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 MINNEOLA HIGHS SCHOOL	District Name: LAKE
Principal: LINDA SHEPHERD-MILLER	Superintendent: DR. SUSAN MOXLEY
SAC Chair: CARLYLE HOLDER	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.
School Grades Trend Data (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)
High School Feedback Report
K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

Administrators

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

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Linda Shepherd-Miller	MS in Educational Leadership Certification: • School Principal • Educational Leadership • Speech Correction	2	21	**2011- 2012 Lake Minneola High School Grade of <u>A</u>** 54% at or above satisfactory achievement in reading 72% at or above satisfactory achievement in math 85% at or above satisfactory achievement in writing 65% of the lowest quartile making learning gains in reading 76% or the lowest quartile making learning gains in math **2010-2011 Lake Minneola HS under construction, not graded** **2009-2010 Carver Middle School Grade of <u>A</u>** 69% at or above level 3 in reading 67% at or above level 3 in math 89% meeting the standard in writing 54% at or above level 3 in science 62% making learning gains in reading 66% making learning gains in math 66% of the lowest quartile making gains in reading 59% of the lowest quartile making gains in math
Assistant Principal	Margaret Eicher	MS in Educational Leadership Certification: • School Principal • Educational Leadership • Family and Consumer Science • Middle Grades Endorsement	1	8	**2011- 2012 Lake Minneola High School Grade of <u>A</u>** 54% at or above satisfactory achievement in reading 72% at or above satisfactory achievement in math 85% at or above satisfactory achievement in writing 65% of the lowest quartile making learning gains in reading 76% or the lowest quartile making learning gains in math **2010-21011 Mount Dora Middle School Grade of <u>B</u>** 63% at or above level 3 in reading 60% at or above level 3 in math 85% meeting the standard in writing 42% at or above level 3 in science 60% making learning gains in reading 63% making learning gains in math

					65% of the lowest quartile making gains in reading
					66% of the lowest quartile making gains in math
					
					2009-2010 East Ridge Middle School Grade of <u>A</u>
					  74% at or above level 3 in reading
					  74% at or above level 3 in math
					  93% meeting the standard in writing
					  61% at or above level 3 in science
					  66% making learning gains in reading
					  77% making learning gains in math
					  70% of the lowest quartile making learning gains in reading
					  75% of the lowest quartile making learning gains in math

Assistant Principal	Johnathan Owens	MS in Educational Leadership
		
		BS in Mass Communication
		
		Certification:
		• School Principal
		• Educational Leadership
		• Middle Grades Social Science
					2011- 2012 Lake Minneola High School Grade of <u>A</u>
					  54% at or above satisfactory achievement in reading
					  72% at or above satisfactory achievement in math
					  85% at or above satisfactory achievement in writing
					  65% of the lowest quartile making learning gains in reading
					  76% or the lowest quartile making learning gains in math
					
					2010-2011 Eustis High School Grade of <u>B</u>
					  46% at or above satisfactory achievement in reading
					  71% at or above satisfactory achievement in math
					  68% at or above satisfactory achievement in writing
					  42% at or above level 3 in science
					  47% making learning gains in reading
					  70% making learning gains in math
					  41% of the lowest quartile making learning gains in reading
					  61% or the lowest quartile making learning gains in math
					
					2009-2010 Eustis High School Grade of <u>B</u>
					  46% at or above satisfactory achievement in reading
					  77% at or above satisfactory achievement in math
					  83% at or above satisfactory achievement in writing
					  43% at or above level 3 in science
					  45% making learning gains in reading
					  75% making learning gains in math
					  36% of the lowest quartile making learning gains in reading
					  72% or the lowest quartile making learning gains in math

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

Assistant Principal	Devon Cole	MS in Educational Leadership BS in Recreation Certification: • School Principal • Educational Leadership • Physical Education			**2011- 2012 Lake Minneola High School Grade of A** 54% at or above satisfactory achievement in reading 72% at or above satisfactory achievement in math 85% at or above satisfactory achievement in writing 65% of the lowest quartile making learning gains in reading 76% or the lowest quartile making learning gains in math **2010-2011 South Lake High School Grade of B** 43% at or above level 3 in reading 73% at or above level 3 in math 68% meeting the standard in writing 36% at or above level 3 in science 46% making learning gains in reading 75% making learning gains in math 42% of the lowest quartile making gains in reading 65% of the lowest quartile making gains in math **2009-2010 Carver Middle School Grade of A** 69% at or above level 3 in reading 67% at or above level 3 in math 89% meeting the standard in writing 54% at or above level 3 in science 62% making learning gains in reading 66% making learning gains in math 66% of the lowest quartile making gains in reading 59% of the lowest quartile making gains in math
Assistant Principal	Rhonda Phillips	MS in Educational Leadership BS in Elementary Education Certification: • Educational Leadership • Elementary Education • ESOL			**2011-2012 South Lake High School Grade Not Available** 69% at or above level 3 in reading 67% at or above level 3 in math 89% meeting the standard in writing 54% at or above level 3 in science 62% making learning gains in reading 66% making learning gains in math 66% of the lowest quartile making gains in reading 59% of the lowest quartile making gains in math **2010-2011South Lake High School Grade of B**

					69% at or above level 3 in reading 67% at or above level 3 in math 89% meeting the standard in writing 54% at or above level 3 in science 62% making learning gains in reading 66% making learning gains in math 66% of the lowest quartile making gains in reading 59% of the lowest quartile making gains in math **2009-2010 Cypress Ridge Elementary School Grade of <u>A</u>** 92% at or above level 3 in reading 92% at or above level 3 in math 93% meeting the standard in writing 78% at or above level 3 in science 73% making learning gains in reading 71% making learning gains in math 70% of the lowest quartile making gains in reading 68% of the lowest quartile making gains in math

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

Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)

Reading	Debbra Snow	MS in Curriculum and Instruction
		BS in Social Sciences
		
		Certification:
		• Middle Grades Social Science
		• Reading Endorsed
		• ESOL
			1	2	**2011- 2012 Lake Minneola High School Grade of <u>A</u>**
					    54% at or above satisfactory achievement in reading
					    72% at or above satisfactory achievement in math
					    85% at or above satisfactory achievement in writing
					    65% of the lowest quartile making learning gains in reading
					    76% or the lowest quartile making learning gains in math

Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Utilize *SearchSoft* software program as provided by LCSB which identifies candidates who are highly qualified.	Principal	Summer 2012 and continuing as needed
2. Interview candidates who are highly qualified before interviewing any other candidates.	Principal and Assistant Principals	Summer 2012 and continuing as needed
3. Conduct interviews with at least two interviewers to ensure at least two objective opinions in regards to candidates	Principal, Assistant Principals and Department Chairs	Summer 2012 and continuing as needed
4. Utilize common questions in all interviews to ensure integrity in all decision making	Principal, Assistant Principals and Department Chairs	Summer 2012 and continuing as needed
5. Pair beginning teachers with an experienced mentor within the same curriculum area	Assistant Principals	Summer 2012 and continuing as needed
6. Conduct specific on-site meetings to address the needs and concerns of teachers new to education or new to LMHS	Assistant Principals	Summer 2012 and continuing as needed

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
Freddie Cole: Out of field for Mathematics Manuel Mendoza: Out of field for ESE	1. Pair out of field teachers with mentors who teach the same curriculum

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
103	2% (2)	32% (33)	59 % (57.3)	10.7% (11)	40.8% (42)	98.1&% (101)	15.5% (16)	7.8% (8)	16.5% (17)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Darlene Hoke	Jennifer Boval	Darlene Hoke is a National Board Certified teacher with a proven record of FCAT and EOC success	Monthly PLC meetings Interim meetings bi-weekly
Dr. Linda Martin	Manuel Mendoza	Dr. Martin is a National Board Certified teacher with a proven record of FCAT success	Monthly PLC meetings Interim meetings bi-weekly

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

Additional Requirements

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

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

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

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

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

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.   - Dr. Linda Martin, ESE Specialist   - Danie Thornton and Chanda Bush, Grade Level Intervention Leaders   - Darlene Hoke, Math Department Chair   - Kim Harrison, Science Department Chair   - Jennifer Carlson, English Department Chair   - David Bultema, Social Studies Department Chair   - Debbra Snow, Literacy Coach   - Dr. Daisy Johnson, Career and Technical Education Department Chair   - Pamela Haberkorn, Electives Department Chair   - Gina Paul, Lead Guidance Counselor   - specific faculty members and guidance counselors as needed
Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?   The MTSS leadership team meets weekly during the month of September to address initial review of student needs and follows with a minimum of once a month to review the needs and progress of students in the RtI process. Specific members of the team will meet more frequently with specific teachers and the grade level RtI Intervention Leaders and grade level guidance counselors as students are initially identified.
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?   LMHS is dedicated to meeting the needs of all learners, especially those who have reached high school with new or previously unidentified needs. The MTSS team has specific input into the SIP especially as it relates to students who struggle to reach academic or behavioral standards.
MTSS Implementation
Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.   The MTSS team will access basic historical student data through both FIDO and AS 400 systems provided to the school for data as by LCSB. Additional current data will be gathered from teacher reports, FAIR testing, benchmark testing, and current eSembler grades. The team will also utilize a tracking system as provided by the LCSB Student Services Department and in house systems created by the current ESE department.
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.   All faculty and staff will be initiated to the MTSS process in a faculty meeting no later than September 30, 2012. Teachers will be directed to identify struggling students prior to the end of October, 2012.
Describe the plan to support MTSS.   Meeting time for the leadership team as well as sub-committees as determined by the student's grade level and specific needs will be made available monthly.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)
June 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

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

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). • Debbra Snow, Literacy Coach and Literacy Leadership Team Leader • Robin Bennett, English Department Representative • Brett Fontenot, Math Department Representative • Jason DeRoche. Science Department Representative • Vincent Montuori, Social Studies Representative • M.E. Gordon, Reading Representative • David Hass, CTE Representative • Pamela Haberkorn, Elective Representative
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). • The LLT will meet at least once a month in order to both gather and disseminate information to all departments as well as create a unified direction for literacy across all curriculum areas.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? • Train all teachers in identifying and utilizing complex text in all curriculum areas • Provide specific support to social studies teachers in the development and incorporation of DBQs (Document Based Questions) • Review the findings of the literacy coach based on her classroom observations, using those findings to direct future plans

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?

> During the 2011-2012 school year, LMHS trained ten (10) additional teacher in NG CARPD, bringing our trained faculty to 25%. These teachers represented all of our curriculum areas. Our Literacy Coach has regularly presents and shares information to the entire staff in regards to the importance of non-fiction and informational text in all classrooms. In addition, she has led specific training in defining and teaching through complex text. She also visits and observes classrooms weekly to provide support to reading in all curriculum areas. Administration also reviews lesson plans weekly to ensure that reading, especially non-fiction, informational, and complex texts, are part of all programs.

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?

- Students routinely take four (4) academic and four (4) elective (Fine and Performing Arts, Foreign Language, AVID, Physical Education) or CTE (Career and Technical Education) classes each year.
- Students are encouraged to complete a CTE program, 2 terms of foreign language and one or more fine or performing arts classes while in high school
- As a school located in Central Florida, each program on campus has direct ties to future career opportunities. Teachers in all areas incorporate career education within their specific field.
- LMHS offers both college and career shadowing days for 11th and 12th graders
- LMHS offers a work / internship program for 12th graders for elective credit when employed by verified local employers off campus
- LMHS offers students in Culinary Arts program the opportunity to work side by side with food service staff to experience real on-the-job training
- LMHS offers CAP academies in TV Production, Early Childhood Development, Culinary Arts, Digital Design and Agri-Science
- LMHS encourages guest speakers in all classrooms to enhance the real world experiences of students

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?

- LMHS Career and Technical Education courses range from Culinary Arts, Early Childhood Development, Agri-Science and Bio-Medical Careers to Commercial Art, Drafting, Robotics, Gaming and Animation Design/Programming to Entrepreneurship and TV Production.   All students are encouraged to complete a full program of study.

- LMHS offers multiple Advanced Placement classes in English, Social Studies, Psychology, Mathematics and various areas of Science.
- LMHS supports AVID at all grade levels
- LMHS supports student athletes by directing students to NCAA accepted courses to enhance scholarship opportunities
- LMHS supports special needs students by incorporating a PAES (work and life skills) lab into the daily schedule of the students
- All Guidance Counselors are grade level specific and follow their students throughout all 4 years of high school, developing close relationships which help identify the specific goals and needs of each student.
- Specific grade level brochures are developed and printed to advertise course offerings to students early each spring. Brochures are posted on the school website for easy parental access.
- Students meet with their individual advisory group to review their brochures, their own high school transcript and begin to make course selections.
- Individual students have the opportunity to meet with their guidance counselor over several weeks to discuss their personal curriculum choices.
- Student selections are gathered and input. The resulting data is utilized to create a master schedule that meets the needs of the students.

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.

