Florida Department of Education

DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Lake Myrtle Elementary	District Name: Pasco
Principal: Jason Petry	Superintendent: Heather Fiorentino
SAC Chair: Jennifer Heptig	Date of School Board Approval: 11/6/12

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

High School Feedback Report

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

Administrators

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)

Principal	Jason Petry	Educational Leadership, Elementary Education,ESOL Endorsed, School Principal	2	4	Lake Myrtle Elementary- 2011-2012 School Grade A AYP-Not Met 2011-2012 School Grade A AMO- Math Level 1- 13% Level 2- 22% Level 3- 30% Level 4- 23% Level 5-12% Learning Gains- 75% Lowest quartile making learning gains-75% Reading Level 1-11% Level 2-20% Level 3-28% Level 4-29% Level 5-12% Learning Gains- 67% Lowest quartile making learning gains-62% Veterans Elementary- 2010-2011 School Grade A AYP-Not Met 2009-2010 School Grade A, AYP-Not Met 2008-2009 School Grade A, AYP- Met

Assistant Principal	Jennifer Heptig	Educational Leadership, Sociology, Elementary Education, ESOL Endorsed	5	7	Lake Myrtle Elementary- 2011-2012 School Grade A AMO- Math Level 1- 13% Level 2- 22% Level 3- 30% Level 4- 23% Level 5-12% Learning Gains- 75% Lowest quartile making learning gains-75% Reading Level 1-11% Level 2-20% Level 3-28% Level 4-29% Level 5-12% Learning Gains- 67% Lowest quartile making learning gains-62% 2010-2011 School Grade B, AYP-Not Met 2009-2010 School Grade B, AYP-Not Met 2008-2009 School Grade A, AYP Not Met, Seven Oaks Elementary- 2007-2008, School Grade A,

					AYP Not Met, 2005-2006 School Grade A, AYP Not Met

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)
Literacy Coach	Heather Ware	Elementary Education, English For Speakers Of Other Languages and Reading Endorsement	1	1	AMO- Math Level 1- 13% Level 2- 22% Level 3- 30% Level 4- 23% Level 5-12% Learning Gains- 75% Lowest quartile making learning gains-75% Reading Level 1-11% Level 2-20% Level 3-28% Level 4-29% Level 5-12% Learning Gains- 67% Lowest quartile making learning gains-62%

Highly Effective Teachers

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

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Hire only Highly Qualified Teachers	Administration	June 2013
2. Provide a professional learning environment in which staff feels supported and appreciated	Administration	June 2013
3. Provide time throughout each month for teachers to work in their professional learning communities to collaborate and support one another.	Administration	June 2013
4.		

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

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
N/A	N/A

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
62	2%(1)	19% (12)	48%(30)	32%(20)	35%(22)	3%(2)	8%(5)	2%(1)	35%(22)

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
Coaches, teacher assigned mentors, team leaders and professional learning community facilitators	New to LMES, new to teaching, new to our state	Based on individual teacher needs	coaching, modeling, planning, data analyzing
Malissa Black	Arielle Harvey	New Teacher	Coaching, Modeling, Planning, data analyzing, collaboration

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

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

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

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. Jason Petry - Principal Jennifer Heptig - Assistant Principal Heather Ware - K-12 Literacy Coach Maeghan Whelan- Behavior Specialist Peni Snyder - School Psychologist Susan Loren - ESE Teacher Jayna Cooper- 4th Grade Teacher Julie Forsting - Kindergarten Teacher Marlene Freiser - Media Specialist Beth Mannarino - Speech Language Pathologist Susan Larkin- Guidance Counselor
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? As a school entering Year Three of PS/RtI(MTSS) training, the school-based RtI Leadership Team will be a core group of people who will attend four days of district based professional development delivered by our RTI(MTSS) Coach. The focus of this professional development is Tier 3, but our school will continue to focus on Tier 1 and Tier 2 with an emphasis of differentiating our core instruction and the implementing the TBIT process. Our team will consist of members from last year's team and due to changes in staff, will have some new members. Along with the help of our RTI(MTSS) Coach, this professional development will be delivered and developed using the Release of Responsibility Method. All our school's teachers and staff members will be organized in grade level Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) who meet weekly. Part of these weekly meetings, the members will be receiving this professional development. The RTI(MTSS) Leadership Team will work along the side of our Professional Learning Communities to review progress monitoring data for the entire school. The team will also continue to use the P-SAPSI to reflect on our school's implementation of PS/RtI (MTSS).
Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? Members of the school-based RtI(MTSS) Leadership Team along with other staff members will review summative assessment data from a variety of sources. They will reflect on the school's current focus to determine if any changes need to made. Throughout the school year, the team will monitor progress towards our school's improvement plan goals and objectives. The team will be looking for evidence that the strategies outlined in the SIP are taking place, as well as work to revise the plan as necessary.
MTSS Implementation

