Florida Department of Education

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: Fletcher Middle School	District Name: Duval
Principal: Teresa Mowbray	Superintendent: Mr. Ed Pratt-Dannals
SAC Chair:	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.

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

Principal	Teresa Mowbray	Highest Level of Education/ Degree: Master's Degree in Educational Leadership; Master's Degree in Music Education	1	15	Principal of Alfred I. DuPont MS 2011-2012: Grade: B, reading mastery: 42%; math mastery: 47%; writing mastery 78%; science mastery: 43%; All subgroups did not make AYP in reading. All subgroups did not make AYP in math. All subgroups made AYP in writing. Principal of Alfred I. DuPont MS 2010-2011: Grade: B, reading mastery: 64%; math mastery: 55%; writing mastery 93%; science mastery: 43%; All subgroups did not make AYP in reading. All subgroups did not make AYP in math. All subgroups made AYP in writing. Principal of Alfred I. DuPont MS 2009-2010: Grade: B, reading mastery: 63%; math mastery: 62%; science mastery: 37% AYP: 72%. Black, SWD, and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in reading. Black, SWD, Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in math. Principal of Alfred I. DuPont MS 2008-2009: Grade: A (with a 7 point gain), reading mastery: 63%; math mastery: 64%; science mastery: 48% ; AYP: 79%. Black, SWD, and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in reading. Black, SWD, Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in math. Principal of Alfred I. DuPont MS 2007-2008: Grade: A (with a 36 point gain); reading mastery: 66%; math mastery: 62%; science mastery: 35%; AYP: 85%. Black, SWD, and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in reading. SWD, Economically Disadvantaged, and English Language Learners did not make AYP in math. Vice Principal of Kernan MS 2006-2007: Grade: A; reading mastery: 69%; math mastery: 76%; science mastery: 54%; AYP: 100%. Assistant Principal of Kernan MS 2005-2006: Grade: A; reading mastery: 70%; math mastery: 71%;

					AYP: 97% SWD did not make AYP in math

Assistant Principal	Yolanda Sanders	M.A. Educational Leadership B.S. Business Education Certificate 07/1/10-6/30/15 Educational Leadership Business Education 6-12	10	10	Assistant Principal, Fletcher Middle School, 2011 – 2012: Grade B Reading Mastery: 67 % Math Mastery: 59% Science Mastery: 66% Writing Mastery: 85% AYP: No did not make AYP. Assistant Principal, Fletcher Middle School, 2010 – 2011: Grade A Reading Mastery:79 % Math Mastery: 76% Science Mastery: 65% Writing Mastery: 81% AYP: No, 79% of criteria satisfied; White, Black, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP. Assistant Principal, Fletcher Middle School, 2009 – 2010: Grade A Reading Mastery: 77 % Math Mastery: 75% Science Mastery: 64 % Writing Mastery: 87% AYP: No, 82% of criteria satisfied; Black, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP. Assistant Principal, Fletcher Middle School, 2008 – 2009: Grade A Reading Mastery: 79 % Math Mastery: 73% Science Mastery: 65 % Writing Mastery: 93% AYP: No, 90% of criteria satisfied; Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP. Assistant Principal, Fletcher Middle School, 2007 – 2008: Grade A Reading Mastery: 80% Math Mastery: 71% Science Mastery: 65% Writing Mastery: 95% AYP: No, 92% of criteria satisfied; Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP. Assistant Principal, Fletcher Middle School, 2006 – 2007: Grade A

		Coordinator of Cooperative Education			Reading Mastery: 77% Math Mastery: 71% Science Mastery: 64% Writing Mastery: 94% AYP: No, 90% of criteria satisfied; Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP. Assistant Principal, Fletcher Middle School, 2005 – 2006: Grade A Reading Mastery:75% Math Mastery: 73% Science Mastery: % Writing Mastery: 93% AYP: No, 90% (Provisional AYP) of criteria satisfied; Black, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP. Assistant Principal, Fletcher Middle School, 2004 – 2005: Grade A Reading Mastery: 76% Math Mastery: 71% Science Mastery: % Writing Mastery: 84% AYP: No, 90% of criteria satisfied; Black and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP. Assistant Principal, Fletcher Middle School, 2003 – 2004: Grade A Reading Mastery: % Math Mastery: % Science Mastery: % Writing Mastery: % AYP: No, 82% of criteria satisfied; Black, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP.

| Assistant Principal | Cynthia Carter | B.A. in Sociology/ Counselor Education, South Carolina State University

Masters of Arts in Education Leadership and Administration, UOP

Certification: Texas Elementary Education K-6; Florida Elementary Education 1-6; Educational Leadership K-12;School Principal/ (All Levels) | 1 | 5 | 2011 – 2012 – Jean Ribault Middle Grade: D; Reading Mastery: 31%; Learning Gains: 55%; Lowest 63%; Math Mastery: 32%; Learning Gains: 54%; Lowest 58% - School did not make AYP..

2010 – 2011 – Jean Ribault Middle Grade: C; Reading Mastery: 36%; Learning Gains: 57%; Lowest 74%; Math Mastery: 41%; Learning Gains: 62%; Lowest 70% - School did not make AYP.

2009-2010: Ribault Middle – Assistant Principal - Grade F. Reading Mastery - 35%, Learning Gains - 45%, Lowest 25% Gains – 60%, ESE did not make AYP in Reading.

2008-2009: Normandy Village Elementary- Instructional Coach- Grade B, Reading Mastery – 68%, Learning Gains – 60%, Lowest 25% Gains – 58%, ESE made AYP in Reading and Math
2008-2009- Grade B, Math Mastery

2007-2008: Mandarin Oaks Elementary – Lead Math/Science Teacher - Grade A, Math Mastery-88%,Learning Gains Math – 76%, Lowest 25% - 78%, AYP met for Economically Disadvantage, Blacks and ESE in Math and Reading |

| Assistant Principal | Lisa Copeland | M Ed Educational Leadership

BA Psychology

Certificate 07/1/09-6/30/14 Educational Leadership, Elementary K-6, Mentally Handicapped K-12, Psychology 6-12 | 7 | 7 | Assistant Principal, Fletcher Middle School, 2011 – 2012: Grade B
Reading Mastery: 67 %
Math Mastery: 59%
Science Mastery: 66%
Writing Mastery: 85%
AYP: No did not make AYP.

