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: Jensen Beach High School	District Name: Martin County
Principal: Ginger Featherstone	Superintendent: Nancy Kline
SAC Chair: Lori Kane	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	Ginger Featherstone	Master Education Leadership	8	15	SY 2011-2012: Grade "A". Reading Mastery 73%, Math Mastery 82%, Writing Mastery 92%, Reading Learning Gains 73%, Math Learning Gains 83%, Reading Learning Gains for Lowest 25% is 71%, Math Learning Gains for Lowest 25% is 77%. SY 2010-2011: Grade "B". Reading Mastery 73%, Math Mastery 90%, Writing Mastery 94%, Science Mastery 68%, Reading Learning Gains 62%, Math Learning Gains 82%, Reading Learning Gains for Lowest 25% is 44%, Math Learning Gains for Lowest 25% is 78%. SY 2009-2010: "A" rated school. Reading Mastery 68%, Math Mastery 91%, Writing Mastery 92%, Science Mastery 65%, Reading Learning Gains 61%, Math Learning Gains 80%, Reading Learning Gains for Lowest 25% is 51%, Math Learning Gains for Lowest 25% is 74%. SY 2008-2009: "A" rated school. Reading Mastery 72%, Math Mastery 93%, Writing Mastery 92%, Science Mastery 64%, Reading Learning Gains 65%, Math Learning Gains 81%, Reading Learning Gains for Lowest 25% is 57%, Math Learning Gains for Lowest 25% is 84%. SY 2007-2008: "A" rated school. Reading Mastery 71%, Math Mastery 89%, Writing Mastery 95%, Science Mastery 55%, Reading Learning Gains 71%, Math Learning Gains 80%, Reading Learning Gains for Lowest 25% is 59%, Math

					Learning Gains for Lowest 25% is 77%. SY 2006-2007: "A" rated school. Reading Mastery 63%, Math Mastery 84%, Writing Mastery 84%, Science Mastery 60%, Reading Learning Gains 63%, Math Learning Gains 73%, Reading Learning Gains for Lowest 25% is 50%, Math Learning Gains for Lowest 25% is 60%. SY 2005-2006: "A" rated school. Reading Mastery 61%, Math Mastery 83%, Writing Mastery 88%, Science Mastery NA, Reading Learning Gains 58%, Math Learning Gains 78%, Reading Learning Gains for Lowest 25% is 57%, Math Learning Gains for Lowest 25% is NA. SY 2004-2005: "A" rated school. Reading Mastery 59%, Math Mastery 80%, Writing Mastery 84%, Science Mastery NA, Reading Learning Gains 59%, Math Learning Gains 75%, Reading Learning Gains for Lowest 25% is 54%, Math Learning Gains for Lowest 25% is NA.
Assistant Principal	Gary Kirsch	ED.S. in Curriculum and Instruction; MST in Chemistry; BA Chemistry	5	17	Same as Ginger Featherstone
Assistant Principal	Theresa Iuliucci	Master Education Leadership	8	6	Same as Ginger Featherstone
Assistant Principal	Amy Laws	Master Education Leadership	5	5	Same as Ginger Featherstone

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	Shannon Blount	Master Education Leadership	8	7	Same as Ginger Featherstone

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
There is a New Teacher Mentoring Program that consists of four components: (1) A New Teacher Handbook; (2) Assigning each new teacher a mentor; (3) Scheduling new teachers to observe experienced teachers in action; (4) Monthly in-services targeting new teachers' professional development.	Mark C. Malham, Ed.D.	Ongoing
There is a systemic professional development program that nurtures the growth of all teachers. Based upon the Administrators' insights, as well as feedback from a teacher survey, topics are selected that address evidence-based instructional strategies, assessments, technology, and relationships.	Gary Kirsch	Ongoing

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.

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

*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
8% (7)	Taking coursework to become certified or ESOL certified

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
90	7.7% (7)	43% (39)	33% (30)	15.5% (14)	34% (31)	92% (81)	21% (19)	6.6% (6)	12% (11)

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
Mark C. Malham, Ed.D.	Tim Caffey	Career Change	Involved in the New Teacher Mentoring program described above. Conducts classroom observations and meets weekly with mentor.
Dana Cone	Ashley Jenkins	New to teaching	See above
Valerie Gaynor	Crystal Lucas	New to teaching	See above

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

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. Various stakeholders are actively engaged in the team. Membership includes Administrators, RtI team leader, mainstream consultant, guidance counselors, reading coach, general education teachers, mentoring team leader, the parent and the student.
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? Students who are not successful are identified on a weekly basis through data team meetings. Students are also identified by guidance counselors, administrators, and general education teachers either through academic, attendance, or behavioral issues.
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? Attendance is part of the SIP; therefore, the team is integrally engaged in developing and implementing the SIP. Additionally, SIP funding has been provided to enable a peer mentoring program to be implemented to support those students in need.