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

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior. Reading- Unit Assessments, FAIR Data, Running Records, other diagnostic assessments Math- Pre/Post Assessments, Math Core K-2(2-5), other diagnostic assessments Writing- Wriitng conferences, using rubrics for short answer responses, other diagnostic assessments Behavior- Referrals (look for trends), monitor secured seclusion, Pasco Star, Monthly data report broken down by highest offenders Science- Science Core K-12 and other diagnostic assessments
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. - PLC, TBIT facilitators will receive training on the MTSS and TBIT process - District will provide assistance during the school year to show the process of MTSS
Describe the plan to support MTSS. -MTSS will be involved in all of our meetings throughout the school year. - Through collaboration the MTSS process interventions/acceleration of students will be developed, implemented and progress monitored - To facilitate the monitoring and the reflection of the grade level data - Assist the grade-level team in working through the four-step problem solving process.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Jason Petry-Principal Jennifer Heptig-Assistant Principal Heather Ware-K-12 Literacy Coach Joyce Csanadi- 3rd grade teacher Rachel Foster- 4th grade teacher Others TBD
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). To assist the school wide's implementation of the K-12 literacy plan This group will meet one time monthly Assist in the development of professional development and the implementation of the Literacy K-12 Plan
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? The focus of the Literacy Leadership Team will be on differentiating reading instruction through daily independent reading, text complexity, and reading stamina. With our end goal being that each classroom teacher utilizes I PICK with students self-selecting texts for independent reading, along with daily conferences between teachers and students. The purpose of these conferences is to set individual reading goals and provide corrective feedback for each reader. The members of LLT will assist in differentiating the professional development on independent reading for our staff members. These needs will be determined by utilizing our school developed innovation configuration map for independent reading and classroom walkthroughs. Implementing the Common Core State Standards in grade K-1 and providing professional development for those teachers in each grade level.

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

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.

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

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

High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.	1A.1. Time not given for daily independent reading-schedules	1A.1. To increase the volume of accountable independent reading.	1A.1. Administration, Professional Learning Communities Leaders, RTI Leadership Team, K-12 Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team	1A.1. During our professional learning communities which meet per grade, the RTI decision rubric will be used to analyze comprehension levels on FAIR (expected level 41st percentile) and comprehension percentages on MMH FCAT Unit Assessments (expected level 70%). The Lead Literacy Team members will observe students engaged in independent reading, looking for individual student goals and listening for corrective feedback by the teacher.	1A.1. FAIR, MMH Unit Assessments, RTI Decision Making Rubric, Walkthrough Document, Innovation Configuration Map for Independent Reading		
Reading Goal #1A: We will have 50%(189) of our students scoring a level three on the Reading FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	28%(106) of our third graders scored a level 3 in reading.	40%(151) of our third graders will score a level 3 in reading.					
		1A.2. Students don't know or understand how to be thinking when reading (metacognitive).	1A.2. To increase the metacognition of our students during the act of reading. Teachers will receive professional development in developing metacognitive readers. The teachers will ask students to think aloud during guided reading and when conferencing with students over independent texts. Students will orally explain and write about their thinking during reading. Professional Development to assist teachers in the quantitative and qualitative factors of text complexity to raise the rigor in reading(Fisher,Frey,Lapp)	1A.2. Administration,K-12 Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team	1A.2. The Lead Literacy Team and administration will conduct walkthroughs to determine the release of responsibility in developing metacognition with our students.	1A.2. school developed walkthrough tool	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	

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

1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.**	1B.2. Students don't know or understand how to be thinking when reading (metacognitive).	1B.2. To increase the metacognition of our students during the act of reading. Teachers will receive professional development in developing metacognitive readers. The teachers will ask students to think aloud during guided reading and when conferencing with students over independent texts. Students will orally explain and write about their thinking during reading. Professional Development to assist teachers in the quantitative and qualitative factors of text complexity to raise the rigor in reading(Fisher,Frey,Lapp)	1B.2. Administration,K-12 Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team	1B.2. The Lead Literacy Team and administration will conduct walkthroughs to determine the release of responsibility in developing metacognition with our students.	1B.2. School developed walkthrough tool		

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

Reading Goal #1B: We will have 66%(4) of our students scoring a level three on the Reading Florida Alternative Assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	50%(3)	66%(4)				
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.	2A.1. Time not given for daily independent reading-schedules	2A.1. To increase the volume of accountable independent reading.	2A.1. Administration, Professional Learning Communities Leaders, RTI Leadership Team, K-12 Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team	2A.1. During our professional learning communities which meet per grade, the RTI decision rubric will be used to analyze comprehension levels on FAIR (expected level 41st percentile) and comprehension percentages on MMH FCAT Unit Assessments (expected level 70%). The Lead Literacy Team members will observe students engaged in independent reading, looking for individual student goals and listening for corrective feedback by the teacher.	2A.1. FAIR, MMH Unit Assessments, RTI Decision Making Rubric, Walkthrough Document, Innovation Configuration Map for Independent Reading		
Reading Goal #2A: We will have 45%(170) of our students reading at a level 4 or 5 on FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	41%(160) of our third graders scored a level 3 in reading.	We will have 45%(170) of our students reading at a level 4 or 5 on FCAT.					

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

		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		Students don't know or understand how to be thinking when reading (metacognitive).	To increase the metacognition of our students during the act of reading. Teachers will receive professional development in developing metacognitive readers. The teachers will ask students to think aloud during guided reading and when conferencing with students over independent texts. Students will orally explain and write about their thinking during reading. Professional Development to assist teachers in the quantitative and qualitative factors of text complexity to raise the rigor in reading(Fisher,Frey,Lapp)	Administration,K-12 Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team	The Lead Literacy Team and administration will conduct walkthroughs to determine the release of responsibility in developing metacognition with our students.	school developed walkthrough tool	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	

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

2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.**	2B.2. Students don't know or understand how to be thinking when reading (metacognitive).	2B.2. To increase the metacognition of our students during the act of reading. Teachers will receive professional development in developing metacognitive readers. The teachers will ask students to think aloud during guided reading and when conferencing with students over independent texts. Students will orally explain and write about their thinking during reading. Professional Development to assist teachers in the quantitative and qualitative factors of text complexity to raise the rigor in reading(Fisher,Frey,Lap p)	2B.2. Administration,K-12 Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team	2B.2. The Lead Literacy Team and administration will conduct walkthroughs to determine the release of responsibility in developing metacognition with our students.	2B.2. School developed walkthrough tool		