Assistant Principal, Fletcher Middle School, 2010 – 2011: Grade A
Reading Mastery:79 %
Math Mastery: 76%
Science Mastery: 65%
Writing Mastery: 81%
AYP: No, 79% of criteria satisfied; White, Black, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP.

Assistant Principal, Fletcher Middle School, 2009 – 2010: Grade A
Reading Mastery: 77 %
Math Mastery: 75%
Science Mastery: 64 %
Writing Mastery: 87%
AYP: No, 82% of criteria satisfied; Black, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP.

Assistant Principal, Fletcher Middle School, 2008 – 2009: Grade A
Reading Mastery: 79 %
Math Mastery: 73%
Science Mastery: 65 %
Writing Mastery: 93%
AYP: No, 90% of criteria satisfied; Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP.

Assistant Principal, Fletcher Middle School, 2007 – 2008: Grade A
Reading Mastery: 80% |

					Math Mastery: 71% Science Mastery: 65% Writing Mastery: 95% AYP: No, 92% of criteria satisfied; Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP. Assistant Principal, Fletcher Middle School, 2006 – 2007: Grade A Reading Mastery: 77% Math Mastery: 71% Science Mastery: 64% Writing Mastery: 94% AYP: No, 90% of criteria satisfied; Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP.
Assistant Principal	Brett Hartley	MS Educational Leadership BS Communications Certificate: 7/1/11 – 6/30/16 Educational Leadership Middle Grades Math 5-9 Middle Grades Integrated 5-9 ESOL K-12	1	2	Assistant Principal, Twin Lakes Academy Middle 2011 – 2012: Grade B Reading Mastery: 59% Math Mastery: 58% Science Mastery: 52% Writing Mastery: 78% AYP: No did not make AYP.

Instructional Coaches

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

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)
N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	N/A

Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Regular meetings of new teachers with Principal/ PDF	Principal/PDF	On-going
2. Partnering new teachers with veteran staff	Assistant Principal/PDF	On-going

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

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

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

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
60	8.3% (5)	6.66% (4)	33.33% (20)	51.66% (31)	31.66% (19)	85% (51)	1% (6)	11.66% (7)	18.33% (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
Alissa Russo (2nd Year MINT)	Lisa Cordy	Veteran teacher, CET trained	Monthly MINT meetings with mentor, PDF and cadre
Ceneetra Anderson (1st Year MINT)	Sharonette Shaw	Veteran teacher, CET trained	Monthly MINT meetings with mentor, PDF and cadre
Paula Janan (2nd Year teacher)	Mark McGiveron	Veteran teacher, CET trained	Monthly MINT meetings with mentor, PDF and cadre
Ryan Fennell	Mark McGiveron	Veteran teacher, CET trained	Meetings with mentor as needed
Margaret Walters	Coleen Vanlue	Veteran teacher, CET trained	Meetings with mentor as needed
Robert Murray	Leigh Morrison	Veteran teacher, CET trained	Meetings with mentor as needed
Ingrid Bowler	Cathy Gates	Veteran teacher, CET trained	Meetings with mentor as needed
Karen Younginger	Robbie Knieberg	Veteran teacher, CET trained	Meetings with mentor as needed
Veteran teacher, CET trained	Lisa Cordy	Veteran teacher, CET trained	Meetings with mentor as needed
Rebecca Okie	Matt Legge	Veteran teacher, CET trained	Meetings with mentor as needed

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

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

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

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

Job Training
N/A
Title I, Part A
N/A
Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) /Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI) School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. Principal: Mrs. Teresa Mowbray Assistant Principal: Mrs. Cynthia Carter **Select General Education Teachers:** Ms. Leigh Morrison, Mrs. Sharonette Shaw, Ms. Ingrid Bowler, Mrs. Sharon Silver, Mrs. Jessica Goldman, Mrs. Katherine Blair, Mr. Steven Moon, Ms. Elizabeth Westbury, Ms. Elizabeth Centola, Ms. Anderson **Guidance Counselor:** Mrs. Ronda Davis

Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?

The team has completed training. The MTSS team adheres to all adopted district protocols regarding time lines for MTSS meetings.

MTSS Leadership team meets on the third Thursday of each month. Agenda items are submitted by grade level instructional teams and each team has one member to present data and current interventions attempted with each student on the agenda. The MTSS Leadership team reviews the data submitted and collaborates with the team representative to develop additional intervention strategies and data-gathering timelines. The MTSS Leadership team works with grade-level instructional teams to develop intervention strategies and review the data collected during the implementation phase of those strategies.

The Building Leadership Team focuses the meetings around:
1) What do we expect the students to learn?
2) How do we know they have or have not learned what is expected?
3) What will we do when they do or don't learn?
4) What evidence do we have to support our responses to these questions?
5) How can we best develop and deliver professional development to the faculty and staff?

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

The MTSS Leadership Team helps to ensure that the core academic classes are set up with a strong Tier I foundation at Fletcher Middle School. The team makes certain that the Tier II and Tier III strategies are also embedded in the math, reading, writing and science portions of the School Improvement Plan. Furthermore, the team assists teachers by demonstrating methods for tracking students to determine if the Tier II or Tier III strategies being implemented are lessening the achievement gap. If students are still struggling, the MTSS Leadership Team offers next steps for students and teachers.

MTSS Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.

Baseline Data:
Using Benchmark data, Baseline and Post Assessment Subject Area Data and the District Timed Writing Assessments to identify areas of weakness.

Implementing:
Working within our school-based PLC's using teacher-created assignments, textbooks and workbooks to assist students.

Monitoring: Benchmarks, SRI, FAIR, Baseline and Post Assessment Subject Area Data and the District Timed Writing Assessments and analyzing data via PLC's.

Midyear: Pre and Post Assessments, District Writing Assessments, Benchmarks, SRI, FAIR as appropriate.

End of year: FAIR, FCAT

Frequency of Data Days: Twice a month; discussions will take place during department PLC meetings.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. The FMS MTSS Leadership Team will be trained at the Schultz Center throughout the 2012-2013 school years. The team will share what they learned with the FMS faculty during early dismissal sessions and/or faculty meetings. The team will assist teachers with collaborative planning, analysis of data, discussing student work, determining appropriate Tier II and Tier III strategies to implement and how to track student growth. The team will develop independently or with district staff professional development training on RtI and the new Pearson Inform student performance data system. To facilitate the professional development of the faculty and staff, each administrator and member of the MTSS committee has received a copy of *Pyramid Response to Intervention* and Response to Intervention (RtI) Strategies flip chart. These documents will be used during meetings for book talks and to augment training received by the District.
Describe the plan to support MTSS. The Administration and MTSS team members will participate in in-house professional development for the faculty, will collaborate with grade-level instructional teams as needed, and will communicate weekly via email with an "Intervention of the Week."