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. Administrators and instructional staff employ various tools that include Pinnacle (online grading software program); Performance Matters (online software program used to analyze benchmark and standardized testing data); RtIB (online software program used to track behavioral issues); and TERMS for attendance data.
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. A systematic professional development program is implemented that engages teachers on a monthly basis throughout the school year. Additionally, the RtI coach at District will be employed to provide additional training workshops.
Describe the plan to support MTSS. The individual teachers track student progress based upon IEPs, as well as Behavioral Tracking forms. Issues are initially addressed with the respective parents. Should issues continue, then it is brought to the attention of the MTSS team, where the team meets with the student and parent to develop a way ahead to ensure student success.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

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

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). The team consists of administrators, reading coach, content-area team leaders, and teachers who volunteer to be on the PLC.
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The Literacy Leadership Team meets on a monthly basis. The reading coach tracks school-wide literacy data and subsequently meets with the reading data-teams on a weekly basis. School-wide literacy concerns are then shared with the LLT to enable professional development needs to be addressed. LLT problem solves and develops initiatives and strategies to target the areas of concern.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? Given the needs of our Levels 1 and 2, the LLT will target through the data teams the areas of concern. Additionally, the LLT will address vocabulary building and reading/writing across the curriculum.

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?

Reading is part of the individual teacher's professional development plan. Additionally, an instructional focus is included on each teacher's lesson plans and formative reading assessments must be documented in the online grade-book.

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?

Various initiatives are in place: there are 19 Advanced Placement (AP) courses offered, as well as dual enrollment (DE) at Indian River State College. A Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) program has been developed to ensure students are writing on a weekly basis in all classes. Teachers work collaboratively to plan and conduct interdisciplinary projects Rigorous and relevant activities permeate the CTE programs, which stress real-world applications. Digital Design students have developed various program brochures for school organizations and sports teams. The teacher has teamed up with the local Starbucks® to create and develop simulated advertisements that are evaluated by the Starbucks® management team. The teacher also works with local businesses to place students in jobs that maximize their potential.

Students in the Nursing Assisting program participate in a 40-hour clinical rotation that includes a long-term care facility and an acute care hospital. Clinical activities provide opportunities for students to do such tasks as answer call lights, take vital signs, and assist with the personal care of patients/residents. They must also interact with facility staff at all levels, and are challenged to apply communication skills both verbally and in writing when they report to facility staff and submit nursing notes.

The pre-engineering students engage in internship positions with local engineering companies and undertake community projects. Several students participated in robotics competitions sponsored by the FIRST (For Inspirational and Recognition of Science and Technology) organization.

The Television Production students are responsible for producing, videotaping, and broadcasting the daily news, upcoming events, and recent accomplishments on the school's TV network.

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?

High school administrators go to the middle schools to meet with incoming 9th graders. Subsequently, meetings are conducted with guidance counselors, parents, and students to work one-on-one in developing a tentative schedule. Each September, the guidance counselors offer a four-year planning presentation to parents, which include transition information, as well as details about what happens over the four academic years. Guidance counselors meet individually with each student and their parents to create a four-

year plan targeted specifically to the student's individual needs based upon goals and career plans. Guidance counselors conduct presentations in 9th, 10th, and 11th grade English classes to describe course content, prerequisites, and options for course selection. Additionally, all teachers have been--or will be--trained in the ICLE Rigor, Relevance, and Relationship (RRR) approach to Gold Seal lesson design.

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.

Guidance counselors host a workshop for juniors entitled "Making Your College Search Count" and one for seniors entitled "Making College Count". Additionally, counselors host a scholarship workshop for seniors and parents to assist them in applying for scholarships.

Each Career and Technical Education (CTE) program is a Career and Professional Education (CAPE) academy with an applicable industry certification and an advisory board. Additionally, each CAPE academy has articulated college credit with Indian River State College and, in some cases, Keiser College. College Placement Testing (CPT) for college readiness is offered three times per year. Additionally, ACT and SAT prep classes are conducted, as well as offering the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB). In addition to the 19 AP courses previously referenced, courses in reading, writing, and college readiness in preparation for the PERT are provided as well as several opportunities for DE coursework.