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

Reading Goal #2B: We will have 33%(2) of our students scoring a level three on the Reading Florida Alternative Assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	16%(1)	33%(2)				
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

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. Time not given for daily independent reading-schedules	3A.1. To increase the volume of accountable independent reading.	3A.1. Administration, Professional Learning Communities Leaders, RTI Leadership Team, K-12 Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team	3A.1. During our professional learning communities which meet per grade, the RTI decision rubric will be used to analyze comprehension levels on FAIR (expected level 41st percentile) and comprehension percentages on MMH FCAT Unit Assessments (expected level 70%). The Lead Literacy Team members will observe students engaged in independent reading, looking for individual student goals and listening for corrective feedback by the teacher.	3A.1. FAIR, MMH Unit Assessments, RTI Decision Making Rubric, Walkthrough Document, Innovation Configuration Map for Independent Reading		
<u>Reading Goal #3A</u>: 75% (188)of students in fourth and fifth grade made learning gains in reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	67%(165) of students in fourth and fifth grade made learning gains in reading.	70% (188) of students in fourth and fifth grade made learning gains in reading.					

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

		3A.2. Students don't know or understand how to be thinking when reading (metacognitive).	3A.2. To increase the metacognition of our students during the act of reading. Teachers will receive professional development in developing metacognitive readers. The teachers will ask students to think aloud during guided reading and when conferencing with students over independent texts. Students will orally explain and write about their thinking during reading. Professional Development to assist teachers in the quantitative and qualitative factors of text complexity to raise the rigor in reading(Fisher,Frey,Lapp)	3A.2. Administration,K-12 Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team	3A.2. The Lead Literacy Team and administration will conduct walkthroughs to determine the release of responsibility in developing metacognition with our students.	3A.2. School developed walkthrough tool	
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	

3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	3B.2. Students don't know or understand how to be thinking when reading (metacognitive).	3B.2. To increase the metacognition of our students during the act of reading. Teachers will receive professional development in developing metacognitive readers. The teachers will ask students to think aloud during guided reading and when conferencing with students over independent texts. Students will orally explain and write about their thinking during reading. Professional Development to assist teachers in the quantitative and qualitative factors of text complexity to raise the rigor in reading(Fisher,Frey,Lap p)	3B.2. Administration,K-12 Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team	3B.2. The Lead Literacy Team and administration will conduct walkthroughs to determine the release of responsibility in developing metacognition with our students.	3B.2. School developed walkthrough tool		

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

Reading Goal #3B: We will have 50%(3) of our students making a learning gain on the Reading Florida Alternative Assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	33%(2)	50%(3)					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4A.1. Time not given for daily independent reading-schedules	4A.1. To increase the volume of accountable independent reading.	4A.1. Administration, Professional Learning Communities Leaders, RTI Leadership Team, K-12 Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team	4A.1. During our professional learning communities which meet per grade, the RTI decision rubric will be used to analyze comprehension levels on FAIR (expected level 41st percentile) and comprehension percentages on MMH FCAT Unit Assessments (expected level 70%). The Lead Literacy Team members will observe students engaged in independent reading, looking for individual student goals and listening for corrective feedback by the teacher.	4A.1. FAIR, MMH Unit Assessments, RTI Decision Making Rubric, Walkthrough Document, Innovation Configuration Map for Independent Reading		
Reading Goal #4A: 70% (175) of students in fourth and fifth grade made learning gains in reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	62% (155) of students in fourth and fifth grade made learning gains in reading.	70% (175) of students in fourth and fifth grade made learning gains in reading.					

		4A.2. Students don't know or understand how to be thinking when reading (metacognitive).	4A.2. To increase the metacognition of our students during the act of reading. Teachers will receive professional development in developing metacognitive readers. The teachers will ask students to think aloud during guided reading and when conferencing with students over independent texts. Students will orally explain and write about their thinking during reading. Professional Development to assist teachers in the quantitative and qualitative factors of text complexity to raise the rigor in reading(Fisher,Frey,Lapp)	4A.2. Administration,K-12 Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team	4A.2. The Lead Literacy Team and administration will conduct walkthroughs to determine the release of responsibility in developing metacognition with our students.	4A.2. School developed walkthrough tool	
		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	

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

4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4B.2. Students don't know or understand how to be thinking when reading (metacognitive).	4B.2. To increase the metacognition of our students during the act of reading. Teachers will receive professional development in developing metacognitive readers. The teachers will ask students to think aloud during guided reading and when conferencing with students over independent texts. Students will orally explain and write about their thinking during reading. Professional Development to assist teachers in the quantitative and qualitative factors of text complexity to raise the rigor in reading(Fisher,Frey,Lapp)	4B.2. Administration,K-12 Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team	4B.2. The Lead Literacy Team and administration will conduct walkthroughs to determine the release of responsibility in developing metacognition with our students.	4B.2. School developed walkthrough tool		
Reading Goal #4B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