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT): Mrs. Teresa Mowbray, Principal Mrs. Yolanda Sanders, AP Curriculum Ms. Anne McConnell, Guidance Counselor Mrs. Karen Gilbert, Reading Teacher/ Reading Chair Mrs. Jessica Goldman, ESE Teacher
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions): The LLT merges current testing (FAIR scores and FCAT scores) into a coherent picture of student needs and progress. The LLT meets three times during the year when the three primary sources of data have been received by the school. The APC and Reading Chair meet, as needed, to revise testing schedules/reporting.

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

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?
The action plan for this year focuses primarily on the "forgotten" reading students who are Tier 2 and 3. This population of students includes the majority of level 2 and bubble 3 students who are not enrolled in the Intensive Reading program. Our primary initiative will be to work with our CAR-PD/Social Studies teachers assisting them with content area reading support for the identified students. The LLT is currently looking at the comprehension aides (i.e., graphic organizers) and FCAT practice materials being used in the Social Studies classes. There are a variety of resources available on the FCRR website to supplement current materials. Once the individual students are identified, the RtI team, ESE team, and content area teachers will be notified of these students and what level of RtI support should be provided to assist students in becoming proficient readers.

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.

*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.

N/A

*Grades 6-12 Only Sec. 1003.413 (2)(b) F.S
For schools with grades 6-12, how does the school ensure that every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student?

The LLT and school administration will ensure that the content and elective areas are using reading, writing and math strategies, the use of test results available to teachers on the Limelight site and the development and understanding the role of reading in the RtI process focusing on science, social studies and math. Students who struggle in reading often struggle in their content area classes. One of the goals of the LLT is to identify these students.

*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?

N/A

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?

N/A

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

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

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.

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

1A. FCAT 2.0: **Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.**	1A.1. Teacher's ability to effectively implement the CLOSE Reading strategy.	1A.1. Teachers will implement the CLOSE Reading strategy to improve students' critical thinking and comprehension skills. Differentiated Instruction	1A.1. Administration, Department Chairs	1A.1. Administration will conduct classroom walkthroughs to assess lesson delivery. Collaboration during PLC meetings. Review of lesson plans	1A.1. Effectiveness will be determined through assessments, FAIR data and classroom walkthroughs rubrics, Benchmark data, lesson plans, assessment data, FAIR, LSA.		
Reading Goal #1A: 32.9% (348) of students scoring at a Level 3 in reading on the FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	32.9% (117)	73%					

		1A.2. Lack of effective data analysis and data driven instruction.	1A.2. Core academic teachers will incorporate Summarizing strategies to improve reading comprehension.	1A.2. Administration, Department Chairs	1A.2. Administration will conduct classroom walkthroughs to assess lesson delivery. Collaboration during PLC meetings.	1A.2. Effectiveness will be determined through informal & formal assessments, FAIR and classroom walkthroughs rubrics.	
		1A.3. Teacher's ability to develop questioning on different levels of complexity.	1A.3. Core academic teachers will incorporate Questioning strategies using Webb's Depth of Knowledge to develop higher order thinking.	1A.3. Administration, Department Chairs	1A.3. Administration will conduct classroom walkthroughs to assess lesson delivery. Collaboration during PLC meetings.	1A.3. Effectiveness will be determined through informal & formal assessments, FAIR and classroom walkthrough rubrics.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.	1B.1. *	1B.1. *	1B.1 *	1B.1. *	1B.1. *		
Reading Goal #1B: *	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

	*	*					
		1B.2. *	1B.2. *	1B.2. *	1B.2. *	1B.2. *	
		1B.3. *	1B.3. *	1B.3. *	1B.3. *	1B.3. *	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.	2A.1 Teacher's ability to effectively implement the CLOSE Reading strategy using more complex text.	2A.1. Teachers will implement the CLOSE Reading strategy to improve students' critical thinking and comprehension skills. Differentiated Instruction	2A.1. Administration, Department Chairs	2A.1. Administration will conduct classroom walkthroughs to assess lesson delivery. Collaboration during PLC meetings, lesson plans.	2A.1. Effectiveness will be determined through assessments, FAIR data and classroom walkthrough rubrics, Benchmark data, lesson plans, assessment data, FAIR, LSA.		
Reading Goal #2A: 24.6% (261) of students scoring at a Level 4 in reading on the FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	24.6% (261)	73%					

		2A.2. Teacher's ability to develop questioning on different levels of complexity.	2A.2. Core academic teachers will incorporate Questioning strategies to develop high level critical thinking skills using Webb's Depth of Knowledge /High Order Thinking.	2A.2. Administration, Department Chairs	2A.2. Administration will conduct classroom walkthroughs to assess lesson delivery. Collaboration during PLC meetings, lesson plans.	2A.2. Effectiveness will be determined through informal & formal assessments, FAIR and classroom walkthroughs rubrics.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 5 in reading.	2B.1. *	2B.1. *	2B.1. *	2B.1. *	2B.1. *		
Reading Goal #2B: *	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	*	*					
		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. Teacher's ability to effectively implement the CLOSE Reading strategy.	3A.1. The School will implement the CLOSE Reading strategy to improve students' critical thinking and comprehension skills. Differentiated Instruction	3A.1. Administration, Department Chairs	3A.1. Administration will conduct classroom walkthroughs to assess lesson delivery. Collaboration during PLC meetings, lesson plans.	3A.1. Effectiveness will be determined through assessments, FAIR data and classroom walkthrough rubrics, Benchmark data, lesson plans, assessment data, FAIR, LSA.		
Reading Goal #3A: 62% (712) students making learning gains in reading on the FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	62% (712)	73%					
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.**	3B.1. *	3B.1. *	3B.1. *	3B.1. *	3B.1. *		
Reading Goal #3B: *	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	*	*					
		3B.2. *	3B.2. *	3B.2. *	3B.2. *	3B.2. *	
		3B.3. *	3B.3. *	3B.3. *	3B.3. *	3B.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		
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4A.1. Teacher's ability to develop questions at different levels of complexity.	4A.1 Core academic teachers will incorporate questioning strategies to improve reading comprehension. Differentiated Instruction	4A.1. Administration, Department Chairs	4A.1. Administration will conduct classroom walkthroughs to assess lesson delivery. Collaboration during PLC meetings, lesson plans.	4A.1. Effectiveness will be determined through assessments, FAIR data and classroom walkthrough rubrics, Benchmark data, lesson plans, assessment data, FAIR, LSA.		