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1A: *78% (663) of students will score a level 3 or higher*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *20% (186)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *78% (663)*	1A.1. Expanding teachers' subject matter instructional strategies, to include CCSS related to ELA	1A.1. Sustain and improve reading in the content areas; develop scope/sequence district-wide	1A.1. Classroom teachers; Evaluators	1A.1. Plan has been implemented and teachers have been briefed; iObservations	1A.1. (1) Teachers use content and rubrics applicable to their discipline. (2) Evaluators review grades in each teacher's gradebook, based upon pre and post tests.
			1A.2. Diverse focus across-- and within the curriculum	1A.2. Implement instructional focus calendar in each discipline that targets categories on a weekly basis	1A.2. Administrators; team leaders; teachers	1A.2. Lesson Plans; iObservations	1A.2. Pinnacle assessments
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1B: *10% (2) of students will score Levels 4, 5, or 6*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *NA*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *10% (2)*	1B.1. Intellectual Learning Gaps	1B.1. Train staff on cognitive disabilities (i.e. SLD) and research based techniques (manipulative use, cooperative learning) effective for SWD; utilize peers to provide additional support to teachers	1B.1. Teachers, peers paraprofessionals, Administrators	1B.1. Identify strategies for specific intellectual disabilities; determine growth of individual students	1B.1. Unique Learning Curriculum, Teacher informal evaluations
			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: *65% (553) of students will score a Level 4 or higher*	2A.1. Lack of consistency in implementation of increased rigor in scientific thinking and research activities	2A.1. Integrate assessments and lesson plans targeting Quadrant D of the Rigor and Relevance model	2A.1. Classroom teachers	2A.1. iObservations; comparison of Marzano's Strategies in targeted teacher behavior	2A.1. Project rubrics and Gradebook
2012 Current Level of Performance:* *62% (523)* **2013 Expected Level of Performance:*** *65% (553)*	2A.2. Involving more students and increasing pass rate for AP exams	2A.2. Involving more students and increasing pass rate for AP exams	2A.2. AP coordinator; AP teachers	2A.2. Meeting logs	2A.2. AP enrollment and pass rate
	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2B: *5% (1) of students will score a Level 7 or higher*	2B.1. Intellectual Learning Gaps	2B.1. Train staff on cognitive disabilities (i.e. SLD) and research based techniques (manipulative use, cooperative learning) effective for SWD; utilize peers to provide additional support to teachers	2B.1. Teachers, peers paraprofessionals, Administrators	2B.1. Identify strategies for specific intellectual disabilities; determine growth of individual students	2B.1. Unique Learning Curriculum, Teacher informal evaluations
2012 Current Level of Performance:* *NA* **2013 Expected Level of Performance:*** *5% (1)*	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.			3A.1. Lack of student engagement due to reading burn out	3A.1. Identify CAR-PD and CATER teachers for Reading Level 2 fluent students as reading intervention options; identify differentiated interventions for Reading students, implement new intensive reading curriculum	3A.1. Guidance Counselors; Reading Coach	3A.1. Review student trend data for placement; re- evaluate at benchmark intervals	3A.1. Benchmarks; List of CATER/CAR-PD teachers
Reading Goal #3A: *75% (638) of students will make learning gains*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *73% (621)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *75% (638)*					
			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 reading.			3B.1. Intellectual Learning Gaps	3B.1. Train staff on cognitive disabilities (i.e. SLD) and research based techniques (manipulative use, cooperative learning) effective for SWD; utilize peers to provide additional support to teachers	3B.1. Teachers, peers paraprofessionals, Administrators	3B.1. Identify strategies for specific intellectual disabilities; determine growth of individual students	3B.1. Unique Learning Curriculum, Teacher informal evaluations
Reading Goal #3B: *90% (10) of students will make learning gains*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *75 (9)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *90% (10)*					
			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. Lack of student engagement/ appropriate behavior	4A.1. Identify engagement/ motivational techniques; utilize the Response to Intervention (RtI) process to identify struggling students; identify support system for teacher (Support Facilitators, Guidance, etc.); evaluate class schedules for tracking of placement; expand mentoring program for all level 1 and 2 students in 9th and 10th grade	4A.1. Support Facilitators; Guidance Counselors; Teachers; Administration	i4A.1. Establish a PLC to research motivational strategies; train new teachers on mentoring responsibilities/RtI and match adult mentors with lower achieving students	4A.1. RtI Data; Mentor list; training logs; AIP folders
Reading Goal #4A: _75% (159) of students will make learning gains_	2012 Current Level of Performance:* _71% (151)_	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* _75% (159)_					
			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 reading.			4B.1. Intellectual Learning Gaps	4B.1. Train staff on cognitive disabilities (i.e. SLD) and research based techniques (manipulative use, cooperative learning) effective for SWD; utilize peers to provide additional support to teachers	4B.1. Teachers, peers paraprofessionals, Administrators	4B.1. Identify strategies for specific intellectual disabilities; determine growth of individual students	4B.1. Unique Learning Curriculum, Teacher informal evaluations
Reading Goal #4B: _30% (2) of students will make learning gains_	2012 Current Level of Performance:* _NA_	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* _30% (2)_					
			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**						
Reading Goal #5A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*							

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**			5B.1. Lack of reading experience with informational/expository text	5B.1. Focus on Reading to Learn approach through electives (CTE, Arts, PE) to motivate and advance percent of reading of non-fiction based on individual interest; increase implementation of Quad D lessons; utilize real-world examples of printed materials as models for skill practice; provide opportunities for content area teachers to earn reading endorsement	5B.1. CTE/Elective Teachers; Support Facilitators; Reading Coach; Administration	5B.1. Teacher led review of lessons through lesson study; identify nonfiction readings based on elective areas, review samples of student work involving reading activities	5B.1. Lesson plans; student work; lesson study reports	
Reading Goal #5B: *55% (81) of students will make progress*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *53% (79)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *55% (81)*						
			5B.2. Lack of comprehension and vocabulary skills	5B.2. Identify, teach and assess common terminology/vocabulary used in reading comprehension questions; identify, teach and assess common content area vocabulary using etymology rules; provide training on Marzano's Strategies for Increased Student Achievement	5B.2. Grade Level Coordinators; Reading Coach; Science contact; ELL Contact; Administration	5B.2. Comparison of Marzano's Strategies in targeted teacher behavior	5B.2. List of common vocabulary taught, assessed; Training rosters; lesson plans	