- Lake Minneola High School has just completed its first year of operation and is not yet included in the annual analysis of high schools. The school did not have a senior class in its first year of operation.
- In its first year of operation, LMHS offered eleven (11) specific Career and Technical Education Programs and will increase the number of programs to thirteen (13) this school year.
- LMHS will track its program completers this school year and develop a plan to increase the number and percentage of program completers in the next academic year.

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 Students are not accustomed to the challenges of complex text.	1A.1 Train teachers to identify the primary features of complex text and how to incorporate complex text into all curriculum areas.	1A.1. Literacy Coach and Literacy Team Department Chairs	1A.1. Teacher feedback through departmental meetings. Classroom visits, analysis and support through the Literacy Coach	1A.1. Benchmark and mid-year testing. FCAT 2.0 results
Reading Goal #1A: • 26% of 9th graders scored level 3in FCAT 2.0 Reading. • 22% of 10th graders scored level 3 in FCAT 2.0 Reading. • This creates an average of 24% scoring level 3. • The goal is to increase student achievement by the standards of Safe Harbor	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *26% (204) of 9th and 10th graders scored level 3 in FCAT Reading.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *34% of 9th and 10th graders will score level 3 in FCAT Reading.*					
			1A.2. Students are more accustomed to analyzing literary works rather than informational text.	1A.2. Link related informational text to required literary analysis. Continue the literary analysis by analyzing the related informational text. Utilize iPad resources that improve student productivity and allow students to become self-directed learners.	1A.2. Literacy Coach and Literacy Team Department Chairs	1A.2. Teacher feedback Analysis of student work	1A.2. Classroom projects Benchmark and mid-year testing FCAT 2.0 results
			1A.3 Student vocabulary is frequently limited to basic understanding and definitions.	1A.3. Incorporate high level vocabulary study to move beyond denotation to analysis of connotation within complex text. Include technical and curriculum specific vocabulary. Regularly review and revise student writing to incorporate richer vocabulary use. Utilize iPad resources that improve student productivity and allow students to become self-directed learners.	1A.3. Literacy Coach and English Chair Additional department chairs to guide specific curriculum based vocabulary. ILS for technology integration	1A.3. Specific improvement in student reading, analysis and writing skills.	1A.3. Improvement in specific classroom grades and activities FCAT 2.0 results

		1A.4 Students do not see the connection between classroom work and real life applications of the skills.	1A.4 Incorporate Springboard curriculum in all English I, II, II, and IV classes	1A.4 English Department chair and Assistant Principal for English Curriculum	1A.4 Specific improvement in student reading, analysis and writing skills.	1A.4 Improvement in specific classroom grades and activities with real world applications FCAT 2.0 results
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.		1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Reading Goal #1B: *Due to the low number of students involved in the FAA, including this information would be a breach of confidentiality.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *NA* 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *NA*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2A: • 29% of 9th graders scored at or above level 4 in FCAT 2.0 Reading • 25% of 10th graders scored level 4 or above in FCAT 2.0 Reading • This creates an average of 27% scoring level 4 or above. • The goal is to increase student achievement by the standards of Safe Harbor	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *27% (229) of 9th and 10th graders scored level 4 or above in FCAT Reading.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *35% of 9th and 10th graders will score level 4 or above in FCAT Reading.*	2A.1. Maintaining high achievement in high school is challenging to students who were high achievers in middle school.	2A.1. Challenge incoming 9th and 10th graders to continue in English Honors classes, linked with AP Human Geography (9th) and AP World History (10th) to ensure a rigorous course of study.	2A.1. Assistant Principals Grade level guidance counselors	2A.1. Monitor population and achievement in honors and AP level classes. Monitor lesson plans for rigorous study.	2A.1. FCAT 2.0 results AP exam results
			2A.2 Student vocabulary may be limited to basic understanding and definitions of challenging words.	2A.2. Incorporate high level vocabulary study to move beyond denotation to analysis of connotation within complex text. Include technical and curriculum specific vocabulary as well as SAT and ACT vocabulary. Regularly review and revise student writing to incorporate richer vocabulary use. Utilize iPad resources that improve student productivity and allow students to become self-directed learners.	2A.2. Literacy Coach and English Chair Additional department chairs to guide specific curriculum based vocabulary. ILS for technology integration	2A.2. Specific improvement in student reading, analysis and writing skills.	2A.2. Improvement in specific classroom grades and activities FCAT 2.0 results
			2A 3. Students do not see the connection between classroom work and real life applications of the skills.	2A 3. Incorporate Springboard curriculum in all English I, II, II, and IV classes	2A 3. English Department chair and Assistant Principal for English Curriculum	2A 3. Specific improvement in student reading, analysis and writing skills.	2A 3. Improvement in specific classroom grades and activities with real world applications FCAT 2.0 results

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

2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Reading Goal #2B: *Due to the low number of students involved in the FAA, including this information would be a breach of confidentiality.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *NA*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *NA*					
			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 reading. Reading Goal #3A: • 62% of 9th and 10th graders made learning gains in FCAT reading. • The goal is to increase student achievement by the standards of Safe Harbor	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *62% (565) of 9th and 10th graders made learning gains in reading.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *66% of 9th and10th graders will make learning gains in reading.*	3A.1. Many students have experienced repeated failures in standardized testing.	3A.1. Lead students to success through a scaffolded instructional model that recognizes success. Incorporate mini-benchmark testing across all curriculum areas. Utilize iPad resources that improve student productivity and allow students to become self-directed learners.	3A.1. Literacy Coach Testing coordinator All classroom teachers Principal and Asst. Principals to monitor lesson plans ILS for technology integration	3A.1. Increased student achievement within individual curriculum areas	3A.1. Benchmark testing FCAT results
			3A.2. Many students lack the background knowledge to understand complex and informational text.	3A.2. Build background knowledge and comfort with complex text by incorporating regular iPad based research in all classes Emphasize real world examples in all curriculum areas to enhance student background knowledge and incorporate the existing knowledge of peers within a classroom. Utilize iPad resources that improve student productivity and allow students to become self-directed learners.	3A.2. All classroom teachers Principal and Asst. Principals to monitor lesson plans ILS for technology integration	3A.2. Increased student achievement within individual curriculum areas	3A.2. Benchmark testing FCAT results
			3A 3. Students do not see the connection between classroom work and real life applications of the skills.	3A 3. Incorporate Springboard curriculum in all English I, II, II, and IV classes	3A 3. English Department chair and Assistant Principal for English Curriculum	3A 3. Specific improvement in student reading, analysis and writing skills.	3A 3. Improvement in specific classroom grades and activities with real world applications FCAT 2.0 results