	N/A	N/A					
		4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	
		4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**	By June of 2012, Lake Myrtle's number of level 1 students was at 40 (11%)	By June of 2013, Lake Myrtle's number of level 1 students was at 36 (9.5%)	By June of 2014, Lake Myrtle's number of level 1 students was at 32 (8.5%)	By June of 2015, Lake Myrtle's number of level 1 students was at 28 (7.4%)	By June of 2016, Lake Myrtle's number of level 1 students was at 24 (6.3%)	By June of 2017, Lake Myrtle's number of level 1 students was at 20 (5.5%)
Reading Goal #5A: By June 2017, our number of level 1 students will decrease in half to 5.5%(20).							
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.**	For White, Black, Hispanic, Asian sub-groups 5B.1. Time not given for daily independent reading-schedules	5B.1. To increase the volume of accountable independent reading.	5B.1. Administration, Professional Learning Communities Leaders, RTI Leadership Team, K-12 Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team	5B.1. During our professional learning communities which meet per grade, the RTI decision rubric will be used to analyze comprehension levels on FAIR (expected level 41st percentile) and comprehension percentages on MMH FCAT Unit Assessments (expected level 70%). The Lead Literacy Team members will observe students engaged in independent reading, looking for individual student goals and listening for corrective feedback by the teacher.	5B.1. FAIR, MMH Unit Assessments, RTI Decision Making Rubric, Walkthrough Document, Innovation Configuration Map for Independent Reading		

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

Reading Goal #5B: By June 2013, our number of subgroups that are not making satisfactory progress will decrease to: White: 25%(61) Black: 40%(7.6) Hispanic: 34%(31) Asian: 20%(4) American Indian: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	White: 27%(66) Black: 43% (8) Hispanic: 40%(36) Asian: 31%(5) American Indian: N/A	White: 25%(61) Black: 40%(7.6) Hispanic: 34%(31) Asian: 20%(4) American Indian: N/A				
		For White, Black, Hispanic, Asian sub-groups 5B.2. Students don't know or understand how to be thinking when reading (metacognitive).	5B.2. To increase the metacognition of our students during the act of reading. Teachers will receive professional development in developing metacognitive readers. The teachers will ask students to think aloud during guided reading and when conferencing with students over independent texts. Students will orally explain and write about their thinking during reading. Professional Development to assist teachers in the quantitative and qualitative factors of text complexity to raise the rigor in reading(Fisher,Frey,Lapp)	5B.2. Administration,K-12 Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team	5B.2. The Lead Literacy Team and administration will conduct walkthroughs to determine the release of responsibility in developing metacognition with our students.	5B.2. School developed walkthrough tool
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5C.1. Time not given for daily independent reading-schedules	5C.1. To increase the volume of accountable independent reading.	5C.1. Administration, Professional Learning Communities Leaders, RTI Leadership Team, K-12 Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team	5C.1. During our professional learning communities which meet per grade, the RTI decision rubric will be used to analyze comprehension levels on FAIR (expected level 41st percentile) and comprehension percentages on MMH FCAT Unit Assessments (expected level 70%). The Lead Literacy Team members will observe students engaged in independent reading, looking for individual student goals and listening for corrective feedback by the teacher.	5C.1. FAIR, MMH Unit Assessments, RTI Decision Making Rubric, Walkthrough Document, Innovation Configuration Map for Independent Reading		
Reading Goal #5C: 25% (4) of ELL students are not making satisfactory progress in reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	35% (6) of ELL students are not making satisfactory progress in reading.	25% (4) of ELL students are not making satisfactory progress in reading.					

		For White, Black, Hispanic, Asian sub-groups 5C.2. Students don't know or understand how to be thinking when reading (metacognitive).	5C.2. To increase the metacognition of our students during the act of reading. Teachers will receive professional development in developing metacognitive readers. The teachers will ask students to think aloud during guided reading and when conferencing with students over independent texts. Students will orally explain and write about their thinking during reading. Professional Development to assist teachers in the quantitative and qualitative factors of text complexity to raise the rigor in reading(Fisher,Frey,Lapp)	5C.2. Administration,K-12 Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team	5C.2. The Lead Literacy Team and administration will conduct walkthroughs to determine the release of responsibility in developing metacognition with our students.	5C.2. School developed walkthrough tool	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5D.1. Time not given for daily independent reading-schedules	5D.1. To increase the volume of accountable independent reading.	5D.1. Administration, Professional Learning Communities Leaders, RTI Leadership Team, K-12 Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team	5D.1. During our professional learning communities which meet per grade, the RTI decision rubric will be used to analyze comprehension levels on FAIR (expected level 41st percentile) and comprehension percentages on MMH FCAT Unit Assessments (expected level 70%). The Lead Literacy Team members will observe students engaged in independent reading, looking for individual student goals and listening for corrective feedback by the teacher.	5D.1. FAIR, MMH Unit Assessments, RTI Decision Making Rubric, Walkthrough Document, Innovation Configuration Map for Independent Reading		

