiency Test (IPT). • Annual CELLA scores. • ELL Committee input based on teacher generated assessments.

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

		2.2. • Need to increase parental awareness of school procedures and available academic options.	2.2. • Survey ELL parents to determine most needed area of knowledge. • Provide workshops during Parent Leadership Council time to remedy the gap.	2.2. Compliance Teacher Parent Leadership Council	2.2. Parent Leadership Council review of the data and workshops	2.2. • Survey data • Workshop feedback
		2.3 • Need to increase grammatical understanding of English with targeted and individualized writing feedback	2.3 • Instruction in understanding and using the FCAT Rubric; Self – assessment; peer editing; MY Access assessment and feedback	2.3 Faculty, Learning Resource Specialist, Assistant Principals	2.3 MY Access reports on regularly scheduled writing prompts	2.3 • MY Access

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
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Access to informational text	Nook WiFi	General Budget	$5,000.00
			Subtotal: $5,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of CELLA Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1A.1. Not Applicable	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
Mathematics Goal #1A: Not Applicable	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Not Applicable	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Not Applicable					
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1. Not Applicable	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Mathematics Goal #1B: Not Applicable	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Not Applicable	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Not Applicable					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1. Not Applicable	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.
Mathematics Goal #2A: Not Applicable	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Not Applicable	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Not Applicable					
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1. Not Applicable	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Mathematics Goal #2B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3A.1. Not Applicable	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.
Mathematics Goal #3A: Not Applicable	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Not Applicable	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Not Applicable					
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1. Not Applicable	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Mathematics Goal #3B: Not Applicable	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Not Applicable	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Not Applicable					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1. Not Applicable	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.
Mathematics Goal #4: Not Applicable	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Not Applicable	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Not Applicable					

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**						
Mathematics Goal #5A: Not Applicable							

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.		5C.1. Not Applicable	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	
Mathematics Goal #5C: Not Applicable	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Not Applicable	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Not Applicable					

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

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

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1A.1. Not Applicable	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
Mathematics Goal #1A: Not Applicable.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Not Applicable	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Not Applicable					
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1. Not Applicable	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Mathematics Goal #1B: Not Applicable	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Not Applicable	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Not Applicable					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1. Not Applicable	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.
Mathematics Goal #2A: Not Applicable	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Not Applicable	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Not Applicable					
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1. Not Applicable	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.

Mathematics Goal #2B: Not Applicable	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Not Applicable	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Not Applicable					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3A.1. Not Applicable	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.
Mathematics Goal #3A: Not Applicable	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Not Applicable	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Not Applicable					
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1. Not Applicable	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Mathematics Goal #3B: Not Applicable	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Not Applicable	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Not Applicable					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1. Not Applicable	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.
Mathematics Goal #4: Not Applicable	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Not Applicable	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Not Applicable					

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**	Not Applicable					
Mathematics Goal #5A: Not Applicable							

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1. Not Applicable	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	
Mathematics Goal #5C: Not Applicable.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Not Applicable	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Not Applicable						

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

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
<u>Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals</u>

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

High School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. <u>Mathematics Goal #1:</u> *Increase performance of students scoring at these levels.*	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> *Data not entered since number of students is less than 10.*	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> *Data not entered since number of students is less than 10.*	1.1. • Need for consistent curriculum and monitoring towards FAA and IEP standards	1.1. • Provide opportunity for faculty PD on FAA and best practices	1.1. • ESE faculty, Inclusion Coach, Staffing Specialist and Assistant Principal	1.1. • Weekly Collaborative group meetings to define essential outcomes. • Identify and align instructional resources • Identify various instructional strategies to meet essential outcomes	1.1. • Common assessment • Data chats based on IEP • FAA
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics. <u>Mathematics Goal #2:</u> *Maintain performance of students scoring at these levels.*	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> *Data not entered since number of students is less than 10.*	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> *Data not entered since number of students is less than 10.*	2.1. • Need for consistent curriculum and monitoring towards FAA and IEP standards	2.1. • Provide opportunity for faculty PD on FAA and best practices	2.1. • ESE faculty, Inclusion Coach, Staffing Specialist and Assistant Principal	2.1. • Weekly Collaborative group meetings to define essential outcomes. • Identify and align instructional resources • Identify various instructional strategies to meet essential outcomes	2.1. • Common assessment • Data chats based on IEP • FAA
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. <u>Mathematics Goal #3:</u> *Increase performance of*	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	3.1. • Need for consistent curriculum and monitoring towards FAA and IEP standards	3.1. • Provide opportunity for faculty PD on FAA and best practices	3.1. • ESE faculty, Inclusion Coach, Staffing Specialist and Assistant Principal	3.1. • Weekly Collaborative group meetings to define essential outcomes. • Identify and align instructional resources	3.1. • Common assessment • Data chats based on IEP • FAA