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 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. Lack of language acquisition	5C.1. Increase use of Rosetta Stone; identify common vocabulary on assessments; identify and secure appropriate reading level materials for remediation and enrichment (bi-lingual story books); partner English Language Learners with Second Language Learners	5C.1. ELL Contact; Reading Coach; Foreign Language Teachers	5C.1. Assess oral fluency; chart and recognize Rosetta Stone progress; list common test taking terms in various languages; identify cognates by content area	5C.1. IPT (Verbal Fluency)Results; Student Achievement Results, Rosetta Stone for NES
Reading Goal #5C: *100% (23) of students will make progress*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *96% (22)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *100% (23)*					
			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. Intellectual Learning Gaps	5D.1. Train staff on cognitive disabilities (i.e. SLD) and research based techniques (manipulative use, cooperative learning) effective for SWD; utilize peers to provide additional support to teachers	5D.1. Teachers, peers paraprofessionals, Administrators	5D.1. Identify strategies for specific intellectual disabilities; determine growth of individual students	5D.1. Unique Learning Curriculum, Teacher informal evaluations
Reading Goal #5D: *70% (53) of students will make progress*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *68% (51)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *70% (53)*					
			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. Lack of student background knowledge	5E.1. Increase opportunities for technology/Internet resource implementation (Smartboards, Senteos, websites); identify and increase virtual field trips and guest speakers	5E.1. Administration; Reading Coach; Teachers; Technology Learning Group (TLG)	5E.1. Identify instructional technology sources and additional opportunities for reading	5E.1. Lesson plans; Student achievement data
Reading Goal #5E: *50% (80) of students will make progress*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *46% (74)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *50% (80)*					
			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
Common Core standards training	9-12	Principal; AP; Team leader	Common Core team	Collaborative planning; Early release	Lesson plans, iObservations	Principal, AP
Data Teams	9-12	Principal; AP; Team leader	Data team	Collaborative planning; Early release	Lesson plans, iObservations	Principal, AP
Conduct CRISS training	9-12	Principal; Reading Coach	Non-CRISS trained teachers	First semester	Lesson plans, iObservations	Evaluators

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

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

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
Provide additional assistance to students before standardized testing	Conduct tutoring for Quartile 1 students	School Improvement	$1,000
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Training teachers on CCSS	Navigator Software		$975
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Expand knowledge of CCSS	Reading conference	School Improvement	$800
Expand teacher subject matter and instructional strategies	Conferences and training	School Improvement	$9,971
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			$12,746 Total:

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1: *75% (21) of students will listen/speak proficiently*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: *71% (19)*	1.1. Lack of comprehension and vocabulary skills	1.1. Identify, teach and assess common terminology/vocabulary used in reading comprehension questions; identify, teach and assess common content area vocabulary using etymology rules; provide training on Marzano's Strategies for Increased Student Achievement	1.1. Grade Level Coordinators; Reading Coach; Science contact; ELL Contact; Administration	1.1. Comparision of Marzano's Strategies in targeted teacher behavior	1.1 List of common vocabulary taught, assessed; Training rosters; lesson plans
		1.2. Lack of language acquisition	1.2. Increase use of Rosetta Stone; identify common vocabulary on assessments; identify and secure appropriate reading level materials for remediation and enrichment (bi-lingual story books); partner English Language Learners with Second Language Learners	1.2. ELL Contact; Reading Coach; Foreign Language Teachers	1.2. Assess oral fluency; chart and recognize Rosetta Stone progress; list common test taking terms in various languages; identify cognates by content area	1.2. IPT (Verbal Fluency)Results; Student Achievement Results, Rosetta Stone for NES
		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:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:	2.1. Lack of language acquisition	2.1. Increase use of Rosetta Stone; identify common vocabulary on assessments; identify and secure appropriate reading level materials	2.1. ELL Contact; Reading Coach; Foreign Language Teachers	2.1. Assess oral fluency; chart and recognize Rosetta Stone progress; list common test taking terms in various languages;	2.1. IPT (Verbal Fluency)Results; Student Achievement Results

25% (7) of students will read proficiently	*19% (5)*		for remediation and enrichment (bi-lingual story books); partner English Language Learners with Second Language Learners		identify cognates by content area	
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3: *50% (13) of students will write proficiently*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing: *48% (12)*	2.1. Lack of organizational support skills	2.1. Mapping for Meaning; One-on-one revision; provide peer/teacher feedback	2.1. Teachers; Support Facilitators	2.1. Train teachers on writing rubrics; identify teachers with high student performance data as lead teachers for modeling	2.1. Writing scores
		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