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

3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Reading Goal #3B: *Due to the low number of students involved in the FAA, including this information would be a breach of confidentiality.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *NA*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *NA*					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4A.1. Many students have experienced repeated failures in standardized testing.	4A.1. Lead students to success through a scaffolded instructional model that recognizes success. Incorporate mini-benchmark testing across all curriculum areas. Utilize iPad resources that improve student productivity and allow students to become self-directed learners.	4A.1. Literacy Coach Testing coordinator All classroom teachers Principal and Asst. Principals to monitor lesson plans ILS for technology integration	4A.1. Increased student achievement within individual curriculum areas	4A.1. FCAT results
Reading Goal #4A: • 65% of students in the lowest quartile made learning gains in reading. • The goal is to increase student achievement by the standards of Safe Harbor	4A.2. 9th graders who made learning gains may not continue to make the gains necessary in 10th grade to ensure a passing score.	4A.2. Incorporate regular data chats within Advisory groups so students are aware of their performance and take ownership of their learning. Utilize iPad resources that improve student productivity and allow students to become self-directed learners. Ensure that all level 1 readers are scheduled into Intensive Reading classes with an endorsed reading teacher. Ensure that all level 2 readers are scheduled in English classes taught by reading endorsed teachers.	4A.2. Advisory teachers ILS for technology integration Assistant Principal for master planning Literacy Coach for fidelity in planning and student placement	4A.2. Data Chat logs Data Notebooks Mater schedule	4A.2. FCAT results
	4A 3. Students do not see the connection between classroom work and real life applications of the skills.	4A 3. Incorporate Springboard curriculum in all English I, II, II, and IV classes	4A 3. English Department chair and Assistant Principal for English Curriculum	4A 3. Specific improvement in student reading, analysis and writing skills.	4A 3. Improvement in specific classroom grades and activities with real world applications FCAT 2.0 results

2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*
65% of students in the lowest quartile made learning gains.	69% of students will make learning gains.

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.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.
Reading Goal #4B: *Due to the low number of students involved in the FAA, including this information would be a breach of confidentiality.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.
			4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** LMHS does not have data from 2010-2011	54% of all students scored at or above satisfactory in reading • 58% Asian • 31% Black/African American • 51% Hispanic • 62% White • 26% ELL • 23% SWD • 42% Economically Disadvantaged	60% of all students will score at or above satisfactory in reading • 63% Asian • 38% Black/African American • 56% Hispanic • 66% White • 34% ELL • 31% SWD • 48% Economically Disadvantaged	64% of all students will score at or above satisfactory in reading • 67% Asian • 45% Black/African American • 61% Hispanic • 70% White • 41% ELL • 38% SWD • 54% Economically Disadvantaged	68% of all students will score at or above satisfactory in reading • 71% Asian • 51% Black/African American • 65% Hispanic • 73% White • 47% ELL • 45% SWD • 59% Economically Disadvantaged	72% of all students will score at or above satisfactory in reading 81% of all students will score at or above satisfactory in math	75% of all students will score at or above satisfactory in reading 83% of all students will score at or above satisfactory in math
Reading Goal #5A: **LMHS did not exist as a school in 2010-2011. LMHS will use baseline data from 2011-2012, our first year of operation.** • The goal is to increase student achievement by the standards of Safe Harbor		72% of all students scored at or above satisfactory in math • 77% Asian • 57% Black/African American • 73% Hispanic • 74% White • 70% ELL • 33% SWD • 60% Economically Disadvantaged	72% of all students will score at or above satisfactory in math • 80% Asian • 62% Black/African American • 76% Hispanic • 74% White • 73% ELL • 41% SWD • 64% Economically Disadvantaged	75% of all students will score at or above satisfactory in math • 82% Asian • 66% Black/African American • 79% Hispanic • 77% White • 76% ELL • 47% SWD • 68% Economically Disadvantaged	78% of all students will score at or above satisfactory in math • 84% Asian • 70% Black/African American • 82% Hispanic • 80% White • 79% ELL • 53% SWD • 72% Economically Disadvantaged		
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**		5B.1.	5B.1	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	
Reading Goal #5B: • The goal is to increase student achievement by the standards of Safe Harbor	**2012 Current Level of Performance:*** 58% Asian 31% Black 51% Hispanic 62% White NA American Indian	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:*** 63% Asian 38% Black 56% Hispanic 66% White NA American Indian	**White**: Many students have experienced multiple failures in standardized testing. **Black**: Many students have experienced multiple failures in standardized testing. **Hispanic:** Many students have experienced multiple failures in standardized testing. **Asian:** Many students have experienced multiple failures in standardized testing.	Identify specific students who meet this criteria and share the data with each of their teachers as well as their Advisory teacher. Establish guidance based data chats with targeted students to determine individual barriers to success.	Guidance Department	Individual meetings occur with all targeted students	FCAT results
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.

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

		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. Limited skills in English impact all curriculum areas.	5C.1 Provide specific language support through Rosetta Stone. Provide ELL support through a dedicated ELL teacher assistant. Pair students with limited English skills with a bi-lingual student in classes whenever possible.	5C.1. Guidance Department	5C.1. Successful implementation of Rosetta Stone. Regularly scheduled teacher assistant support	5C.1. Improved FCAT results
Reading Goal #5C: • Only 26% of ELL students scored at a satisfactory level • The goal is to increase student achievement by the standards of Safe Harbor	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *26% (6) of ELL students scored at a satisfactory level in reading*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *34% of ELL students will score at a satisfactory level*					
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5D.1. Students with disabilities have not had consistent ESE support.	5D.1. Re-structure the ESE support facilitation team to be grade level specific. Schedule ESE students into classes that are conducive to ESE support facilitation. Create an ESE resource room for one-on-one assistance.	5D.1. ESE specialist	5D.1. Review of ESE schedules support the grade level specific plan. Review of the resource room log provides a record of implementation.	5D.1. Improved FCAT results
Reading Goal #5D: • 23% of SWD who took FCAT scored at a satisfactory level. • The goal is to increase student achievement by the standards of Safe Harbor	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *23% (43)of SWD scored at a satisfactory level in reading.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *31% of SWD will score at a satisfactory level in reading.*					
			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 reading.			5E.1. Economically disadvantaged students lack transportation to remain after school for tutoring.	5E.1. Develop a cooperative plan with feeder middle schools and transportation that allows students who remain after school for tutoring to be shuttled to their former middle school after tutoring to take the later bus home	5E.1. Assistant Principal in charge of tutoring.	5E.1. Record of students using the shuttle bus	5E.1. Improved FCAT scores
Reading Goal #5E: • 42% of Economically Disadvantages students made satisfactory progress in reading. • The goal is to increase student achievement by the standards of Safe Harbor	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *42% (257 of 612) made satisfactory progress.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *48% (612 of 1275) will make satisfactory progress in reading*					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			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.						
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
Complex and Informational Text	9-12 All curriculum	Literacy Coach	All teachers, all curriculum areas	Introduction on October 19, 2012	Continuation through PLC groups	Principal and Assistant Principals
Complex Text	9-12 All curriculum	Literacy Coach	Each department based PLC	Once per month	PLC minutes Teacher feedback	Principal and Assistant Principals
Reading Analysis through Springboard	9 – 12 English	Springboard Consultant	All English teachers not previously trained	September 2012	Department and Curriculum Cohort meetings	Department Chair Principal and Assistant Principals