students scoring at these levels. *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	*Data not entered since number of students is less than 10.*	*Data not entered since number of students is less than 10.*				• Identify various instructional strategies to meet essential outcomes	

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
High School AMO Mathematics Goals

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

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
A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** In SY1011, 48% of students scored satisfactory in mathematics.	In SY1112, 57 % of students scored satisfactory in mathematics.	By SY1213, 57% of students will score satisfactory in mathematics.	By SY1314, 61% of students will score satisfactory in mathematics.	By SY1415, 65% of students will score satisfactory in mathematics.	By SY1516, 70% of students will score satisfactory in mathematics.	By SY1617, 74% of students will score satisfactory in mathematics.
HS Mathematics Goal A: Annually increase the number of students scoring satisfactory in mathematics.							

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. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**		3B.1. • Consistent monitoring of student academic knowledge.	3B.1. • Continue working in Algebra and Geometry Collaborative groups to refine essential outcomes and interventions. • Use Khan Academy to provide student with tiered intervention strategies. • Use PENDA to provide student in Geometry with tiered intervention strategies.	3B.1. • Algebra faculty • Geometry faculty • PL facilitator • Assistant Principal	3B.1. • Weekly Collaborative group meetings	3B.1. • Common Assessments • Khan Academy Reports • PENDA Reports	
HS Mathematics Goal B: *By SY1213, maintain meeting the AMO's by continuing with current strategies.*	**2012 Current Level of Performance:*** White:73% Black: 50% Hispanic:48% Asian: 71% American Indian: N/A						
	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White: 68% Black:48% Hispanic:53% Asian: 73% American Indian: N/A						

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			3C.1. • Limited resources at home	3C.1. • Each ELL student in danger of not performing on grade level is placed on an Academic Needs Identification Plan (ANI) based on data mentioned above among other input: grades, teacher request, and student's request for help. • Provide On-Campus opportunities for ELL students to receive coaching in the area of need: tutoring, organizational skills, and vocabulary enhancement.	3C.1. • Compliance Teacher • Bilingual paraprofessionals	3C.1. • ELL student meetings during 5th period to monitor progress, and document input for weaknesses or strengths. Teachers/ELL students will generate appointments on a weekly basis. • Tracking of ELL student attendance to receive tutoring services at the Academic Resource Center (ARC). This input will generate areas of most need: Math, English, Science, or History. • ELL student classwork monitored by faculty facilitators during 5th period meetings. • Review of Academic Needs Improvement plan every marking period to add/reinforce strategies and accommodations as needed.	3C.1. • ELLs progress report. • ELLs report card. • October FCAT testing. • Benchmark testing. • Re-evaluation testing using Idea Proficiency Test (IPT). • Annual CELLA scores. • ELL Committee input based on teacher generated assessments.
HS Mathematics Goal C: *By SY1213, 47% of ELL students will score satisfactory in mathematics.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *34%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *37%*					
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
D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			3D.1. • Consistent support to student's learning strategies	3D.1. • Provide support facilitation strategies in the classroom for both mathematics faculty and ESE student. • Provide student support	3D.1. • ESE Support Facilitator • Mathematics faculty • Inclusion Coach	3D.1. • Student classwork progress	3D.1. • Common Assessments • Student academic grades • OCPS Benchmark
HS Mathematics Goal D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	27%	30%		through inclusion coach.			Assessments
By SY1213, 40% of Students with Disabilities will score satisfactory in mathematics.							