Reading Goal #4A: 59% (678) students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading on the FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	59% (678)	73%				
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.**	4B.1. *	4B.1. *	4B.1. *	4B.1. *	4B.1. *	
Reading Goal #4B: *	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	*	*				
		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**	70%	73%	75%	78%	81%	83%
Reading Goal #5A: In six years, 2013 73%, 2014 75%, 2015 78%, 2016 81%, 2017 84%, of students will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.							
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. Teacher's ability to effectively implement the CLOSE Reading strategy Lack of effective data analysis and data driven instruction.	5B.1. The School will implement the CLOSE Reading strategy to improve students' critical thinking and comprehension skills. Differentiated Instruction	5B.1. Administration, Department Chairs	5B.1. Administration will conduct classroom walkthroughs to assess lesson delivery. Collaboration during PLC meetings, lesson plans.	5B.1. Effectiveness will be determined through pre-post assessments, FAIR data and classroom walkthrough rubrics, Benchmark data, lesson plans, assessment data, FAIR, LSA		

Reading Goal #5B: 58.3% (175) White 16.3% (49) Black 16% (48) Hispanic 4% (12) Asian 5 (16) Multi of student subgroups by ethnicity not making satisfactory progress in reading on the FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	58.3% (175) White 16.3% (49) Black 16% (48) Hispanic .04% (12) Asian .05 (16) Multi	75% White 45% Black 51% Hispanic 78% Asian					

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	
		5B.2. Lack of effective data analysis and data driven instruction. Teacher's ability to scaffold instruction for targeted group	5B.2. Core academic teachers will incorporate Summarizing strategies to improve reading comprehension	5B.2. Administration, Department Chairs	5B.2. Administration will conduct classroom walkthroughs to assess lesson delivery. Collaboration during PLC meetings.	5B.2. Effectiveness will be determined through assessments, FAIR data and classroom walkthrough rubrics, Benchmark data, lesson plans, assessment data, FAIR, LSA.	

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5C.1 ELL students' Limited English language comprehension skills. Lack of effective data analysis and data driven instruction. Teacher's ability to scaffold instruction for targeted group.	5C.1. Teachers will incorporate Summarizing strategies to improve reading comprehension. Teachers will differentiate instruction using flexible grouping.	5C.1. Administration, Department Chairs	5C.1 Teachers will conference with ELL students to determine if their needs are being met.	5C.1. ELL students should be able to demonstrate knowledge of Reading Comprehension Strategies.		
Reading Goal #5C: 7% (21) of English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading on the FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	7% (21)	31%					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5D.1. Teacher's ability to incorporate Differentiated Instruction based on data analysis. Teacher's ability to scaffold instruction for targeted group.	5D.1. Core academic teachers will incorporate Summarizing strategies to improve reading comprehension Differentiated Instruction	5D.1. Administration, Department Chairs	5D.1. Administration will conduct classroom walkthroughs to assess lesson delivery. Collaboration during PLC meetings.	5D.1. Effectiveness will be determined through assessments, FAIR data and classroom walkthrough rubrics, Benchmark data, lesson plans, assessment data, FAIR, LSA.		
Reading Goal #5D: 24.6% (74) of Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading on the FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	24.6% (74)	39%					

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		

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

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5E.1. Teacher's ability to provide students with complex levels of questioning.	5E.1. Core academic teachers will incorporate Questioning to improve reading comprehension.	5E.1. Administration, Department Chairs	5E.1. Administration will conduct classroom walkthroughs to assess lesson delivery. Collaboration during PLC meetings.	5E.1. Effectiveness will be determined through assessments, FAIR data and classroom walkthrough rubrics, Benchmark data, lesson plans, assessment data, FAIR, LSA.		
Reading Goal #5E: 50.4% (152) of Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading on the FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	50.4% (152)	56%					

		5E.2. Lack of effective data analysis and data driven instruction. Teacher's ability to scaffold instruction for targeted group	5E.2. Core academic teachers will incorporate Summarizing strategies to improve reading comprehension Differentiated Instruction	5E.2. Administration, Department Heads	5E.2. Administration will conduct classroom walkthroughs to assess lesson delivery. Collaboration during PLC meetings.	5E.2. Effectiveness will be determined through assessments, FAIR data and classroom walkthrough rubrics, Benchmark data, lesson plans, assessment data, FAIR, LSA.	

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities Please note that each						

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

PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
CLOSE Reading	All Teachers	District & School based facilitator	All teachers	Early Dismissal/ Content PLC	Evidence of implementation in classroom. Administrative walkthroughs, PLC, Lesson Plans.	Administration, Department Heads
Webb's Depth of Knowledge	All Teachers	District & School based facilitator	All Teachers	Early Dismissal/ Content PLC	Evidence of implementation in classroom. Administrative walkthroughs, PLC, Lesson Plans.	Administration, Department Heads
Differentiated Instruction	All Teachers	District & School based facilitator	All Teachers	Early Dismissal/ Content PLC	Evidence of implementation in classroom. Administrative walkthroughs, PLC, Lesson Plans	Administration , Department Heads
Inform Training	All Teachers	District & School based facilitator	All Teachers	Early Dismissal/ Content PLC	Evidence of implementation in classroom. Administrative walkthroughs, PLC, Lesson Plans	Administration , Department Heads

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/ materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal: $0			
Technology			

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal: $0			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Provide Fluency training for Intensive Reading teachers		District	$0.00
Differentiated Instruction for all teachers	Purchase culturally relevant material for ethnic subgroups.	District	$0.00
Subtotal: $0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:$0			
Total: $0.00			

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

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

1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.	1.1. Students Oral Proficiency Levels.	1.1. Think/pair/share	1.1. Underwood	1.1. Arrange small discussion and talking activities that permit students practice their verbal skills.	1.1. Content Retelling	
CELLA Goal #1: 36.3% (8) of students scoring proficient in listening/speaking on the FCAT.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					
	8 out of 22 students are proficient in Listening/ Speaking.					
		1.2. Lack of knowledge/ vocabulary of English language due to limited time in the USA.	1.2. Utilize oral techniques such as modeling and chunking.	1.2. Underwood	1.2. Repeat/paraphrase/ slow down.	1.2. Interviews and One on one instruction (teacher –student)
		1.3. Limited knowledge - Vocabulary	1.3 Utilize the Total Physical Response teaching strategy which introduces new language through a series of commands to enact an event.	1.3. Underwood/Core Teachers	1.3. Use songs/music/ chants in the classroom. Direct observation of student involvement using TPR	1.3. Informal Assessment: Observations/Anecdotal Utilize the dialogue journal technique in which students regularly communicate with the teacher.