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

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Springboard	Materials and Training	Discretionary Budget	$4000.00
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Achieve 3000	Computer Assisted Learning Program	SAI and IDEA Budgets	$15,000
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			$19,000.00 Total:

End of Reading Goals

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

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1: *LMHS opened with 9th, 10th and 11th graders only for 2011-2012* *Our goal is to increase the percentage of students who are proficient in listening / speaking by at least 10% in each grade level.*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: *Proficiency scores are:* *9th grade: 83% (5)* *10th grade: 55 (6)* *11th grade: 33% (2)*	1.1. Teachers are not fully aware of specific strategies that can be employed to assist English Language Learners	1.1. Provide teachers with on-site professional development and targeted assistance in ESOL strategies.	1.1. Guidance counselor in charge of ELL and CELLA testing	1.1 Follow up conferencing with teachers of ELL students.	1.1. Improved individual and school scores on CELLA testing
		1.2. Students who are newly arrived to the US lack even basic skills in English	1.2. Provide targeted assistance to Rosetta Stone software to improve essential skills in English	1.2. Guidance counselor in charge of EL and CELLA testing.	1.2. Individual follow up with students using Rosetta Stone software.	1.2. Improved individual and school scores on CELLA testing
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2: *LMHS opened with 9th, 10th and 11th graders only for 2011-2012* *Our goal is to increase the percentage of students who are proficient in listening / speaking by at least 10% in each grade level.*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: *Proficiency scores are:* *9th grade: 50% (3)* *10th grade: 27 (3)* *11th grade: 33% (2)*	2.1. Teachers are not fully aware of specific strategies that can be employed to assist English Language Learners	2.1. Provide teachers with on-site professional development and targeted assistance in ESOL strategies.	2.1. Guidance counselor in charge of ELL and CELLA testing	2.1 Follow up conferencing with teachers of ELL students.	2.1. Improved individual and school scores on CELLA testing
	1.2. Students who are newly arrived to the US lack even basic skills in English	2.2. Provide targeted assistance to Rosetta Stone software to improve essential skills in English	2.2. Guidance counselor in charge of EL and CELLA testing.	2.2. Individual follow up with students using Rosetta Stone software.	2.2. Improved individual and school scores on CELLA testing	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

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

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. CELLA Goal #3: *LMHS opened with 9th, 10th and 11th graders only for 2011-2012* *Our goal is to increase the percentage of students who are proficient in listening / speaking by at least 10% in each grade level.*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : *Proficiency scores are:* *9th grade: 67% (4)* *10th grade: 45 (5)* *11th grade: 50% (3)*	3.1. Teachers are not fully aware of specific strategies that can be employed to assist English Language Learners	3.1. Provide teachers with on-site professional development and targeted assistance in ESOL strategies.	3.1. Guidance counselor in charge of ELL and CELLA testing	3.1 Follow up conferencing with teachers of ELL students.	3.1. Improved individual and school scores on CELLA testing
	1.2. Students who are newly arrived to the US lack even basic skills in English	3.2. Provide targeted assistance to Rosetta Stone software to improve essential skills in English	3.2. Guidance counselor in charge of ELL and CELLA testing.	3.2. Individual follow up with students using Rosetta Stone software.	3.2. Improved individual and school scores on CELLA testing	3.2.
		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.

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
No school based budget required			
			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:
			$0 Total:

End of CELLA Goals

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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: **NA**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Mathematics Goal #2B: **NA**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.
Mathematics Goal #5E: *NA*	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 Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Mathematics Goal #2B: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

High School Mathematics Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.		1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Mathematics Goal #1: *Due to the low number of students involved in the FAA, including this information would be a breach of confidentiality.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Mathematics Goal #2: *Due to the low number of students involved in the FAA, including this information would be a breach of confidentiality.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		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: *Due to the low number of students involved in the FAA, including this information would be a breach of confidentiality.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.
Mathematics Goal #4: *Due to the low number of students involved in the FAA, including this information would be a breach of confidentiality.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.
			4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1. Algebra 1 Goal #1: 43% of students taking the spring End of Course assessment for Algebra 1 achieved a level 3. • The goal is to increase student achievement by the standards of Safe Harbor	**2012 Current Level of Performance:*** *43% (123) of students achieved level 3 on the Algebra EOC.*	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:*** *51% of students will achieve level 3 on the Algebra EOC.*	1.1. Teachers and students were not fully prepared for the complexity of the exam.	1.1. Support students throughout the school year with individual tutoring 3 days a week. Support students with a concentrated tutoring blitz in the last two (2) weeks prior to the Algebra EOC taught cooperatively by all Algebra 1 teachers.	1.1. Math Department Chair Principal Assistant Principal in charge of tutoring.	1.1. PLC and Leadership Meetings	1.1. EOC results
			1.2. Not all teacher instruction was as rigorous as the EOC	1.2. Teachers to work cooperatively through their PLC and department chair to share best practices to ensure improved student achievement.	1.2. Math Department chair Administrator in charge of math curriculum.	1.2. Review of PLC minutes Review of lesson plans for best practices Review of tutoring blitz.	1.2. EOC results
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1. Algebra Goal #2: 10% of students taking the spring End of Course assessment for Algebra 1 achieved a level 4 or 5. • The goal is to increase student achievement by the	**2012 Current Level of Performance:*** *10% (29) students achieved level 4 and 5 on the Algebra EOC.*	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:*** *19% of students will achieve level 4 or 5 on the Algebra EOC.*	2.1. Students accept a passing score or three (3) as acceptable.	2.1. Create an incentive program to reward students who achieve higher than a level three (3) on the Algebra EOC	2.1. Principal	2.1 Review of the results from the December, 2012 EOC	2.1. Algebra EOC
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.