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

Reading Goal #5D: 62% (37) of SWD students are not making satisfactory progress in reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	70% (42) of SWD students are not making satisfactory progress in reading.	62% (37) of ELL students are not making satisfactory progress in reading.				
		5D.2. Students don't know or understand how to be thinking when reading (metacognitive).	5D.2. To increase the metacognition of our students during the act of reading. Teachers will receive professional development in developing metacognitive readers. The teachers will ask students to think aloud during guided reading and when conferencing with students over independent texts. Students will orally explain and write about their thinking during reading. Professional Development to assist teachers in the quantitative and qualitative factors of text complexity to raise the rigor in reading(Fisher,Frey,Lapp)	5D.2. Administration,K-12 Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team	5D.2. The Lead Literacy Team and administration will conduct walkthroughs to determine the release of responsibility in developing metacognition with our students.	5D.2. School developed walkthrough tool
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5E.1. Time not given for daily independent reading-schedules	5E.1. To increase the volume of accountable independent reading.	5E.1. Administration, Professional Learning Communities Leaders, RTI Leadership Team, K-12 Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team	5E.1. During our professional learning communities which meet per grade, the RTI decision rubric will be used to analyze comprehension levels on FAIR (expected level 41st percentile) and comprehension percentages on MMH FCAT Unit Assessments (expected level 70%). The Lead Literacy Team members will observe students engaged in independent reading, looking for individual student goals and listening for corrective feedback by the teacher.	5E.1. FAIR, MMH Unit Assessments, RTI Decision Making Rubric, Walkthrough Document, Innovation Configuration Map for Independent Reading		
Reading Goal #5E: 35% (41) of Economically Disadvantaged students are not making satisfactory progress in reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 43% (51) of Economically Disadvantaged students are not making satisfactory progress in reading.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 35% (41) of Economically Disadvantaged students are not making satisfactory progress in reading.					

		5E.2. Students don't know or understand how to be thinking when reading (metacognitive).	5E.2. To increase the metacognition of our students during the act of reading. Teachers will receive professional development in developing metacognitive readers. The teachers will ask students to think aloud during guided reading and when conferencing with students over independent texts. Students will orally explain and write about their thinking during reading. Professional Development to assist teachers in the quantitative and qualitative factors of text complexity to raise the rigor in reading(Fisher,Frey,Lapp)	5E.2. Administration,K-12 Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team	5E.2. The Lead Literacy Team and administration will conduct walkthroughs to determine the release of responsibility in developing metacognition with our students.	5E.2. School developed walkthrough tool	
		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	

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.						

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
Teachers will receive professional development on the text complexity, common core state standards, and independent reading.	K-5	K-12 Literacy Coach, Administration	All PLC members, instructional and non-instructional staff members working to develop our readers	PLC meetings (Wednesdays)	classroom walkthroughs, follow up coaching	K-12 Literacy Coach, Administration, Lead Literacy Team Members
All staff members will receive professional development on the four steps of the problem solving process.	K-5	K-12 Literacy Coach, RtI Coach, Administration	All PLC members, instructional and non-instructional staff members working to develop our readers	PLC meetings (Wednesdays)	classroom walkthroughs, follow up coaching	K-12 Literacy Coach, Administration, Lead Literacy Team Members
Teachers will receive professional development on K-12 Reading Plan.	K-5	K-12 Literacy Coach, RtI Coach, Administration	All PLC members, instructional and non-instructional staff members working to develop our readers	PLC meetings (Wednesdays)	classroom walkthroughs, follow up coaching	K-12 Literacy Coach, Administration, Lead Literacy Team Members

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

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/ materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:0.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:0.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Building our Professional Knowledge of the Common Core State Standards, with the book, "Pathways to the Common Core"	10 or more books	Internal Funds	<$250.00
Subtotal: $250.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
We will continue to utilize our school developed rubric to analyze each teacher's classroom library and build upon what we created last year.	Classroom Libraries-We will purchase appropriate level text for teachers' classroom libraries and continue to build the classroom libraries.	Internal Funds-Family Donations	$2,500.00
Subtotal:			
Total:$250.00			

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.	1.1. Limited English Proficiency	1.1. ESOL strategies implemented in lessons throughout the year	1.1. Teacher, Administration, Literacy Coach	1.1. Progress over time on teacher assessments	1.1. Teacher classroom assessments and CELLA	
CELLA Goal #1: 35% (11) of ELL students are proficient in listening/ speaking. .	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					
	23% (7) of CELLA students are scoring proficient in listening/ speaking.					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.	2.2 Students don't know or understand how to be thinking when reading (metacognitive). 2.2 To increase the metacognition of our students during the act of reading. Teachers will receive professional development in developing metacognitive readers. The teachers will ask students to think aloud during guided reading and when conferencing with students over independent texts. Students will orally explain and write about their thinking during reading. Professional Development to assist teachers in the quantitative and qualitative factors of text complexity to raise the rigor in reading(Fisher,Frey,Lapp) 2.2 To increase the metacognition of our students during the act of reading. Teachers will receive professional development in developing metacognitive readers. The teachers will ask students to think aloud during guided reading and when conferencing with students over independent texts. Students will orally explain and write about their thinking during reading. Professional Development to assist teachers in the quantitative and qualitative factors of text complexity to raise the rigor in reading(Fisher,Frey,Lapp)	2.2 To increase the metacognition of our students during the act of reading. Teachers will receive professional development in developing metacognitive readers. The teachers will ask students to think aloud during guided reading and when conferencing with students over independent texts. Students will orally explain and write about their thinking during reading. Professional Development to assist teachers in the quantitative and qualitative factors of text complexity to raise the rigor in reading(Fisher,Frey,Lapp) 2.2 Administration,K-12 Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team 2.2 Administration,K-12 Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team	2.2 Administration,K-12 Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team 2.2 The Lead Literacy Team and administration will conduct walkthroughs to determine the release of responsibility in developing metacognition with our students. 2.2 The Lead Literacy Team and administration will conduct walkthroughs to determine the release of responsibility in developing metacognition with our students.	2.2 The Lead Literacy Team and administration will conduct walkthroughs to determine the release of responsibility in developing metacognition with our students. 2.2 School developed walkthrough tool 2.2 School developed walkthrough tool	2.3 School developed walkthrough tool	
CELLA Goal #2: 35% (11) of ELL students are proficient in reading.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient for Reading:					