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

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.	2.1. Cultural barriers	2.1 Choose literature representative of the ethnic background in the classroom.	2.1. Underwood	2.1. Direct Reading Summarizing	2.1 Cultural Sharing Varied Holidays Activities	
CELLA Goal #2: 27.2% (6) of students scoring proficient in reading on the FCAT.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:					
	6 out of 22 students are proficient in Reading.					
		2.2. Background Knowledge	2.2. Graphic Organizers (K.W.L)	2.2. Dora Underwood	2.2 Provide visuals for using the graphic organizers Check working KWL in class.	2.2. Completion of KWL and different graphic organizers after readings.

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

		2.3. ELL students have special needs with vocabulary, concepts, and difficulty of text.	2.3. Enrolled students in Fast For Word a computer based reading program (students will spend 45 minutes every day on Fast For Word.	2.3. Dora Underwood	2.3. Daily and weekly analysis of student's performance using Success Viewer and Progress Tracker.	2.3. Conduct Pre-testing and Post-testing using Reading Progress Indicator that is available within Fast For Word

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.	2.1 Background knowledge	2.1. Choose writing activities that activate prior knowledge and introduce standard English to ELL.	2.1 Language Arts Teachers/Dora Underwood	2.1 Writing small paragraphs in class.	2.1 Writing samples.	
CELLA Goal #3: 36.3% (8) of students scoring proficient in writing on the FCAT.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
	8 out of 22 students are proficient in Writing.					

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

		2.2. Lack of knowledge of FCAT (writing) format.	2.2. Explain: Words and phrases in Context, main idea, plot, purpose, author purpose, point of view, compare and contrast, cause and effect, multiple-choice and short responses.	2.2 Language Arts Teachers/Dora Underwood	2.2. Using FCAT Fitness Drills on plot, purpose, author purpose, point of view, compare and contrast, cause and effect, multiple-choice and short responses.	2.2. Pre-test and post-test. District based assessments and FCAT Writing.
		2.3. Lack of knowledge (on the format for writing essays)	2.3. Teach students the 5 paragraph format of writing essays in English.	2.3. Language Arts Teachers/Dora Underwood	2.3. Work on a writing plan, revising a First and editing a last draft.	2.3. Write a 5 paragraph essay similar to essays done by non-ELL students.

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

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal: $0.00			
Total: $0.00			

End of CELLA Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathema	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.	1A.1. Level 1 students need to improve by two FCAT levels in order to achieve this goal.	1A.1 Intensive Math is offered in all three grade levels, specifically to Level 1 and 2 students.	1A.1. Administrators, Math Department, Intensive Math teachers	1A.1. Analyze FCAT, Benchmark examinations; Classroom assessments	1A.1. FCAT Math 2.0 Benchmark, Pre and Post Assessments		

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

Mathematics Goal #1A: 30.7% (326) of students scoring at a Level 3 in reading on the FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	30.7% (326)	69%					
		1A.2. Multiple achievement levels in a classroom.	1A.2. Data-based differentiated instruction in the classroom.	1A.2. Principal, Math Department Head, Math Department	1A.2. Progress monitoring using our Baseline/ Post-Test data in our Professional Development/Data classroom.	1A.2. LSA student results	
		1A.3. Aligning state, district, and classroom goals, as well as ensuring that students are not over-testing.	1A.3. Develop a system to implement appropriate common assessments during each instructional module.	1A.3. Math Department	1A.3. Monitor all district-based and classroom-based assessment results.	1A.3. LSA student results	

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

1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	1B.1. *	1B.1. *	1B.1. *	1B.1. *	1B.1. *		
Mathematics Goal #1B: *	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	*	*					
		1B.2. *	1B.2. *	1B.2. *	1B.2. *	1B.2. *	
		1B.3. *	1B.3. *	1B.3. *	1B.3. *	1B.3. *	

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

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

2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.	2A.1. Students taking advanced Math courses, which have standards that do not directly correlate their specific FCAT Math 2.0 assessment.	2A.1. Students will engage in "Focus lesson Wednesdays," in which specific grade level standards are covered and mastered.	2A.1. Administrators, Math Department Head, Math Department	2A.1. Teachers will use Baseline and Post-Tests from M/J Math 1, 2 and/or 3 to monitor students' progress on grade level specific standards.	2A.1. FCAT Math 2.0, Algebra 1 EOC, Geometry EOC		
Mathematics Goal #2A: 35.1% (372) of students scoring at a Level 4 and 5 in reading on the FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	35.1% (372)	69%					

		2A.2. Insufficient amount of higher level questioning, strategies and rigor in the classroom.	2A.2. Post, and use, Webb's Depth of Knowledge chart in classroom. Implement the 8 Mathematical practices throughout the 2012-2013 school year.	2A.2. Principal, Administration, Math Department Head, Math Department	2A.2. Monitor teacher's lesson plans to ensure higher-level techniques are being used with the students. Classroom walk-throughs to also be implemented.	2A.2. Teacher lesson plans; LSA student results	
		2A.3. Multiple achievement levels in a classroom	2A.3. Data-based, differentiated instruction in the classroom.	2A.3. Principal, Math Department Head, Math Department	2A.3. Progress-monitoring using our Baseline/ Post-Test data in our Professional Development/Data classroom.	2A.3. LSA student results.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.**	2B.1. *	2B.1. *	2B.1. *	2B.1. *	2B.1. *		

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

Mathematics Goal #2B: *	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	*	*				
		2B.2. *	2B.2. *	2B.2. *	2B.2. *	2B.2. *
		2B.3. *	2B.3. *	2B.3. *	2B.3. *	2B.3. *

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

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

3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3A.1. Students who have already achieved a Level 4 or 5 have difficulty making true learning gains, based on FCAT 2.0 scores.	3A.1. Focus lessons on Wednesdays will be implemented to ensure students are receiving, and mastering, content that is grade-level specific.	3A.1. Math Department Head, Math Department	3A.1. Teachers will use Baselines and Post-Tests from M/J Math 1, 2 and 3 to monitor students' progress on grade level specific standards.	3A.1. Benchmark results, FCAT Math 2.0		
Mathematics Goal #3A: 57% (604) of students making learning gains in reading on the FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	57% (604)	69%					