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
E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. HS Mathematics Goal E: *By SY1213, maintain meeting the AMO's by continuing with current strategies.*	**2012 Current Level of Performance:*** *52%*	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:*** *54%*	3E.1. • Consistent monitoring of student academic knowledge.	3E.1. • Continue working in Algebra and Geometry Collaborative groups to refine essential outcomes and interventions. • Use Khan Academy to provide student with tiered intervention strategies. • Use PENDA to provide student in Geometry with tiered intervention strategies.	3E.1. • Algebra faculty • Geometry faculty • PL facilitator • Assistant Principal	3E.1. • Weekly Collaborative group meetings	3E.1. • Common Assessments • Khan Academy Reports • PENDA Reports

End of HS Mathematics AMO 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
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1. Algebra 1 Goal #1: *Increase to 37% (192/519) students scoring at Level 3.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *SY1112, 35% (181/519)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *SY1213, 37% (192/519)*	1.1. • Consistent monitoring of student academic knowledge	1.1. • Continue working in Algebra Collaborative group to refine essential outcomes and interventions. • Use Khan Academy to provide student with tiered intervention strategies.	1.1. • Algebra faculty • PLC facilitator • Assistant Principal	1.1. • Weekly Collaborative group meetings	1.1. • Common Assessments • Khan Academy reports
			1.2 • Understanding the Algebra standards by deconstructing the standards.	1.2 • Participate in the East Learning Community collaborative group for mathematics standards understanding. • Train the mathematics faculty at UHS based on the learning from the East Learning Community collaborative group	1.2 • Algebra faculty • PLC facilitator • Assistant Principal	1.2 • East Learning Community collaborative group meetings • Weekly Collaborative group meetings	1.2 • Common Assessments • Observations
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1. Algebra Goal #2: *Increase 7% (29/419) students scoring at Levels 4 and 5.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *SY1112, 5% (26/519)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *SY1213, 7% (29/519)*	2.1. • Consistent monitoring of student academic knowledge	2.1. • Continue working in Algebra Collaborative group to refine essential outcomes and interventions. • Use Khan Academy to provide student with tiered intervention strategies.	2.1. • Algebra faculty • PLC facilitator • Assistant Principal	2.1. • Weekly Collaborative group meetings	2.1. * Common Assessments * Khan Academy reports
			2.2 • Need for enrichment activities	2.2 • Work in Algebra collaborative group to identify enrichment activities tied to essential outcomes	2.2 • Algebra faculty • PLC facilitator • Assistant Principal	2.3 • Weekly Collaborative group meetings	2.2 • Common Assessments • Observations

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
<u>Geometry End-of-Course Goals</u> *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Geometry EOC)*

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

Geometry EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.			1.1. • Consistent monitoring of student academic knowledge	1.1. • Continue working in Geometry Collaborative group to refine essential outcomes and interventions.	1.1. • Geometry faculty • PLC facilitator • Assistant Principal	1.1. • Weekly Collaborative group meetings	1.1. • Commons Assessments • Benchmarks • Geometry EOC
<u>Geometry Goal #1:</u> *Increase to 35% the number of students scoring in the second-third percentile.*	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> *SYI112, 32% (183/572) students scored in the second-third percentile.*	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> *SY12 13, 35% of students will score in the second-third percentile.*					
			1.2 • Understanding the Geometry standards by deconstructing the standards.	1.2 • Participate in the East Learning Community collaborative group for mathematics standards understanding. • Train the mathematics faculty at UHS based on the learning from the East Learning Community collaborative group	1.2 • Geometry faculty • PLC facilitator • Assistant Principal	1.2 • East Learning Community collaborative group meetings • Weekly Collaborative group meetings	1.2 • Common Assessments • Observations
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.			2.1. • Consistent monitoring of student academic knowledge	2.1. • Continue working in Geometry Collaborative group to refine essential outcomes and interventions.	2.1. • Geometry faculty • PLC facilitator • Assistant Principal	2.1. • Weekly Collaborative group meetings	2.1. • Commons Assessments • Benchmarks • Geometry EOC
<u>Geometry Goal #2:</u> *Increase to 26% the number of students scoring in the second-third percentile.*	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> *SYI112, 24% (137/572) students scored in the top-third percentile.*	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> *SY1213, 26% of students will score in the second-third percentile.*					
			2.2 • Need for enrichment activities	2.2 • Work in Geometry collaborative group to identify enrichment activities tied to essential outcomes	2.2 • Geometry faculty • PLC facilitator • Assistant Principal	2.3 • Weekly Collaborative group meetings	2.2 • Common Assessments • Observations