	27% (8) of CELLA students are scoring proficient in reading.				
		2.2 Students don't know or understand how to be thinking when reading (metacognitive).	2.2 To increase the metacognition of our students during the act of reading. Teachers will receive professional development in developing metacognitive readers. The teachers will ask students to think aloud during guided reading and when conferencing with students over independent texts. Students will orally explain and write about their thinking during reading. Professional Development to assist teachers in the quantitative and qualitative factors of text complexity to raise the rigor in reading(Fisher,Frey,Lapp)	2.2 Administration,K-12 Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team	2.2 The Lead Literacy Team and administration will conduct walkthroughs to determine the release of responsibility in developing metacognition with our students.	2.3 School developed walkthrough tool
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.	2.3. Limited English Proficiency	2.3. ESOL strategies implemented in lessons throughout the year	2.3. Teacher, Administration, Literacy Coach	2.3. Progress over time on teacher assessments	2.3. Teacher classroom assessments and CELLA	
CELLA Goal #3: 40% (12) of CELLA students are proficient in writing. .	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
	33% (10) of CELLA students are proficient in writing.					
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:0.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:0.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:0.00			

End of CELLA Goals

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.	1A.1. Technology and Time	1A.1. To identify areas of deficiency on the pre math assessments and purposely plan to differentiate instruction. Both whole group and small group instruction will be utilize to meet the needs of all students.	1A.1. Administration, Teachers	1A.1. During our PLC meetings, we utilize our math data wall to conduct ongoing progress monitoring of the expected post test level. (70% or higher)	1A.1. Post Go Math Assessments, CORE K-12, Rubics		
Mathematics Goal #1A: *40%(152) of students scoring achievement Level 3 in mathematics*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	30%(114) of students scoring achievement Level 3 in mathematics	*40%(152) of students scoring achievement Level 3 in mathematics*				
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.**	1B.1. Technology and Time	1B.1. To identify areas of deficiency on a classroom teacher made pre math assessments and purposely plan to differentiate instruction. Both whole group and small group instruction will be utilize to meet the needs of all students.	1B.1. Administration, Teachers	1B.1. During our PLC meetings, we utilize our math data wall to conduct ongoing progress monitoring of the expected post test level. (70% or higher)	1B.1. Post Go Math Assessments, CORE K-12, Rubics	
Mathematics Goal #1B: We will have 33%(2) of our students at Levels 4,5,6 on the Math Florida Alternative Assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	16%(1)	33%(2)				
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.	2A.1. Technology and Time	2A.1. To identify areas of deficiency on the pre math assessments and purposely plan to differentiate instruction. Both whole group and small group instruction will be utilize to meet the needs of all students.	2A.1. Administration, Teachers	2A.1. During our PLC meetings, we utilize our math data wall to conduct ongoing progress monitoring of the expected post test level. (70% or higher)	2A.1. Post Go Math Assessments, CORE K-12, Rubics		
Mathematics Goal #2A: *40%(152) of students scoring achievement Level 4 or 5 in mathematics.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	35%(133) of students scoring achievement Level 4 or 5 in mathematics.	*40%(152) of students scoring achievement Level 4 or 5 in mathematics.*					
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	

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

2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.**	2B.1. Technology and Time	2B.1. To identify areas of deficiency on a classroom teacher made pre math assessments and purposely plan to differentiate instruction. Both whole group and small group instruction will be utilize to meet the needs of all students.	2B.1. Administration, Teachers	2B.1. During our PLC meetings, we utilize our math data wall to conduct ongoing progress monitoring of the expected post test level. (70% or higher)	2B.1. Post Go Math Assessments, CORE K-12, Rubics		
Mathematics Goal #2B: We will have 33%(2) of our students at or above a Level 7 on the Math Florida Alternative Assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	0%(0)	33%(2)					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3A.1. Technology and Time	3A.1. To identify areas of deficiency on the pre math assessments and purposely plan to differentiate instruction. Both whole group and small group instruction will be utilize to meet the needs of all students.	3A.1. Administration, Teachers	3A.1. During our PLC meetings, we utilize our math data wall to conduct ongoing progress monitoring of the expected post test level. (70% or higher)	3A.1. Post Go Math Assessments, CORE K-12, Rubics		
Mathematics Goal #3A: **82%(311) of students made learning gains in mathematics.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	75%(284) of students made learning gains in mathematics.	**82%(311) of students made learning gains in mathematics.**					
		3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	

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

3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.**	3B.1. Technology and Time	3B.1. To identify areas of deficiency on a classroom teacher made pre math assessments and purposely plan to differentiate instruction. Both whole group and small group instruction will be utilize to meet the needs of all students.	3B.1. Administration, Teachers	3B.1. During our PLC meetings, we utilize our math data wall to conduct ongoing progress monitoring of the expected post test level. (70% or higher)	3B.1. Post Go Math Assessments, CORE K-12, Rubics	
Mathematics Goal #3B: We will have 50%(3) of our students are making learning gainson the Math Florida Alternative Assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	33%(2)	50%(3)				
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4A.1. Technology and Time	4A.1. To identify areas of deficiency on the pre math assessments and purposely plan to differentiate instruction. Both whole group and small group instruction will be utilize to meet the needs of all students.	4A.1. Administration, Teachers	4A.1. During our PLC meetings, we utilize our math data wall to conduct ongoing progress monitoring of the expected post test level. (70% or higher)	4A.1. Post Go Math Assessments, CORE K-12, Rubics		
Mathematics Goal #4A: **82%(311) of students made learning gains in mathematics.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	75%(284) of students made learning gains in mathematics.	**82%(311) of students made learning gains in mathematics.**					
		4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	
		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	