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

50

standards of Safe Harbor		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** **NA**						
Algebra 1 Goal #3A: **LMHS did not exist as a school in 2010-2011. LMHS will use baseline data from 2011-2012, our first year of operation.** • The goal is to increase student achievement by the standards of Safe Harbor							
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.	
Algebra 1 Goal #3B: • The goal is to increase student achievement by the standards of Safe Harbor	**2012 Current Level of Performance:*** *Data is not available* / **2013 Expected Level of Performance:*** *Data is not available*						
		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: • The goal is to increase student achievement by the standards of Safe Harbor	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Data is not available*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Data is not available*					
			3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.
			3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3D: • The goal is to increase student achievement by the standards of Safe Harbor	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Data is not available*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Data is not available*					
			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: • The goal is to increase student achievement by the standards of Safe Harbor	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Data is not available*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Data is not available*					
			3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

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

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

Geometry EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.			1.1. Students are unaccustomed to the rigor of EOC exams.	1.1. Establish EOC specific after school tutoring four (4) weeks prior to testing to review concepts taught early in the curriculum and to build student confidence.	1.1. Math Department Chair	1.1. Data comparison of scores of students who did and did not attend tutoring.	1.1. EOC data
Geometry Goal #1: *This data has not been made available to us.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *This data has not been made available to us.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *This data has not been made available to us.*					
			1.2. Average or lower achieving students need additional time to master the curriculum.	1.2. Establish alternating day schedule for Biology for select students	1.2. Guidance Department Assistant Principal	1.2. Data comparison of achievement for students in traditional versus alternating day students.	1.2. EOC data
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.			2.1. Students are unaccustomed to the rigor of EOC exams.	2.1. Students are unaccustomed to the rigor of EOC exams.	2.1. Math Department Chair	2.1. Data comparison of scores of students who did and did not attend tutoring.	2.1. EOC data
Geometry Goal #2: *This data has not been made available to us.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *This data has not been made available to us.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *This data has not been made available to us.*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2011-2012**					
Geometry Goal #3A: *This data has not been made available to us.*						

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.**		3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Geometry Goal #3B: *This data has not been made available to us.*	**2012 Current Level of Performance:*** *This data has not been made available to us.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: **2013 Expected Level of Performance:*** *This data has not been made available to us.* 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: *This data has not been made available to us.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *This data has not been made available to us.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *This data has not been made available to us.*					
			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: *This data has not been made available to us.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *This data has not been made available to us.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *This data has not been made available to us.*					
			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: *This data has not been made available to us.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *This data has not been made available to us.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *This data has not been made available to us.*					
			3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Understanding Algebra and Geometry EOC Expectations	9 – 12 All Curriculum Areas	Math Department Chair	School Wide	October 19, 2012	PLC Minutes	Principal and Assistant Principal

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
Math tutoring three (3) afternoons a week	Stipend payment to tutors	SAI Budget	$4000
Springboard	Materials and Training	Discretionary Budget	$9000
			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:
			$13,000 Total:

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

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.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.
Science Goal #2A: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Science Goal #2B: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this b*					
			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: *Due to the low number of students involved in the FAA, including this information would be a breach of confidentiality*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *NA*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *NA*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Science Goal #2: *Due to the low number of students involved in the FAA, including this information would be a breach of confidentiality*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *NA*	2013Expected Level of Performance:* *NA*					
			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]).

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

Biology 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.			1.1. Students are unaccustomed to the rigor of EOC exams.	1.1. Establish EOC specific after school tutoring four (4) weeks prior to testing to review concepts taught early in the curriculum and to build student confidence. Create and implement an FCIM strategy that targets the 22 core benchmarks that emphasize complex text, writing in the subject area and specific practice with questions similar to the Biology EOC	1.1. Science Department Chair	1.1. Data comparison of scores of students who did and did not attend tutoring.	1.1. EOC data
Biology 1 Goal #1: *This data has not been made available to us.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *This data has not been made available to us.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *This data has not been made available to us.*					
			1.2. Average or lower achieving students need additional time to master the curriculum.	1.2. Establish alternating day schedule for Biology for select students	1.2. Guidance Department Assistant Principal	1.2. Data comparison of achievement for students in traditional versus alternating day students.	1.2. EOC data
			1.3. A significant time gap exists between 7th grade Life Science and 10th Grade Biology	1.3. Create and implement an FCIM strategy that targets the 22 core benchmarks that emphasize complex text, writing in the subject area and specific practice with questions similar to the Biology EOC	1.3. Science Department Chair	1.3. Classroom data to measure student progress	1.3. EOC data
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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. Students are unaccustomed to the rigor of EOC exams.	2.1. Establish EOC specific after school tutoring four (4) weeks prior to testing to review concepts taught early in the curriculum and to build student confidence. Create and implement an FCIM strategy that targets the 22 core benchmarks that emphasize complex text, writing in the subject area and specific practice with questions similar to the Biology EOC	2.1. Science Department Chair	2.1. Data comparison of scores of students who did and did not attend tutoring.	2.1. EOC data
Biology 1 Goal #2: *This data has not been made available to us.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *This data has not been made available to us.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *This data has not been made available to us.*					

		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
Understanding the Expectations of the Biology EOC	9 – 12 All curriculum areas	Science Department Chair	School Wide	December, 2012	PLC Minutes	Principal and Assistant Principal

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No school based funding required			
			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:
			$0 Total:

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

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. Writing Goal #1A: *Based on FCAT Writing data, 84% of students scored at or above level 3. As a new school, there is no previous data.* *LMHS presumes that the performance standard for 2013 will be 4.0* • The goal is to increase student achievement by the standards of Safe Harbor, but move the performance standard to 4.0	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *84% of students scored at level 3 or above*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *86% of students will score at level 4 or above*	1A.1. Students were not fully prepared to write formally using appropriate conventions in a final draft format.	1A.1. Incorporate 5 minute grammar and convention reviews in each English class each day. Pair all English I, II, and III classes with the appropriate Social Studies classes on an alternating day basis allowing English and Social Studies teachers to collaborate on writing assignments including DBQs. Assign paired English and Social Studies teachers to the same planning and/or lunch times to foster formal and informal collaboration.	1A.1. English Department Chair Social Studies Chair Literacy Coach Assistant Principal	1A.1. Improved writing samples in benchmark assessments and classroom grades	1A.1 Improved FCAT Writing scores.
			1A.2. Students are accustomed to reviewing only their own writing with limited review and analysis of the writing of their peers.	1A.2. Write, review and revise self-created writing as well as the writing of peers at least once a month. Pair high achieving classes (honors and AP) with average classes to create peer reviews at least bi-monthly. Establish a writing lab (comparable to tutoring) that encourages students to receive both teacher-directed and peer editing to enhance individual writing skills.	1A.2. English Department Chair Literacy Coach Assistant Principal	1A.2. Review of strategy use and success in PLC meetings	1A.2. Improved FCAT Writing scores.
			1A.3. High achieving students still need support to move from high school writing standards to college and	1A.3. Establish a writing lab (comparable to tutoring) that encourages students to receive both teacher-	1A.3. English Department Chair	1A.3. Review of strategy use and success in PLC meetings	1A.3. Improved FCAT Writing scores

			career standards.	directed and peer editing to enhance individual writing skills.			
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Writing Goal #1B: *Due to the low number of students involved in the FAA, including this information would be a breach of confidentiality*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *NA*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *NA*					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