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

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities					
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.					
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Algebra Collaborative group	9-10	PLC facilitator	Algebra faculty	Weekly	Review of Minutes Review of lesson planes Observations Review of Common Assessment Review of Data	PLC Facilitator and Assistant Principal
Geometry Collaborative group	10	PLC facilitator	Geometry faculty	Weekly	Review of Minutes Review of lesson planes Observations Review of Common Assessment Review of Data	PLC Facilitator and Assistant Principal
East Learning Community Mathematics Consortium	Algebra / Geometry	OCPS Curriculum Services facilitators	Algebra faculty Geometry faculty Mathematics chair Assistant Principal	Quarterly	Review of Minutes Review of lesson planes Observations Review of Common Assessment Review of Data	Assistant Principal

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
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

	Subtotal:
	Total:

End of Mathematics Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.			1A.1. Not Applicable	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
Science Goal #1A: Not Applicable	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Not Applicable	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Not Applicable					
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1B.1. Not Applicable	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Science Goal #1B: Not Applicable	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Not Applicable	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Not Applicable					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.			2A.1. Not Applicable	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.
Science Goal #2A: Not Applicable	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Not Applicable	2013Expected Level of Performance:* Not Applicable					
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2B.1. Not Applicable	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.

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

Science Goal #2B: Not Applicable	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Not Applicable	2013Expected Level of Performance:* Not Applicable				

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
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1.1. • Need for consistent curriculum and monitoring towards FAA and IEP standards	1.1. • Provide opportunity for faculty PD on FAA and best practices	1.1. • ESE faculty, Inclusion Coach, Staffing Specialist and Assistant Principal	1.1. • Weekly Collaborative group meetings to define essential outcomes. • Identify and align instructional resources • Identify various instructional strategies to meet essential outcomes	1.1. • Common assessment • Data chats based on IEP • FAA
Science Goal #1: *Increase performance of students scoring at these levels.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Data not entered since number of students is less than 10.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Data not entered since number of students is less than 10.*					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2.1. • Need for consistent curriculum and monitoring towards FAA and IEP standards	2.1. • Provide opportunity for faculty PD on FAA and best practices	2.1. • ESE faculty, Inclusion Coach, Staffing Specialist and Assistant Principal	2.1. • Weekly Collaborative group meetings to define essential outcomes. • Identify and align instructional resources • Identify various instructional strategies to meet essential outcomes	2.1. • Common assessment • Data chats based on IEP • FAA
Science Goal #2: *Maintain performance of students scoring at these levels.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Data not entered since number of students is less than 10.*	2013Expected Level of Performance:* *Data not entered since number of students is less than 10.*					