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

4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.**	4B.1. N/A	4B.1. N/A	4B.1. N/A	4B.1. N/A	4B.1. N/A		
Mathematics Goal #4B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
		4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	
		4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**	By June of 2012, Lake Myrtle's number of level 1 students was at 46(13%)	By June of 2013, Lake Myrtle's number of level 1 students was at 40 (9.5%)	By June of 2014, Lake Myrtle's number of level 1 students was at 34 (8.5%)	By June of 2015, Lake Myrtle's number of level 1 students was at 30 (7.4%)	By June of 2016, Lake Myrtle's number of level 1 students was at 27 (6.3%)	By June of Myrtle's nu level 1 stud 23 (6.5%)
Mathematics Goal #5A: By June 2017, our number of level 1 students will decrease in half to 6.5%(23).							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: Technology and Time	5B.1. To identify areas of deficiency on the pre math assessments and purposely plan to differentiate instruction. Both whole group and small group instruction will be utilize to meet the needs of all students.	5B.1. Administration, Teachers	5B.1. During our PLC meetings, we utilize our math data wall to conduct ongoing progress monitoring of the expected post test level. (70% or higher)	5B.1. Post Go Math Assessments, CORE K-12, Rubics		

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

Reading Goal #5B: By June 2013, our number of subgroups that are not making satisfactory progress will decrease to: White: 25%(61) Black: 40%(7.6) Hispanic: 34%(31) Asian: 20%(4) American Indian: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	White: 33%(80) Black: 49% (9) Hispanic: 40%(36) Asian: 26%(5) American Indian: N/A	White: 25%(61) Black: 40%(7.6) Hispanic: 34%(31) Asian: 20%(4) American Indian: N/A				
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5C.1. Technology and Time	5C.1. To identify areas of deficiency on the pre math assessments and purposely plan to differentiate instruction. Both whole group and small group instruction will be utilize to meet the needs of all students.	5C.1. Administration, Teachers	5C.1. During our PLC meetings, we utilize our math data wall to conduct ongoing progress monitoring of the expected post test level. (70% or higher)	5C.1. Post Go Math Assessments, CORE K-12, Rubics		
Mathematics Goal #5C: 46%(7) of ELL students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	53%(9) of ELL students not making satisfactory Progress	46%(7) of ELL students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.					
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5D.1. Technology and Time	5.D.1. To identify areas of deficiency on the pre math assessments and purposely plan to differentiate instruction. Both whole group and small group instruction will be utilize to meet the needs of all students.	5D.1. Administration, Teachers	5D.1. During our PLC meetings, we utilize our math data wall to conduct ongoing progress monitoring of the expected post test level. (70% or higher)	5D.1. Post Go Math Assessments, CORE K-12, Rubics		
Mathematics Goal #5D: 50%(30) of SWD students not making satisfactory progress	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	63%(38) of SWD students not making satisfactory progress	50%(30) of SWD students not making satisfactory progress					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5E.1. Technology and Time	5E.1. To identify areas of deficiency on the pre math assessments and purposely plan to differentiate instruction. Both whole group and small group instruction will be utilize to meet the needs of all students.	5E.1. Administration, Teachers	5E.1. During our PLC meetings, we utilize our math data wall to conduct ongoing progress monitoring of the expected post test level. (70% or higher)	5E.1. Post Go Math Assessments, CORE K-12, Rubics		
Mathematics Goal #5E: 42%%(49) of Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	49%(58) of Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress	42%%(49) of Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.					
		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

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

ddle School Mathema	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.		
Mathematics Goal #1A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	

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

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

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

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

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

| Mathematics Goal #2B:

Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

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

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

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

Mathematics Goal #3B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

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

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

Mathematics Goal #4B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.
		4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**						
Mathematics Goal #5A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		

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

Mathematics Goal #5B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5D: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	

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

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

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.**	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.		
Mathematics Goal #3: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	
		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

4. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.		
Mathematics Goal #4: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	
		4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**						
Algebra 1 Goal #3A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.**	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		

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

Algebra 1 Goal #3B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:				
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

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

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.		
Algebra 1 Goal #3D: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	

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

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

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

<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.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	
Geometry Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017		
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2011-2012**						
Geometry Goal #3A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.**	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		

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

Geometry Goal #3B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.		
Geometry Goal #3D: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	

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

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional						

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

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
At PLCs, we will designate a time during each 9 weeks	K-5	PLC Facilitator, Administration	All Grade levels	Once every 9 weeks	Upon observations and walkthrough data	Administration

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

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:0.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:0.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:0.00			
Total:0.00			

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. Teachers needing time to implement and prepare their lessons with the end in mind using data from the Core K-12.	1A.1. To have all instructional staff utilize the district pacing guide for science to ensure all content is taught.	1A.1. K-5 Teachers, administration	1A.1. Progress monitor the benchmark data from the Core K-12.	1A.1. Core K-12 Other diagnostics	
Science Goal #1A: *40%(56) of students scored a level 3 in science.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	39%(55) of students scored a level 3 in science.	*40%(56) of students scored a level 3 in science.*				
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.