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CELLA Goals

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. Mathematics Goal #1: *10% (2) of students will score a Level 4 or higher* 2012 Current Level of Performance:* — *NA* 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* — *10% (2)*	1.1. Intellectual Learning Gaps	1.1. Train staff on cognitive disabilities (i.e. SLD) and research based techniques (manipulative use, cooperative learning) effective for SWD; utilize peers to provide additional support to teachers	1.1. Teachers, peers paraprofessionals, Administrators	1.1. Identify strategies for specific intellectual disabilities; determine growth of individual students	1.1. Unique Learning Curriculum, Teacher informal evaluations
	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. Mathematics Goal #2: *5% (1) of students will score a Level 7 or higher* 2012 Current Level of Performance:* — *NA* 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* — *5% (1)*	2.1. Intellectual Learning Gaps	2.1. Train staff on cognitive disabilities (i.e. SLD) and research based techniques (manipulative use, cooperative learning) effective for SWD; utilize peers to provide additional support to teachers	2.1. Teachers, peers paraprofessionals, Administrators	2.1. Identify strategies for specific intellectual disabilities; determine growth of individual students	2.1. Unique Learning Curriculum, Teacher informal evaluations
	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. Intellectual Learning Gaps	3.1. Train staff on cognitive disabilities (i.e. SLD) and research based techniques (manipulative use, cooperative learning) effective for SWD; utilize peers to provide additional support to teachers	3.1. Teachers, peers paraprofessionals, Administrators	3.1. Identify strategies for specific intellectual disabilities; determine growth of individual students	3.1. Unique Learning Curriculum, Teacher informal evaluations
Mathematics Goal #3: *70% (9) of students will make learning gains*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *67% (8)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *70% (9)*					
			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. Intellectual Learning Gaps	4.1. Train staff on cognitive disabilities (i.e. SLD) and research based techniques (manipulative use, cooperative learning) effective for SWD; utilize peers to provide additional support to teachers	4.1. Teachers, peers paraprofessionals, Administrators	4.1. Identify strategies for specific intellectual disabilities; determine growth of individual students	4.1. Unique Learning Curriculum, Teacher informal evaluations
Mathematics Goal #4: *17% (2) of students will make learning gains*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *NA*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *17% (2)*					
			4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.
			4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.			1.1. Expanding teachers' subject matter instructional strategies	1.1. Sustain and improve mathematical skills in the content areas; develop scope/sequence district-wide	1.1. Classroom teachers; Evaluators	1.1. Plan has been developed and teachers have been briefed; iObservations	1.1. Teachers use content and rubrics applicable to the discipline. Evaluators review online grade-book, based upon pre and post-tests.
Algebra 1 Goal #1: *55% (163) of students will score a Level 3 or higher*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *51% (151)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *55% (163)*					
			1.2. Diverse focus across- and within the curriculum	1.2. Implement instructional focus calendar in each discipline that targets categories on a weekly basis	1.2. Administrators; team leaders; teachers	1.2. Lesson Plans; iObservations	1.2. Online grade-book assessments
			1.3. Lack of consistency in implementation of strategies to enhance math proficiency	1.3. Select and implement research-based strategies (Marzano's, CRISS) to address students' weaknesses in measurement	1.3. Team leader; Math PLCs; Administration	1.3. List of identified strategies for increased reading and math proficiency; updated training for all teachers on identified strategies; re-write practice assessments using FCAT-style questioning format; iObservations; communicate iObservations results with staff	1.3 Training rosters; Lesson plans; iObservations Data; self and peer assessments
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.			2.1. Lack of consistency in implementation of increased rigor in scientific thinking and research activities	2.1. Integrate assessments and lesson plans targeting Quadrant D of the Rigor and Relevance model	2.1. Teachers	2.1. iObservations; comparison of Marzano's Strategies in targeted teacher behavior	2.1 Project rubrics and Gradebook
Algebra Goal #2: *30% (90) of students will score a Level 4 or higher*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *28% (83)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *30% (90)*					
			2.2. Involving more students and increasing pass rate for AP exams	2.2. Meet with parents and students to promote AP courses	2.2. AP coordinator; AP teachers	2.2. Meeting logs	2.2. AP enrollment and pass rate

		2.3. Lack of consistency in implementation of increased rigor in thinking and computational activities	2.3. Train all teachers on Analytical Thinking strategies, Brain-Based Research, Quadrant D lessons and Lesson Study to increase rigor of expected student outcomes	2.3. Reading Coach; AP Coordinator; District Math Specialist; Teachers; Administration	2.3. Create training materials from resources (Brain Rules, Analytical Thinking and ICLE Rigor/Relevance Framework); iObservations; Communicate iObservations results with staff	2.3 Training rosters; Quad D lessons; Student work samples; iObservations reports

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**						
Algebra 1 Goal #3A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*							

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.**		3B.1. Lack of math word problem practice and application	3B.1. Identify, teach and assess common terminology/vocabulary used in math word problems; identify, teach and assess common content area vocabulary using etymology rules; provide training on Marzano's Strategies for Increased Student Achievement	3B.1. Teachers; Grade Level Coordinators; ESE contact; District Math Contact; Administration	3B.1. List of identified strategies; updated training for all teachers	3B.1. Training rosters; lesson plans; course assessments; Benchmark data	
Algebra 1 Goal #3B: *40% (26) of students will make progress*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *37% (24)*						
	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *40% (26)*						
		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. Lack of language acquisition	3C.1. Identify common vocabulary used in word problems; identify and secure appropriate bi-lingual reading and math level materials for remediation and enrichment; partner English Language Learners with Second Language Learners	3C.1. ELL Contact; team leader; Administrators	3C.1. Assess oral fluency; list common test taking terms in various languages; identify cognates by content area	3C.1. IPT (Oral Fluency) Results; Student achievement results
Algebra 1 Goal #3C: *50% (5) of students will make progress*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *33% (3)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *50% (5)*					
			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. Cognitive Learning Gaps	3D.1. Train staff on cognitive disabilities (i.e. SLD) and research based techniques (manipulative use, cooperative learning) effective for SWD; utilize support facilitators to provide additional support to teachers	3D.1. ESE Team Coordinator; Support Facilitators; Team Leader; Administrators	3D.1. Identify strategies for specific cognitive disabilities; Determine growth of individual students	3D.1. Benchmark/FCAT Explorer reports; training log
Algebra 1 Goal #3D: *65% (20) of students will make progress*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *60% (18)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *65% (20)*					
			3D.2. Test Taking Strategies	3D.2. Identify students with disability affecting math processing; teach tips for testing; provide reinforcement and repetition of skill development	3D.2. ESE Team Coordinator; Math Teachers; Administrators	3D.2. Chart student progress before, during and after being taught test-taking strategies; Data teams review results	3D.2. List of students; List of testing tips; test results
			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. Lack of Student Background Knowledge	3E.1. Increase opportunities for technology/Internet resource implementation (e.g. Smartboards); identify and increase virtual field trips and guest speakers	3E.1. Administration; Reading Coach; Teachers; Technology Learning Group (TLG)	3E.1. Identify instructional technology sources	3E.1. Lesson plans; Student achievement data
Algebra 1 Goal #3E: *35% (25) of students will make progress*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *33% (24)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *35% (25)*					
			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. Geometry Goal #1: *60% (262) will score a Level 3 or higher*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *57% (248)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *60% (262)*	1.1. Expanding teachers' subject matter instructional strategies	1.1. Sustain and improve mathematical skills in the content areas; develop scope/sequence district-wide	1.1. Classroom teachers; Evaluators	1.1. Plan has been developed and teachers have been briefed; iObservations	1.3. Teachers use content and rubrics applicable to the discipline. Evaluators review online grade-book, based upon pre and post-tests.
			1.2. Diverse focus across- and within the curriculum	1.2. Implement instructional focus calendar in each discipline that targets categories on a weekly basis	1.2. Administrators, team leaders, teachers	1.2 Lesson plans; iObservations	1.2. Online gradebook assessments
			1.3. Lack of consistency in implementation of strategies to enhance math proficiency	1.3. Select and implement research-based strategies (Marzano's, CRISS) to address students' weaknesses in geometry	1.3. Team leader; Math PLCs; Administration	1.3 List of identified strategies for increased reading and math proficiency; updated training for all teachers on identified strategies; re-write practice assessments using FCAT-style questioning format ; iObservations; communicate iObservations results with staff	1.3. Training rosters; Lesson plans; iObservations Data; self and peer assessments
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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. Geometry Goal #2: *10% (43) of students will score a Level 4 or higher*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *NA*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *10% (43)*	2.1. Lack of consistency in implementation of increased rigor in scientific thinking and research activities	2.1. Integrate assessments and lesson plans targeting Quadrant D of the Rigor and Relevance model	2.1. Teachers	2.1. iObservations; comparison of Marzano's Strategies in targeted teacher behavior	2.1 Project rubrics and Gradebook
			2.2. Involving more students and increasing pass rate for AP exams	2.2. Meet with parents and students to promote AP courses	2.2. AP coordinator; AP teachers	2.2. Meeting logs	2.2. AP enrollment and pass rate