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

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

Biology 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1. Biology 1 Goal #1: *Increase to 35% the number of students scoring at second-percentile.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *SY1112, 32% (192/602) scored in the second-third percentile.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *SY1213, 35% of students will score in the second-third percentile.*	1.1. • Need for consistent curriculum and monitoring of Biology standards.	1.1. • Provide opportunity for faculty PD on Biology standards, essential outcomes, and best practices	1.1. • Biology faculty • PLC Facilitator • Assistant Principal	1.1. • Weekly Collaborative group meetings to define essential outcomes. • Identify and align instructional resources • Identify various instructional strategies to meet essential outcomes	1.1. • Common assessment Data • Benchmark EOC
			1.2. • Need for tiered intervention strategies for Biology.	1.2. • Use PENDA to provide student in Biology with tiered intervention strategies.	1.2. • Biology faculty • PLC Facilitator • Assistant Principal	1.2. • Weekly Collaborative group meetings	1.2. • PENDA Reports
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1. Biology 1 Goal #2: *Increase to 32%) the number of students scoring at the second-percentile.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *SY1112, 29% (174/602) scored in the top-third percentile.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *SY1213, 32% of students will score in the second-third percentile.*	1.1. • Need for consistent curriculum and monitoring of Biology standards.	1.1. • Provide opportunity for faculty PD on Biology standards, essential outcomes, and best practices	1.1. • Biology faculty • PLC Facilitator • Assistant Principal	1.1. • Weekly Collaborative group meetings to define essential outcomes. • Identify and align instructional resources • Identify various instructional strategies to meet essential outcomes	1.1. • Common assessment Data • Benchmark EOC
			2.2. • Need for tiered intervention strategies for Biology.	2.2. • Use PENDA to provide student in Biology with tiered intervention strategies.	2.2. • Biology faculty • PLC Facilitator • Assistant Principal	2.2. • Weekly Collaborative group meetings	2.2. • PENDA Reports

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Biology Collaborative Group	9-10	PLC Facilitator	Biology faculty	Weekly	Review of minutes Review of lesson plans Observations Review of Data	PLC Facilitator and Assistant Principal
PENDA resource training	Biology	Consultant	Biology faculty	Fall semester	Email and PENDA Reports	Assistant Principal

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
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
PENDA web subscription	Digital resource to provide tiered interventions.	General Funds	$8,450.00
			Subtotal: $8,450.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
			Total: $8,450.00

End of Science Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
<u>Writing Goals</u>

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

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.			1A.1. • Fidelity and consistency of writing instruction	1A.1. • Collaborative planning to determine essential standards, order of instruction, and common lesson plans	1A.1. • Faculty, Learning Resource Specialist, Assistant Principals	1A.1. • Common Assessment	1A.1. • MY Access and common assessments
Writing Goal #1A: *Increase by 91% (623/685) of students scoring level 3.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *SY1112, 89% (609/685)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *SY1213, 91% (623/685)*					
			1A.2. • Fidelity and consistency of writing assessment	1A.2. • Use of MY Access and feedback	1A.2. • Faculty, Learning Resource Specialist, Assistant Principals	1A.2. • MY Access reports on regularly scheduled writing prompts	1A.2. • MY Access
			1A.3. • Students' lack of understanding of what constitutes a Level 4 on the FCAT Writes test	1A.3. • Instruction in four components of the FCAT Writes rubric; Instruction in using the FCAT rubric; self-assessment; peer editing	1A.3. • Faculty, Learning Resource Specialist, Assistant Principals	1A.3. • MY Access reports on regularly scheduled writing prompts	1A.3. • MY Access
			1A4. • Students' lack of writing practice	1A4. • Regularly scheduled FCAT Writes style prompts	1A4. • Faculty, Learning Resource Specialist, Assistant Principals	1A4. • MY Access reports on regularly scheduled writing prompts	1A4. • MY Access
			1A5. • Targeted and individualized writing feedback	1A5. • Instruction in understanding and using the FCAT Rubric; Self – assessment; peer editing; MY Access assessment and feedback	1A5. • Faculty, Learning Resource Specialist, Assistant Principals	1A5. • MY Access reports on regularly scheduled writing prompts	1A5. • MY Access
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.			1B.1. • Need for consistent curriculum and monitoring towards FAA and IEP standards	1B.1. • Provide opportunity for faculty PD on FAA and best practices	1B.1. • ESE faculty, Inclusion Coach, Staffing Specialist and Assistant Principal	1B.1. • Weekly Collaborative group meetings to define essential outcomes. • Identify and align instructional resources	1B.1. • Common assessment Data chats based on IEP • FAA
Writing Goal #1B: *Increase student*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

performance of students scoring at those levels.	Data not entered since number of students is less than 10.	Data not entered since number of students is less than 10.			• Identify various instructional strategies to meet essential outcomes	