		3A.2. Multiple achievement levels in a classroom.	3A.2. Data-based, differentiated instruction in the classroom.	3A.2. Principal, Math Department Head, Math Department.	3A.2. Progress-monitoring using our Baseline/ Post-Test data in our Professional Development/Data classroom.	3A.2 LSA student results.	
		3A.3. Insufficient amount of higher level questioning, strategies and rigor in the classroom.	3A.3. Post, and use, Webb's Depth of Knowledge chart in the classroom. Implement the 8 Mathematical practices throughout the 2012-2013 school year.	3A.3. Administration, Math Department Head, Math Department	3A.3. Monitor teachers' lesson plans to ensure higher-level techniques being used with the students. Classroom walk-throughs will also be implemented.	3A.3. Teacher lesson plans; LSA student results.	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3B.1. *	3B.1. *	3B.1. *	3B.1. *	3B.1. *		
Mathematics Goal #3B: *	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	*	*					

		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		*	*	*	*	*	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.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		
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4A.1. The students in the lower quartile are missing the basic Math skills to help them make gains, according to FCAT Math 2.0.	4A.1 Implement Intensive Math classes in all three grade levels.	4A.1. Principal, Assistant Principal of Curriculum, Math Department	4A.1. FCAT Benchmark examinations	4A.1. FCAT Math 2.0		

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

Mathematics Goal #4A: 49% (519) of students making learning gains in reading on the FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	49% (519)	69%					
		4A.2. Multiple achievement levels in one classroom.	4A.2. Data-based, differentiated instruction in the classroom.	4A.2. Principal, Math Department Head, Math Department	4A.2. Progress-monitoring using our Baseline/ Post-Test data in our Professional Development/Data classroom.	4A.2. LSA student results.	
		4A.3. Insufficient amount of higher level questioning, strategies and rigor in the classroom.	4A.3. Post, and use, Webb's Depth of Knowledge chart in the classroom. Implement the 8 Mathematical practices throughout the 2012-2013 school year.	4A.3. Administration, Math Department, Math Department	4A.3. Monitor teachers' lesson plans to ensure higher-level techniques are being used with the students. Classroom walk-throughs will also be implemented.	4A.3. Teacher lesson plans; LSA student results.	

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

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

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	

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

5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011	78%	80%	82%	84%	86%	88%
Mathematics Goal #5A: In six years, 2013 80%, 2014 82%, 2015 84%, 2015 84%, 2016 86%, 2017 88% will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**	5B.1. Students often lack reading proficiency which impairs their ability to comprehend real-world application problems, which require numerous steps and strategies to complete.	5B.1. Teachers will discuss one of the Common Core 8 Mathematical Practices each month. These practices concentrate on strategies needed to solve word problems	5B.1. Mathematics teachers, department chair, administration	5B.1. Classroom walk – trough's to see if practice standards are posted and discussed	5B.1 Classroom walk-through reflections.		

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

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

	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Mathematics Goal #5B: 62.6% (226) White 16.8% (61) Black 13.0% (47) Hispanic 2% (8) Asian of student subgroups by ethnicity not making satisfactory progress in reading on the FCAT.							
	62.6% (226) White 16.8% (61) Black 13.0% (47) Hispanic 2% (8) Asian	67% White 42% Black 55%% Hispanic 77% Asian					

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

		5B.2. Students enter Fletcher Middle with varying degrees of proficiency in Mathematics.	5B.2. Fletcher Middle offers needs-specific courses and curriculum. i.e. Intensive Math, Intensified Algebra Teachers offer before-school tutoring to assist in ramping up students' ability levels.	5B.2. Mathematics teachers, department chair, administration	5B.2. Analyzing district and school assessments to monitor individual student growth.	5B.2. Classroom Assessments, Agile Mind assessments, Bench mark, Baseline and Post-assessments, FCAT 2.0	

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5C.1. Language barrier between students and teacher.	5C.1. Pair students together that have common native language; Use visuals frequently to assist with vocabulary terms	5C.1 ELL classroom teachers.	5C.1. Using baseline/post-test data to drive instruction.	5C.1. Baseline/Post-Test results.		
Mathematics Goal #5C: 5.8% (21) of English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics on the FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	5.8% (21)	37%					

		5C.2. Parents of ELL are often uneasy about visiting and/or making contact with the school due to language barriers and other cultural concerns.	5C.2. Parent communication via letter or automated phone call is translated into the student's home language. ELL paraprofessionals are there to translate and assist in bridging the communication gap.	5C.2. ELL Paraprofessional, Classroom Teacher	5C.2. Parent communication via letter or automated phone call is translated into the student's home language.	5C.2. Student Performance with Parental Help.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5D.1. Students having below grade-level skill sets.	5D.1 Guided practice through support facilitation classes. Pre-teaching, re-teaching, practice of skills in learning strategies classes.	5D.1. ESE support facilitation teachers; Learning Strategies teachers.	5D.1. Teacher-guided practice	5D.1. Pre-test and post-test results.		
Mathematics Goal #5D: 22.4% (81) of Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics on the FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	22.4% (81)	36%					

| | | 5D.2. General education teachers now have to work with SWD without consistent assistance from an ESE co-teacher. | 5D.2. General Education teachers, who teach inclusion classes, should collaborate weekly. | 5D.2. General Education teachers, ESE support facilitators; Math Department Head; Math Department | 5D.2. Classroom walk-throughs; Teachers comparing data bi-weekly. | 5D.2. LSA student results; FCAT Benchmark results, FCAT 2.0 results | |
| | | 5D.3. Moving students from special to regular standards. | 5D.3. FCAT-based warm-ups in general education classrooms and/or learning strategies classrooms. Integration of Math problems into other curriculum areas. | 5D.3. General Education teachers; ESE support facilitators; Math Department Head, Math Department | 5D.3. Teacher-guided practice; Results of FCAT 2.0 benchmark examinations to drive instruction. | 5D.3. Pre-test and post-test results. | |