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

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

		2.3. Lack of consistency in implementation of increased rigor in thinking and computational activities	2.3. Train all teachers on Analytical Thinking strategies, Brain-Based Research, Quadrant D lessons and Lesson Study to increase rigor of expected student outcomes	2.3. Reading Coach; AP Coordinator; District Math Specialist; Teachers; Administration	2.3. Create training materials from resources (Brain Rules, Analytical Thinking and ICLE Rigor/Relevance Framework); iObservations; Communicate iObservations results with staff	2.3 Training rosters; Quad D lessons; Student work samples; iObservations reports

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: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*						

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.**			3B.1. Lack of math word problem practice and application	3B.1. Identify, teach and assess common terminology/vocabulary used in math word problems; identify, teach and assess common content area vocabulary using etymology rules; provide training on Marzano's Strategies for Increased Student Achievement	3B.1. Teachers; Grade Level Coordinators; ESE contact; District Math Contact; Administration	3B.1. List of identified strategies; updated training for all teachers	3B.1. Training rosters; lesson plans; course assessments; Benchmark data
Geometry Goal #3B: *70% (55) of students will make progress*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *64% (50)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *70% (55)*					
			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. Lack of language acquisition	3C.1. Identify common vocabulary used in word problems; identify and secure appropriate bi-lingual reading and math level materials for remediation and enrichment; partner English Language Learners with Second Language Learners	3C.1. ELL Contact; team leader; Administrators	3C.1. Assess oral fluency; list common test taking terms in various languages; identify cognates by content area	3C.1. IPT (Oral Fluency) Results; Student achievement results
Geometry Goal #3C: *80% (7) of students will make progress*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *75% (6)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *80% (7)*					
			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. Cognitive Learning Gaps	3D.1. Train staff on cognitive disabilities (i.e. SLD) and research based techniques (manipulative use, cooperative learning) effective for SWD; utilize support facilitators to provide additional support to teachers	3D.1. ESE Team Coordinator; Support Facilitators; Team Leader; Administrators	3D.1. Identify strategies for specific cognitive disabilities; Determine growth of individual students	3D.1. Benchmark/FCAT Explorer reports; training log
Geometry Goal #3D: *90% (38) of students will make progress*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *85% (36)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *90% (38)*					
			3D.2. Test Taking Strategies	3D.2. Identify students with disability affecting math processing; teach tips for testing; provide reinforcement and repetition of skill development	3D.2. ESE Team Coordinator; Math Teachers; Administrators	3D.2. Chart student progress before, during and after being taught test-taking strategies; Data teams review results	3D.2. List of students; List of testing tips; test results
			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. Geometry Goal #3E: *65% (55) of students will make progress* 2012 Current Level of Performance:* *61% (52)* 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *65% (55)*	3E.1. Lack of Student Background Knowledge	3E.1. Increase opportunities for technology/Internet resource implementation (e.g. Smartboards); identify and increase virtual field trips and guest speakers	3E.1. Administration; Reading Coach; Teachers; Technology Learning Group (TLG)	3E.1. Identify instructional technology sources	3E.1. Lesson plans; Student achievement data
	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
Common Core standards training	9-12	Principal; AP; Team leader	Common Core team	Collaborative planning; Early release	Lesson plans, iObservations	Principal, AP
Data Teams	9-12	Principal; AP; Team leader	Data team	Collaborative planning; Early release	Lesson plans, iObservations	Principal, AP