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Collaborative groups	9-12	Learning Resource Specialist PLC Facilitator	English 1 English 2 English 3 English 4 AP English IB English	Weekly	Review of minutes Review of lesson plans Observations Review of Common Assessments Review of Data	Learning Resource Specialist, PLC Facilitator and Assistant Principal

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
MY Access	Web-based writing resource and progress monitoring	General Funs	$15,600
			Subtotal: $15,600
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not Applicable			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not Applicable			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not Applicable			
			Subtotal:

	Total: $15,600

End of Writing Goals

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

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

Civics EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.			1.1. Not Applicable	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Civics Goal #1: Not Applicable	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Not Applicable	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Not Applicable					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.			2.1. Not Applicable	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Civics Goal #2: Not Applicable	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Not Applicable	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Not Applicable					

Civics Professional Development

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

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

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
Not Applicable			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not Applicable			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not Applicable			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not Applicable			
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Civics Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
U.S. History End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(required in year 2013-2014)*

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

U.S. History EOC Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #1: *Data not available*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Not applicable* — 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Not applicable*	1.1. • Need for consistent curriculum and monitoring of US History standards.	1.1. • Provide opportunity for faculty PD on US History standards, essential outcomes, and best practices	1.1. • US History faculty, PLC Facilitator, and Assistant Principal	1.1. • Weekly Collaborative group meetings to define essential outcomes. • Identify and align instructional resources • Identify various instructional strategies to meet essential outcomes	1.1. • Common assessment Data • Benchmark EOC
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #2: *Data not available*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Not applicable* — 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Not applicable*	2.1. • Need for consistent curriculum and monitoring of US History standards.	2.1. • * Provide opportunity for faculty PD on US History standards, essential outcomes, and best practices	2.1. • US History faculty, PLC Facilitator, and Assistant Principal	2.1. • Weekly Collaborative group meetings to define essential outcomes. • Identify and align instructional resources • Identify various instructional strategies to meet essential outcomes	2.1. • Common assessment Data • Benchmark EOC

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
U.S. History Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
US History Collaborative group	10-11	PLC Facilitator	US History faculty	Weekly	Review of minutes Review of lesson plans Observations Review of Common Assessments Review of Data	PLC Facilitator and Assistant Principal

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
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of U.S. History Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			1.1. • Inconsistent consequences for being tardy to class • Inconsistent attendance entry by faculty leads to misidentifying students for attendance study team meetings	1.1. • LOP (Loss of Privilege) systemic method for providing consequences for class tardies • Consistent monitoring of attendance data	1.1. • Deans • Assistant Principals	1.1. • Evaluation of data	1.1. • LOP reports • Monthly OCPS EDW report on attendance • Annual attendance data
Attendance Goal #1: *Increase overall attendance rate by decreasing excessive absences and tardies.*	2012 Current Attendance Rate:* *SY 1112, the daily attendance rate of 92.55% (3012)*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* *SY1213, the average daily attendance rate of 95%.*					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) *SY1112, 32% (1336/4172) absences were excessive.*	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) *SY1213, 30%*					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) *SY1112, 5% (71/1414) students had excessive tardies.*	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) *Sy1213, 3%*					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Attendance Professional Development

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
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.						
Loss of Privilege program	All	Deans	All faculty	Preplanning	Monitor LOP data	Deans and Assistant Principals
Attendance	All	Learning Resource Teacher	All faculty	September	Monitor attendance data	Assistant Principals

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
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Attendance Goals

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1: *Decrease overall suspensions by providing a tiered behavior intervention and alternative educational setting.*	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions *427* 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School *306* 2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions *431* 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School *277*	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions *347* 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School *208* 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions *350* 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School *208*	1.1. • Inconsistent communication of classroom behavior expectations • Disruption of educational services due to suspensions	1.1. • Continuation of the ACHIEVE school-wide method for communicating to students classroom expectations • PLACE (Positive Learning and Corrective Education) alternative to suspension program.	1.1. • Deans • PLACE facilitator • Assistant Principals	1.1. • Referral rate by faculty • Referral rate by students • Observations	1.1. • OCPS EDW report on discipline • iObservation data