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

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5E.1. SES students often lack reading proficiency which impairs their ability to comprehend real-world application problems, which require numerous steps and strategies to complete.	5E.1. Teachers will discuss one of the Common Core 8 Mathematical Practices each month. These practices concentrate on strategies needed to solve word problems	5E.1. Mathematics teachers, department chair, administration	5E.1 Classroom walk –trough's to see if practice standards are posted and discussed.	5E.1. Classroom walk-through reflections		
Mathematics Goal #5E: 49% (177) of Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics on the FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	49% (177)	45%					

| | | 5E.2.
SES students often score level 1 or 2 on FCAT 2.0. | 5E.2.
All level 1's and as many level 2's as possible are placed into an intensive math class to get additional assistance in math. | 5E.2.
Intensive math teacher | 5E.2.
Teachers will analyze students growth through teacher and district assessments. | 5E.2.
Benchmarks, FCAT 2.0, District LSA's and Agile Mind assessments. | |

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

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		

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.	1.1. Students in Algebra 1 are required to take two state assessments.	1.1. Algebra 1 PLC will take both learning schedules and align them with both, grade level standards, and Algebra 1 specifications.	1.1. Algebra 1 teachers	1.1. PLC collaboration; Analysis of district and state assessments	1.1. Algebra 1 Benchmarks, Algebra 1 EOC, FCAT Math 2.0		
Algebra 1 Goal #1: 38.2% (18) of students scoring a level 3 in Algebra 1 on the EOC.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	38.2% (18)						

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	
		1.2. Students scoring low level 3 on the 7th grade FCAT Math 2.0 have a more likely chance of not scoring a 3 on the Algebra 1 EOC due to time constraints.	1.2. Low level 3 students will be enrolled in an intensified Algebra program that meets 90 minutes per day, instead of 45 minutes per day.	1.2. Intensified Algebra 1 teachers	1.2. Analysis of Agile Mind materials and assessments throughout the 90-minute program.	1.2. Agile Mind assessments, Algebra 1 Benchmarks, Algebra 1 EOC	

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.	2.1. Students in Algebra 1 are required to take two state assessments.	2.1. Algebra 1 PLC will take both learning schedules and align them with both, grade level standards, and Algebra 1 specifications.	2.1. Algebra 1 teachers	2.1. PLC collaboration; Analysis of district and state assessments	2.1. Algebra 1 Benchmarks, Algebra 1 EOC, FCAT Math 2.0		
Algebra Goal #2: 50% (24) of students scoring at or above levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1 on the EOC.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	50% (24)						

		2.2. 7th grade Algebra 1 students have lost one complete year of middle school mathematics curriculum	2.2. 7th grade Algebra 1 teachers will integrate skills from the missing curriculum using Focus Lesson Wednesday lessons.	2.2. Intensified Algebra 1 teachers	2.2 PLC collaboration; Analysis of district and state assessments.	2.2. Algebra 1 Benchmarks, Algebra 1 EOC, FCAT Math 2.0	

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: *							

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 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. Students scoring low level 3 on the 7th grade FCAT Math 2.0 have a more likely chance of not scoring a 3 on the Algebra 1 EOC due to time constraints.	3B.1. Low level 3 students will be enrolled in an intensified Algebra program that meets 90 minutes per day, instead of 45 minutes per day.	3B.1. Intensified Algebra 1 teachers	3B.1. Analysis of Agile Mind materials and assessments throughout the 90-minute program.	3B.1. Agile Mind assessments, Algebra 1 Benchmarks, Algebra 1 EOC		
Algebra 1 Goal #3B: 6.2% (3) of student's subgroups by ethnicity not making satisfactory in Algebra 1 on the EOC.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	6.2% (3)						

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

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3C.1. Students scoring low level 3 on the 7th grade FCAT Math 2.0 have a more likely chance of not scoring a 3 on the Algebra 1 EOC due to time constraints.	3C.1. Low level 3 students will be enrolled in an intensified Algebra program that meets 90 minutes per day, instead of 45 minutes per day.	3C.1. Intensified Algebra 1 teachers	3C.1. Analysis of Agile Mind materials and assessments throughout the 90-minute program.	3C.1. Agile Mind assessments, Algebra 1 Benchmarks, Algebra 1 EOC		
Algebra 1 Goal #3C: 0% (0) of English Language Learners not making satisfactory in Algebra 1 on the EOC.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	0% (0)						

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		
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3D.1. Students scoring low level 3 on the 7th grade FCAT Math 2.0 have a more likely chance of not scoring a 3 on the Algebra 1 EOC due to time constraints.	3D.1. Low level 3 students will be enrolled in an intensified Algebra program that meets 90 minutes per day, instead of 45 minutes per day.	3D.1. Intensified Algebra 1 teachers	3D.1. Analysis of Agile Mind materials and assessments throughout the 90-minute program.	3D.1. Agile Mind assessments, Algebra 1 Benchmarks, Algebra 1 EOC		

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

	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Algebra 1 Goal #3D: 4.2% (2) of students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory in Algebra 1 on the EOC.							
	4.2% (2)						

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

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3E.1. Students scoring low level 3 on the 7th grade FCAT Math 2.0 have a more likely chance of not scoring a 3 on the Algebra 1 EOC due to time constraints.	3E.1. Low level 3 students will be enrolled in an intensified Algebra program that meets 90 minutes per day, instead of 45 minutes per day.	3E.1. Intensified Algebra 1 teachers	3E.1. Analysis of Agile Mind materials and assessments throughout the 90-minute program.	3E.1. Agile Mind assessments, Algebra 1 Benchmarks, Algebra 1 EOC		
Algebra 1 Goal #3E: 0% (0) of Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory in Algebra 1 on the EOC.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	0% (0)					

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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	

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.	1.1. Students in Geometry are required to take two state assessments.	1.1. Geometry PLC will take both learning schedules and align them with both, grade level standards, and Algebra 1 specifications.	1.1. Geometry teachers	1.1. PLC collaboration; Analysis of district and state assessments	1.1. Geometry Benchmarks, Geometry EOC, FCAT Math 2.0		
Geometry Goal #1: % (?) of students scoring level 3 in Geometry on the EOC.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	% (?)						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.	2.1. Students in Geometry are required to take two state assessments.	2.1. Geometry PLC will take both learning schedules and align them with both, grade level standards, and Algebra 1 specifications.	2.1. Geometry teachers	2.1. PLC collaboration; Analysis of district and state assessments	2.1. Geometry Benchmarks, Geometry EOC, FCAT Math 2.0		
Geometry Goal #2: % (?) of students scoring at or above level 4 and 5 in Geometry on the EOC.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	% (?)						