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

<u>Mathematics Budget</u> (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 Mathematics Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

High School Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1: *17% (2) of students will score a Level 4 or higher*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *NA*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *17% (2)*	1.1. Intellectual Learning Gaps	1.1. Train staff on cognitive disabilities (i.e. SLD) and research based techniques (manipulative use, cooperative learning) effective for SWD; utilize peers to provide additional support to teachers	1.1. Teachers, peers paraprofessionals, Administrators	1.1. Identify strategies for specific intellectual disabilities; determine growth of individual students	1.1. Unique Learning Curriculum, Teacher informal evaluations
			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. Science Goal #2: *17% (2) of students will score a Level 7 or higher*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *NA*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *17% (2)*	2.1. Intellectual Learning Gaps	2.1. Train staff on cognitive disabilities (i.e. SLD) and research based techniques (manipulative use, cooperative learning) effective for SWD; utilize peers to provide additional support to teachers	2.1. Teachers, peers paraprofessionals, Administrators	2.1. Identify strategies for specific intellectual disabilities; determine growth of individual students	2.1. Unique Learning Curriculum, Teacher informal evaluations
			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

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

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

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

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

Biology 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.			1.1. Expanding teachers' subject matter instructional strategies	1.1. Sustain and improve reading in the content areas; develop scope/sequence district-wide	1.1. Classroom teachers; Evaluators	1.1. Classroom teachers; Evaluators	1.1 (1) Teachers use content and rubrics applicable to their discipline. (2) Evaluators review grades in each teacher's gradebook, based upon pre and posttests
Biology 1 Goal #1: *60% (228) of students will score a Level 3 or higher*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *58% (222)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *60% (228)*					
			1.2. Diverse focus across-- and within the curriculum	1.2. Implement instructional focus calendar in each discipline that targets categories on a weekly basis	1.2. Administrators; team leaders; teachers	1.2. Administrators; team leaders; teachers	1.2. Administrators; team leaders; teachers
			1.3. Lack of consistent awareness of current student proficiency level in science	1.3. Compare student data from benchmark assessments during the SY12-13 to identify student strengths and weaknesses; review science Benchmarks on daily basis in Biology science classes; instruct and assess on identified areas using performance assessment techniques; teach test taking strategies	1.3. Science Team Leader; Teachers; District Science Contact; Administration	1.3. Science Team Leader; Teachers; District Science Contact; Administration staff on performance assessment techniques; review performance assessment results	1.3. Instructional Focus Calendar; Training logs; Lesson Plans; iObservations Data Reports
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.			2.1. Lack of consistency in implementation of increased rigor in scientific thinking and research activities	2.1. Integrate assessments and lesson plans targeting Quadrant D of the Rigor and Relevance model	2.1. Classroom teachers	2.1. iObservations; comparison of Marzano's Strategies in targeted teacher behavior	2.1. Project rubrics and Gradebook
Biology 1 Goal #2: *10% (38) of students will score a Level 4 or higher*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *NA*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *10% (38)*					

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

		2.2. Involving more students and increasing pass rate for AP exams	2.2. Meet with parents and students to promote AP courses	2.2. AP coordinator; AP teachers	2.2. Meeting logs	2.2. AP enrollment and pass rate
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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
Common Core standards training	9-12	Principal; AP; Team leader	Common Core team	Collaborative planning; Early release	Lesson plans, iObservations	Principal, AP
Data Teams	9-12	Principal; AP; Team leader	Data team	Collaborative planning; Early release	Lesson plans, iObservations	Principal, AP
Formative Assessments	9-12	Science Teachers; District Science Specialist; team leaders	All	Collaborative planning; Early release	Lesson plans, iObservations	Principal, AP

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

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			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 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: *95% (387) of students will score a Level 3 or higher* **2012 Current Level of Performance:*** *92% (374)* **2013 Expected Level of Performance:*** *95% (387)*	1A.1. Need to ensure consistency and on-going constructive instructional feedback to students	1A.1.Train teachers on writing rubrics using sample student work and methods for holistic assessment	1A.1. Team leader, AP Coordinator; teachers; Administrators	1A.1. Identify common student writing errors; create training materials based on rubrics and student work samples; train staff on rubrics; continue writing across the curriculum activities; provide constructive instructional feedback to students; teachers review corrected student work; iObservations; communicate iObservations results with staff	1A.1. Sample student work; training logs; iObservations reports
	1A.2. Need to ensure consistency and on-going constructive instructional feedback to students	1A.2. Conduct teacher work sessions on assessment of student work	1A.2. Team leader, AP Coordinator; teachers; Administrators	1A.2. Identify common student writing errors; create training materials based on rubrics and student work samples; train staff on rubrics; continue writing across the curriculum activities; provide constructive instructional feedback to students; teachers review corrected student work; iObservations; communicate iObservations results with staff	1A.2. Sample student work; training logs; iObservations reports
	1A.3. Need to ensure consistency and on-going constructive instructional feedback to students	1A.3. Train teachers in feedback protocol focusing on Marzano strategies	1A.3. Team leader, AP Coordinator; teachers; Administrators	1A.3. Identify common student writing errors; create training materials based on rubrics and student work samples; train staff on rubrics; continue writing across the curriculum activities; provide constructive instructional feedback to students; teachers review corrected student work; iObservations; communicate iObservations results with staff	1A.3. Sample student work; training logs; iObservations reports
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.	1B.1. Intellectual Learning Gaps	1B.1. Train staff on cognitive disabilities (i.e. SLD) and research based techniques (manipulative use,	1B.1. Teachers, peers paraprofessionals, Administrators	1B.1. Identify strategies for specific intellectual disabilities; determine growth of individual	1B.1. Unique Learning Curriculum, Teacher informal evaluations