Suspension Professional Development

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

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not applicable			

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

			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Suspension Goals

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Dropout Prevention <u>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</u> *Data for 2011-12 is not available.* **Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*			1.1. • Behind in credits/GPA	1.1. • Continue credit retrieval academic services	1.1. • Guidance Counselors	1.1. • Graduation Requirements met • FCAT scores • Credits recovered	1.1. • Graduation Rate • FCAT passed • Final grades
	<u>2012 Current Dropout Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*</u>					
	SY1011, 0.6%.	*Not applicable*					
	<u>2012 Current Graduation Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*</u>					
	SY1011, 91.3%	*Not applicable*					

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
Not applicable						

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
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement			1.1. • Lack of parental involvement in academic support	1.1. • Identify and recruit parents to serve on School Advisory Council. • Create events for parents to receive information on support students' academic and social emotional needs outside of Guidance Services programs.	1.1. • SAFE Coordinator • Assistant Principal	1.1. • Increase in membership of School Advisory Council • Increase Additions volunteer hours • Increase in number of Additions volunteers.	1.1. • Additions Volunteer reports
Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Increase the number of hours and/or parental attendance for academic support.* **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:* *SY1112, 306 ADDitions volunteers were registered for UHS.*	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:* *SY1213, increase to at least 336 ADDitions volunteers registered for UHS.*					

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
Not applicable						

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
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

<u>**Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Goal(s)**</u>

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
<u>STEM Goal #1:</u> • Implement a project/problem based learning style through courses in the Global Technology curriculum.	1.1. • Planning interdisciplinary, project/problem based learning for all classes.	1.1 • The STEM Collaborative group will create Project/Problem based learning curriculum and monitoring the data from each grade level • Increase staff and faculty development in STEM fields by attending major conferences and professional development: i.e. ITSEC. • The STEM Collaborative group will have events such Science Technology Engineering & Math Night. • The STEM Collaborative group will continue to support the UHS Robotics Team, Girls in Engineering Math and Science. • University High School will work closely with Research Park for continued support STEM. .	1.1. • Global Technology Coordinator • STEM Collaborative group	1.1. • Project/Problem based curriculum created for STEM can be analyzed by STEM collaborative group.	1.1. 4. Lesson plan reviews

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
STEM Collaborative group	9-12	PLC Facilitator	Global Technology faculty	Weekly	Review of minutes Review of lesson plans Observations Review of Common Assessments Review of data	PLC Facilitator and Assistant Principal

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
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of STEM Goal(s)

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
CTE Goal #1: *Continue to increase participation in the veterinarian certification. In SY1112, 90% (9/10) students passed the certification exam.*	1.1. • Completing the required 250 hours at a veterinary clinic or animal setting.	1.1. • Continue to work with students and community to find placement.	1.1. • Faculty	1.1. • Placement of students	1.1. • Number of students participating in testing • Pass rate of certification test

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
Not applicable					

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
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not applicable			
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Additional Goal			1.1. • Academic advising for students to enroll in advance courses.	1.1. • Continue to refine academic advising • Identify students through AP Potential for advance course work.	1.1. • Guidance Counselors • Assistant Principals	1.1. • Student course requests • AP Potential reports	1.1. • Student schedules
Additional Goal #1: 1. *Increase enrollment and performance in advanced programs.* 2. *Increase enrollment and performance in upper level mathematics and science courses.* 3. *Increase enrollment and performance in college dual enrollment programs.* 4. *Increase college and career readiness.* 5. *Increase students earning at or above 21.2 on the ACT and/or at/or above 502 verbal, 515 math, and 494 writing on the SAT.* 6. *Decrease the achievement gap for each identified subgroup by 10% (See*	2012 Current Level :* *SY1112, 1205 students were enrolled AP/IB courses.* *SY1112, 19.4% students were enrolled in upper level math and 26.6% in upper level science courses.* *SY1112, 36 students were enrolled in college dual enrollment courses.* *SY1011, Mean score for ACT was 18.8. SY1112, Mean score for SAT Write was 476. Mean score for SAT Verbal was 499. Mean score for SAT Math was 506.*	2013 Expected Level :* *SY1213, 1225 students to be enrolled in AP/IB courses.* *SY1213, 22.4% students will be enrolled in upper level math and 29.6% in upper level science courses.* *SY1213, 45 students will be enrolled in college dual enrollment courses.* *SY1213, Increase Mean scores for ACT SAT Write 480. SAT Verbal 505. SAT Math 510.* *SY1213, 1149 students will be*					