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
Writing Across All Disciplines	9-12	Jennifer Carlson	All teachers	November 6, 2012, follow up with small groups once a month in PLC meetings	Lesson plan review and PLC minutes to document writing across all curriculum areas	Assigned administrator

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
Writing Lab for students once a week	English teacher to act as writing tutor	SAI budget	$3500
			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:
			$ 3500 Total:

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

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: **NA at this time**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **NA at this time**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **NA at this time**					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Civics Goal #2: **NA at this time**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **NA at this time**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **NA at this time**					
			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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 Attendance Goal #1: In the 2011-2012 school year, 442 out of 1265 students (35%) missed 10 or more days of school. For the first quarter of the current school year, only 2.88% of students have missed 10 days of more. The ADA for 2011-2012 was 93.3% The goal is to improve the ADA to at least 95% for the current school year, and reduce the excessive absence rate to 25%.	2012 Current Attendance Rate:* *ADA for the current school year to date is 94.82%* 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) *2.88% (52 of 1800) students in the first quarter of the current school year have 10 or more absences.* 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) *1.44% (26 of 1800) students in the current school year have 10 or more tardies*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* ***Goal for 2013 is 95% ADA*** 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) ***A maximum of 25% (450) will miss 10 or more days a reduction of 10% points.*** 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) *1.25% (22.5) student will have 10 or more taardies*	1.1. Students do not recognize absenteeism as a hindrance to their overall educational success.	1.1. Develop a strong school attendance policy based on both incentives for good attendance and consequences for poor attendance. Obtain approval from the SAC and the LCSB.	1.1. Principal, Assistant Principal SAC	1.1. Comparison of average daily attendance month to month from 2011-2012 to 2012-2013	1.1. Improved grades and FCAT/EOC scores due to improved attendance.
			1.2. The existing PLACO system for tracking tardiness has not been used with fidelity.	1.2. Use the existing PLASCO daily attendance and tardy tracking system with increased fidelity.by establishing three PLASCO sign in	1.2. Clerical staff and administration	1.2. Comparison of data from 2012 to 2013	1.2. Improved grades and FCAT/EOC scores due to improved attendance.

			sites on campus for all tardy students. Establish one sign in PLASCO site for students who arrive late.			
		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

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
No school based budget is required.			
			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:
			$0 Total:

End of Attendance Goals

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

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1: *Approximately 21.2% of the student body had at least one in school suspension in the 2011-2012 school year. This percentage rate should reduce to 19%* *Approximately 12.1% of the student body had at least on out of school suspension in the 2011-2012 school year. This percentage rate should reduce to 10%*	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions *This data is not available.* 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School *96 9th graders 113 10th graders 62 11th graders Total of 271 students (21.2%)* 2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions *This data is not available.* 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School *73 9th graders 56 10th graders 26 11th graders Total of 155 students(12.1%)*	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions *This data is not available.* 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School *19% or 342 of 1800 students* 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions *This data is not available.* 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School *10% (180 of 1800 students)*	1.1. Students transferring from other high schools are unfamiliar with a student centered, positive culture.	1.1. Maintain homeroom (advisory) rosters so that students remain together as a cohesive group from year to year with the same teacher/advisor allowing the teacher/advisors to create close relationships with students. Open lines of communication so that guidance counselors are aware of all in and out of school suspensions, establishing a protocol that all suspended students meet with their guidance counselor to discuss their behavior choices and consequences.	1.1. Assistant principal and guidance department Assistant Principal and Guidance Department	1.1. Tracking of student suspension data Guidance notes and follow through with students.	1.1 Comparison of suspension data for potential reduction in suspension rates.
			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

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
No school based budget is requried			
			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:
			$0 Total:

End of Suspension Goals

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: *LMHS did not have a senior class for the 2011-2012 school year.* *NA at this time* **Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*	2012 Current Dropout Rate:* *NA: LMHS did not have a senior class in 2011-2012* 2012 Current Graduation Rate:* ***NA for 2012***	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:* *10% estimate based on expected graduation rate* 2013 Expected Graduation Rate:* *90% overall graduation rate*	1.1. Low achieving or disenfranchised students feel isolated from the rest of the student population.	1.1. Maintain homeroom (advisory) rosters so that students remain together as a cohesive group from year to year with the same teacher/advisor allowing the teacher/advisors to create close relationships with students. Establish a rotation of visits by guidance counselors to each advisory group, minimum of once each term. Establish and maintain a Guidance Corner option in the lunchroom each day so that students may easily see a counselor and vice versa. Outreach by each guidance counselor to students considered to be at risk in each grade level Targeted assistance from assigned administrators for each at risk student	1.1. Assistant Principal and Guidance Department	1.1. Documentation of classroom visits Sign-in log in the Guidance Corner Notations by Guidance regarding specific counseling sessions.	1.1. Reduction in drop out rate. (LMHS did not have a senior class in 2011-2012. Therefore, 2012-2013 will be the first full year of data)
			1.2. Students are frequently anxious to leave school and move on to paid employment.	1.2. Establish a program for seniors who have a 2.0 GPA that allows them to leave school for the final block of the day and receive elective credit for paid employment.	1.2. Guidance Counselor and Assistant Principal	1.2. Review of student records to determine the percentage of students who begin the program, continue successfully in it and remain in school for graduation.	1.2 Evaluation forms completed by the employer and the student.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No school based budget is required			
			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:
			$0 Total:

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: *LMHS did not keep absolute numbers in its first year of operation. Approximately 78% (1000) of the parents of enrolled students attended the first parent nights in August, 2011 SAC consistently had 90% (22) members participate for each meeting. LMHS moved from a student population of 1275 in 2011-2012 to 1800 in 2012-2013.* *Statistics were not maintained on other campus events.*	**2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*** *78% (1000) of parents attended orientation in August of 2011*	**2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*** *90% (1440) of parents will attend orientation in 2012-2013*	1.1. Parents have multiple obligations and cannot all attend at the same time on the same date.	1.1. Re-create the process for orientation expanding to 3 full opportunities with varying times including early afternoon to mid-evening time frames.	1.1 Assistant Principal and Principal	1.1. Verification of number of iPad pick-ups completed during orientation.	1.1. Follow through on the iPad pick-up
			1.2. Parents and community members do not have a reason to come to the school except for orientation or problems.	1.2. Create new parent and community events that invite parents to visit the school for social reasons such as Veterans Concert, Holiday Showcase and other events.	1.2. Fine and Performing Arts Teachers	1.2. Ticket sales, attendance counts, sales of snacks	1.2 Analysis of end of the year data regarding parent visitation.
			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

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

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
No school based budget is required			
			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:
			$0 Total:

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: *Increase the overall number of STEM classes, increasing overall participation. This will include:* • *Changing a curriculum focus from Computers for College and Careers (8209020) to Introduction to Information Technology (8207310* • *Add an additional technology curriculum in Networking* • *Increase the overall number of participants in STEM related classes by 10%* • *Increase participation in elective science classes by 10%*	1.1. Students are unfamiliar with STEM related classes	1.1. Identify specific STEM classes in student brochures Promote career paths related to STEM education through Guidance conferences and Guidance Corner	1.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Guidance and CTE Department Chair	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

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

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

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
No school based budget is required.			
			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:
			$0 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: 1. **LMHS will increase its participation in CTE classes at both the entry level and above to increase the number and percentage of program completers.** 2. **LMHS will increase the number of students participating in and completing CAP academies.** 3. **LMHS will actively hire CTE teachers with industry based experience.**	1.1. Students are unfamiliar with the CTE programs at LMHS as many are new and unavailable at other schools.	1.1. Increase on-site information to students regarding CTE offerings	1.1. Guidance and administration	1.1. Increased enrollment in CTE courses	1.1. Evaluation of data for program completers and students requesting further study in CTE courses.
	1.2. LMHS has too few CTE opportunities for students	1.2. Increase the number of CTE opportunities at LMHS, adding two new curriculum lines in 2012-2013	1.2. Guidance and county level CTE director	1.2 Enrollment in new CTE courses.	1.2. Evaluation of data for program completers and students requesting further study in CTE courses.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

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

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

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No outside budget is required.			
			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:
			$0 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 Additional Goal #1: *LMHS will improve the implementation of iPads in each classroom and curriculum area.* *LMHS is a full iPad school with a device assigned to each student and teacher on campus.* Additional Goal #2: *LMHS will increase the number of students participating in Advanced Placement classes by 10% (from 321 students to a minimum of 350 students)* Additional Goal #3: *LMHS will continue to provide a safe environment for students where bullying is not tolerated. In our first year of operation, zero (0) office referrals were specifically coded as bullying.*	2012 Current Level :* *85% of teachers participated in at least two (2) on-site technical professional trainings during the 2011-2012 school year.*	2013 Expected Level :* *90% of teachers will participate in at least two (2) on-site technical professional trainings during the 2012-2013 school year, with at least one training at an intermediate or advanced level.*	1.1. Not all teachers fully participated in training and fully implemented iPads in their daily classroom instruction	1.1. Redefine training opportunities into more cohesive units of study allowing teachers to improve specific skills as needed. Create technology study groups who function as PLCs to improve technology integration Provide direct teacher and student support in iPad use via a dedicated Innovative Learning specialist and fully trained student assistants.	1.1. Principal and Assistant Principal ILS	1.1. Improved participation in technology trainings Data and implementation strategies as shared by PLC study groups Teacher participation is specific strategies such as flipped classrooms.	1.1. Teacher responses to surveys at the end of each semester.
			1.2. Goal #2 Students are unfamiliar with new AP classes offered for the first time at LMHS	1.2. Create an outreach system through Guidance to encourage students to challenge themselves to AP classes, especially in math and science	1.2. Guidance department and Assistant Principal for curriculum	1.2. Monitor participation in AP classes	1.2. Results of AP testing – number of participants and number of passing scores
			1.3. Some students are hesitant to report bullying for fear of reprisals	1.3. Create a confidential bullying reporting system that allows students to email any adult on campus to report incidents of bullying. TV Production classes to create public service message to play regularly with morning announcements.	1.3. Grade level administrators in charge of discipline	1.3. Successful intervention strategies to stop bullying before it escalates	1.3. Maintenance of fewer than ten (10) office referrals that are related to bullying behavior.

Additional Goals Professional Development

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

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

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
Technology: Various topics to include Moodle, content specific applications, Flipped classroom development, Skydrive integration, multi-media resources and projects,	9-12 grades All curriculum areas	Kellie Beck, ILS	All curriculum areas	Target dates vary throughout the school year with at least two (2) opportunities each week.	Review of sign in sheets to verify participation, reflection assignments at the conclusion of each full training unit, personal follow up as needed for classroom implementation.	Kellie Beck (ILS) Principal and Assistant Principal
Advanced Placement: Who, What, Where, and Why	9-12 grades All curriculum areas	Assistant Principal in charge of curriculum	All curriculum areas	September, 2012	Maintenance of full AP rosters	Assistant Principal and Guidance Counselors
Bullying: Stop Bullying Now	9-12 grades All curriculum areas	Assistant Principals in charge of discipline TV Production Teacher	All curriculum areas	September, 2012 and ongoing	Monitoring of office referrals for incidents of bullying	Assistant Principals in charge of discipline

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
No school based budget is required			
			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:
			$0 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: $19,000
CELLA Budget	
	Total: $0
Mathematics Budget	
	Total: $13,000
Science Budget	
	Total: $0
Writing Budget	
	Total: $3500
Civics Budget	
	Total: $0
U.S. History Budget	
	Total: $0
Attendance Budget	
	Total: $0
Suspension Budget	
	Total: $0
Dropout Prevention Budget	
	Total: $0
Parent Involvement Budget	
	Total: $0
STEM Budget	
	Total: $0
CTE Budget	
	Total: $0
Additional Goals	
	Total: $0
	Grand Total: $35,500.00

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

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

<u>Differentiated Accountability</u>

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
☐ Priority	☐ Focus	☐ Prevent

- 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.
Review of By-laws and guidelines; selection of officers; review of student achievement data; direction for use of SAC funds; direction for use of funds for achieving an A

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Potential use for a reading intervention program available for all lower level students. Amount TBD	