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

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

1B. **Florida Alternate Assessment:** **Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.**	1B.1. Use of new science series	1B.1. Becoming familiar on the new science series	1B.1. Teacher, administration	1B.1. Fidelity of the series	1B.1. New series diagnostics and teacher assessments		
Science Goal #1B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.	2A.1. Teachers needing time to implement and prepare their lessons with the end in mind using data from the Core K-12.	2A.1. To have all instructional staff utilize the district pacing guide for science to ensure all content is taught.	2A.1. K-5 Teachers, administration	2A.1. Progress monitor the benchmark data from the Core K-12.	2A.1. Core K-12 Other diagnostics		
Science Goal #2A: *29%(40) of students scored a level 4 or 5 in science.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	27%(38) of students scored a level 4 or 5 in science.	*29%(40) of students scored a level 4 or 5 in science.*					
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.	2B.1. Use of new science series	2B.1. Becoming familiar on the new science series	2B.1. Teacher, administration	2B.1. Fidelity of the series	2B.1. New series diagnostics and teacher assessments		

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

Science Goal #2B: *100%(1) student will be at or above a level 7 in science*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	0%(1)	*100%(1)*					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

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

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

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

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

* 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 Achievem					

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

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

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

Biology 1 Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

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

Science Professional Development

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

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:0.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

Subtotal:0.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Science Classroom	Classroom that can be used for science experiments	Science Fund	$500.00
Subtotal:$500:00			
Total:$500.00			

End of Science Goals

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

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.	1A.1. Lack of understanding of how to utilize the series for writing instruction	1A.1. To utilize the Treasure Reading Series to instruct writing for all second and third grade students.	1A.1. Administration	1A.1. Second and third grade teachers will administer and analyze writing assessments at the conclusion of each six week Treasure Unit.	1A.1. Treasure writing rubric		
Writing Goal #1A: 80%(88) of students scored at a level 3.0 and higher in writing	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	77%(85) of students scored at a level 3.0 and higher in writing.	80%(88) of students scored at a level 3.0 and higher in writing					
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	

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

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

1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.**	1B.1. Lack of understanding of how to utilize the series for writing instruction	1B.1. To utilize the Treasure Reading Series to instruct writing for all second and third grade students.	1B.1. Administration	1B.1. Second and third grade teachers will administer and analyze writing assessments at the conclusion of each six week Treasure Unit.	1B.1. Treasure writing rubric		
Writing Goal #1B: We will have 50%(1) of our students that score a 4 or higher on the Writing Florida Alternative Assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*						
	0%(0)	50%(1)					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

Writing Professional Development

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
N/A						

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
Subtotal:0.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal:0.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:0.00			
Total:0.00			

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Civics Professional Development

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

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

End of Civics Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

U.S. History Professional Development

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

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

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

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

End of U.S. History Goals

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance						
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Attendance	1.1. Parent support of Tardy and Absentee policy.	1.1. Instituting the Tardy and Attendance policy	1.1. Administration	1.1. Monitoring of Attendance once a week/month	1.1. TERMS		
Attendance Goal #1: *Decrease the amount of students with excessive absences and tardies by 10%.*	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
	95%(707)	97%(723)					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	177	*155*					

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

	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	105	*90*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

Attendance Professional Development

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
N/A						

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:0.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

Subtotal:0.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:0.00			
Total:0.00			

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	1.1. Time	1.1. To meet weekly to utilize the MTSS problem solving steps to use data to develop interventions for our most challenging behavioral students.	1.1. Administration staff working with EBD students, School Behavior Specialist	1.1. Weekly progress monitor the behavior of the students within our program Progress monitor monthly discipline reports	1.1. point sheets	
Suspension Goal #1: Reduce the total number of in school and out of school suspensions by 50%.	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions				
	8	4				
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School				
	8	4				
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions				
	21	10				

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

	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	21	*10*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

Suspension Professional Development

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
N/A						

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
Subtotal:0.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal:0.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:0.00			
Total:0.00			

End of Suspension Goals

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

<u>Dropout Prevention Goal(s)</u>
Note: Required for High School- F.S., Sec. 1003.53

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

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

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

| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

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
N/A						

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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:0.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:0.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:0.00			
Total:0.00			

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. Parents do not review newsletters, blogs, podcasts, or listen to ConnectEds.	1.1. To utilize our school's website to communicate through podcasts, blogs and tweets and purchase an app to keep parents up to date at the touch of a button or icon.	1.1. Administration, Support Staff	1.1. Survey the parents on the helpfulness of App	1.1. Surveys, Internet counters		
Parent Involvement Goal #1: **40% of our parents were involved in a after school night** *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*					

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

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

	20% of our parents were involved in a after school night.	40% of our parents were involved in a after school night				
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:0.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:0.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:0.00			
Total:0.00			

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a					

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

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

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

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

CTE Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a					

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

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

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

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Additional Goal	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Additional Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Additional Goals Professional Development

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

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

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	
	Total:$250.00
CELLA Budget	
	Total:0.00
Mathematics Budget	
	Total:0.00
Science Budget	
	Total: $500.00
Writing Budget	
	Total:0.00
Civics Budget	
	Total:0.00
U.S. History Budget	
	Total:0.00
Attendance Budget	
	Total:0.00
Suspension Budget	
	Total:0.00
Dropout Prevention Budget	
	Total:0.00
Parent Involvement Budget	
	Total:0.00
STEM Budget	
	Total:0.00
CTE Budget	
	Total:0.00
Additional Goals	
	Total: 750.00

	Grand Total: $3000.00

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

Differentiated Accountability

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
▢Priority	▢Focus	X Prevent

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

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

X Yes   ▢ No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.
Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
Build Communication between community and school A+ money distribution School grades and how their configured Purchase a school App

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

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount $2,000.00
To build Communication: Purchase an App program	< $1,000.00