Goals 5B, 3B Algebra EOC,3B Geometry EOC) 7. *Increase fine arts enrollment.* 8. *Work cooperatively with technical centers.(See CTE Goal)* 9. *Decrease disproportionate classification in special education.* 10. *Increase by successful completion of Algebra 1 prior to 10th grade (See Goal Algebra End of Course Exam).*	*SY1112, 1116 students were enrolled in fine arts courses.* *SY1112, all race areas in ESE are less than the population except white. There were 39.2% in ESE and 28.1% of total White population.* *SY1112, 73.3% of students passed Algebra prior to 10th grade.*	*enrolled in fine arts courses.* *SY1213, decrease the disproportionate classification of white students in ESE to 25.1%.* *SY1213, 75% of students will pass Algebra prior to 10th grade.*					
			1.2. • Consistent curriculum and instructional strategies in AP/IB courses.	1.2. • Continue refinement of essential outcomes and monitoring of student progress.	1.2. • AP/IB Collaborative group • PLC Facilitator • Assistant Principals	1.2. • Weekly Collaborative group meetings to refine essential outcomes. • Data chats.	1.2. • Common assessment data • Observations • AP/IB Scores
			1.3. • Rigorous learning opportunities to practice for ACT and SAT needs.	1.3. • Continue refinement of essential outcomes and monitoring of student progress.	1.3. • All Collaborative groups • PLC Facilitator • Assistant Principals	1.3. • Weekly Collaborative group meetings to refine essential outcomes. • Data chats.	1.3. • Common assessment data • Observations • ACT/ SAT Scores
			1.4. • Need for students • to take comprehensive academic notes	1.4 • Use of AVID strategies including WICOR	1.4 • Faculty • Collaborative groups • Assistant Principals	1.4 • Analyze and evaluate student assessment results.	1.4 • Student academic grades • OCPS IMS • OCPS Benchmark Assessments

Additional Goals Professional Development

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.					
AP Potential Reports	Guidance Counselors	OCPS Curriculum Services	Guidance Counselor	Fall 2012	Student placement.	Guidance Counselors and Assistant Principals

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
Not applicable.			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not applicable.			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not applicable.			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Not applicable.			
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.
Reading Budget
Total: $22,978.30
CELLA Budget
Total:$5,000.00
Mathematics Budget
Total:
Science Budget
Total:$8,450.00
Writing Budget
Total: $15,600.00
Civics Budget
Total:
U.S. History Budget
Total:
Attendance Budget
Total:
Suspension Budget
Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget
Total:
Parent Involvement Budget
Total:
STEM Budget
Total: $30,000
CTE Budget
Total:
Additional Goals
Total:
Grand Total: $82,028.30

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

<u>Differentiated Accountability</u>

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
☐Priority	☐Focus	☐Prevent

- Are you reward school? ☐Yes ☒No

(A reward school is any school that has improved their letter grade from the previous year or any A graded school.)

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

☒ Yes ☐ No

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

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
The School Advisory Council will meet monthly during the school year. The Council will monitor student progress during meetings through presentations by school staff on the progress based on SIP activities. The SAC will conduct a community, faculty, and student needs assessment surveys to determine stakeholders perceptions of academics, safety, and continuous improvement. In addition, the SAC will plan to inform students and parents with a booth during open house, school newsletter, website updates, and Spring academic night.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Parental Involvement	$2,000.00
Classroom Grants	$1,500.00