Writing Goal #1B: *55% (224) of students will score a Level 4 or higher*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *52% (212)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *55% (224)*		cooperative learning) effective for SWD; utilize peers to provide additional support to teachers		students	
			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
Common Core standards training	9-12	Principal; AP; Team leader	Common Core team	Collaborative planning; Early release	Lesson plans, iObservations	Principal, AP
Data Teams	9-12	Principal; AP; Team leader	Data team	Collaborative planning; Early release	Lesson plans, iObservations	Principal, AP

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
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 Writing 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			1.1. Habitual absenteeism	1.1. Reiterate exemption policy for grade/attendance incentive; use attendance intervention team to monitor importance of school attendance; employ positive reinforcement for incoming freshmen	1.1. Administrators, Attendance clerk, Counselors, Volunteers, Teachers	1.1. Promote plan to parents and students	1.1. Attendance recoreds
Attendance Goal #1: *Increase daily student attendance to 97% (1655)*	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
	95% (1607)	*96% (1638)*					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	.05% (79)	*.04% (68)*					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	.02% (29)	*% (17)*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Attendance Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PBS PLC	9-12	Assistant Principal, PBS team	PBS team members	Collaborative planning and early release	SWIS data	Assistant principal, PBS coordinator

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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: ***Reduce out of school suspensions to 400 and reduce total number of students suspended to 225 (13%)***	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions *8% (136)*	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions *6% (102)*	1.1. Increased student population and stringent adherence to "Zero Tolerance" policy	1.1. Conduct initial policy-awareness presentations; conduct subsequent presentations before major extracurricular events	1.1. Administrators	1.1. Administrators and teachers adhering to policies and procedures	1.1.SWIS data
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School *6% (101)*	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School *4% (68)*					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions *19% (315)*	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions *17% (290)*					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School *12% (203)*	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School *10% (170)*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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
PBIS	9 - 12	PBIS Team Leader	PBIS members, teachers	Weekly collaborative planning, early release	SWIS Data	PBIS Team Leader

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

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

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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: ***Continue to decrease the dropout rate and increase the graduation rate to 99% (388)*** **Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*	2012 Current Dropout Rate:* *1% (5)* 2012 Current Graduation Rate:* *97% (371)*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:* *1% (17)* 2013 Expected Graduation Rate:* *98% (384)*	1.1. Student apathy	1.1. Identify potential dropouts, offer alternative methods to obtain graduation credits, promote industry certifications using CAPE certified CTE programs	1.1. Counselors, Administrators, and Teachers	1.1. Identify students in need of credits to graduate or with attendance concerns, monitor students' grades to identify possible non-graduates, expand mentoring program to include potential dropouts	1.1. Graduation/Dropout rates
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Educate staff on credit requirements/alternate options to earn credits	9-12	Administrators	All	Collaborative planning, early release	Administrative meetings	Principal, Assistant principal

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
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 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: *The number of parents involved will increase by 5%* **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:* 28% (459)	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:* 33% (482)	1.1. Extensive parent commitments external to school	1.1. Increase the use of various media (Connect Ed, Website, flyer) to inform parents	1.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, PTSA members, volunteer coordinator	1.1. Parent involvement	1.1. Attendance logs
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

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
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Engage parents and stakeholders in the school's climate	Climate survey	School Improvement	$300
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			$300 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: *Ensure 100% of students taking the AP Physics exam will earn a passing score*	1.1. Exam rigor	1.1. Provide tutoring and employ additional resources to facilitate struggling learners	1.1. Physics teacher	1.1. AP Physics exam	1.1. AP pass rate
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

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

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

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
CTE Goal #1: *Ensure 100% of students taking their respective industry certification exams will earn a passing score*	1.1. Certification rigor	1.1. Provide tutoring and employ additional resources (e.g. practice tests) to facilitate struggling learners	1.1. CTE teachers	1.1. Industry Certifications	1.1. Industry Certification passing rates
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity					
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.					
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
CAPE requirements	9 to 12	CTE team leader	CTE teachers	Collaborative planning and early release	CAPE binders	CTE team leader and Principal

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

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.
Reading Budget
Total: $12,746
CELLA Budget
Total:
Mathematics Budget
Total:
Science Budget
Total:
Writing Budget
Total:
Civics Budget
Total:
U.S. History Budget
Total:
Attendance Budget
Total:
Suspension Budget
Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget
Total:
Parent Involvement Budget
Total: $300
STEM Budget
Total:
CTE Budget
Total:
Additional Goals
Total:
Grand Total: $13,046

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

Differentiated Accountability

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
☐Priority	☐Focus	☐Prevent

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

☒ Yes   ☐ No

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

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
SAC will meet eight times over the course of the school year. Initially the School Improvement Plan (SIP) will be presented and voted on, along with the proposed SIP budget. Subsequently, each meeting will provide the principal an opportunity to provide an overview of what is underway each month to parents, community members, teacher representatives, and student representatives. Additionally, each SIP goal chair will provide an update each month as to the progress each team is making to accomplish the strategies laid out in the SIP

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Professional Training and Development, Quartile 1 tutoring (School Improvement); climate survey software and mailing	$13,046

Teacher training (School Recognition)	$5,722