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		

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

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

3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2011-2012	*	*	*	*	*	
Geometry Goal #3A:							
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		

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.**	3B.1. Students in Geometry are required to take two state assessments.	3B.1. Geometry PLC will take both learning schedules and align them with both, grade level standards, and Algebra 1 specifications.	3B.1. Geometry teachers	3B.1. PLC collaboration; Analysis of district and state assessments	3B.1. Geometry Benchmarks, Geometry EOC, FCAT Math 2.0		
Geometry Goal #3B: % (?) of student subgroups by ethnicity not making satisfactory progress in Geometry on the EOC.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	% (?)						

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

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

	% (?)						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3D.1. *	3D.1. *	3D.1. *	3D.1. *	3D.1. *		

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

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

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

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

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

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					

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		

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

1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.	1A.1. Teacher training on the new textbook.	1A.1. Using writing strategies from Common Core State Standards for ELA which has the students to write arguments focused on discipline-specific content. Students will introduce and support claims with logical reasoning and relevant, accurate data as well as evidence that demonstrates understanding of the topic or text, using credible sources.	1A.1. Assistant principal for science academic focus; 8th grade teachers in a collaborative learning community.	1A.1. 1. Learning Schedule Assessments LSA 1 pre-test and post- test.	1A.1. District's Learning Schedule Assessments LSA.		

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

Science Goal #1A: 66% (272) of students scoring at level 3 in Science on the FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	66% (272)	72% (297)				
		1A.2. Teacher training on the new textbook. Curriculum gaps in the amount of inquiry labs from grade to grade; meeting the needs of students at levels 1 and 2 in reading.	1A.2. Using the text series' video-based inquiry labs to have the students involved in investigating various works and the creditability of these sources as part of their questioning strategy.	1A.2. Assistant principal for science academic focus; 8th grade teachers in a collaborative learning community.	1A.2. 1. Learning Schedule Assessments LSA 1 pre-test and posttest to review of student performance gains and growth in that unit.	1A.2. District's Learning Schedule Assessments LSA.	

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

		1A.3. Teacher training on the new textbook. Curriculum gaps in the amount of inquiry labs from grade to grade. Meeting the needs of students at levels 1 and 2 in reading.	1A. Students in level 3-5 reading and/or math FCAT will be designing, implementing, and communicating their own scientific investigation. The science project includes: problem, hypothesis, data collection, data analysis and conclusion as a way for them to demonstrate "Cause and Effect."	1A.3. Assistant principal for science academic focus; 8th grade teachers in a collaborative learning community.	1A.3. 1 Learning Schedule Assessments LSA 1 pre-test and post-test.	1A.3. District's Learning Schedule Assessments LSA.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.**	1B.1. *	1B.1. *	1B.1. *	1B.1. *	1B.1. *		
Science Goal #1B: *	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	*	*					

| | | 1B.2. * | 1B.2. * | 1B.2. * | 1B.2. * | 1B.2. * | |
| | | 1B.3. * | 1B.3. * | 1B.3. * | 1B.3. * | 1B.3. * | |

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

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

2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.	2A.1. Teacher training on the new textbook. Curriculum gaps in the amount of inquiry labs from grade to grade.	2A.1. Using the Holt, McDougal Science Fusion series in introducing Inquiry labs as visual prompts to reinforce and review scenarios as way to research and present empirical evidence in a persuasive presentation. The students in their written debate	2A.1. Assistant principal for science academic focus; 8th grade teachers in a collaborative learning community.	2A.1. Learning Schedule Assessments LSA 1 pre-test and post-test.	2A.1. District's Learning Schedule Assessments LSA.		

		will need to research new evidence as an important tool in establishing scientific knowledge for collegial acceptance of new scientific information.				
Science Goal #2A: % (?) of students scoring at levels 4 and 5 in Science on the FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*				
	% (?)					

		2A.2. Teacher training on safe science project process.	2A.2. Students in level 3-5 reading and/ or math FCAT will be designing and implementing their own science project that includes problem, hypothesis, data collection, data analysis and conclusion as a way of practicing the scientific inquiry habits needed for increasing school scores on the FCAT portion of the test called "Nature of Science."	2A.2. Assistant principal for science academic focus; 8th grade teachers in a collaborative learning community.	2A.2. Embedding the scientific process skills within the inquiry labs essential to enhance students' enduring understanding of science concepts.	2A.2. District's Learning Schedule Assessments LSA.	
		2A.3. Teacher training on the new textbook. Curriculum gaps in the amount of inquiry labs from grade to grade.	2A.3. 2. Quarterly implemented video-based inquiry labs and activities from Holt, McDougal <u>Science Fusion</u> series.	2A.3. Assistant principal for science academic focus; 8th grade teachers in a collaborative learning community.	2A.3. Learning Schedule Assessments LSA 1 pre-test and post-test.	2A.3. District's Learning Schedule Assessments LSA.	

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

2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.	2B.1. *	2B.1. *	2B.1. *	2B.1. *	2B.1. *		
Science Goal #2B: *	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	*	*					
		2B.2. *	2B.2. *	2B.2. *	2B.2. *	2B.2. *	
		2B.3. *	2B.3. *	2B.3. *	2B.3. *	2B.3. *	

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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					

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

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

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

Biology 1 Goal #2: *	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	*	*					
		2.2. *	2.2. *	2.2. *	2.2. *	2.2. *	
		2.3. *	2.3. *	2.3. *	2.3. *	2.3. *	

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

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

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

Writing Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.	1A.1. Students may not feel it is important to plan and organize ideas before drafting the essay. Other students may not be familiar with planning. Lack of knowledge of planning and organizing an essay in the writing process.	1A.1. Use school wide essay map (graphic organizer) for planning and organizing (the first step of the writing process) of expository and persuasive essays in all academic core classes.	1A.1. All academic core Teachers Dept. Heads Administrators	1A.1. Teacher evaluates plan sheet to make sure that essay map is complete and that it addresses prompt/topic and that it shows a good foundation for the essay. Student uses plan sheet while drafting essay and the writing reflects a logical and well-organized essay.	1A.1. District Timed Writing FCAT Rubric Write Score data ELA teacher shares data with all team teachers) Conferencing with student Portfolio assignments Research papers and projects Extended Responses		

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

Writing Goal #1A: 85% (350) of students scoring at levels 3 in Writing on the FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*					
	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	85% (312)	93% (335)				
		1A.2. Lack of knowledge of the parts of a basic paragraph. Lack of knowledge of writing a basic paragraph and limited practice in the content area classes.	1A.2. Teach students in all academic core classes the five steps of writing a basic paragraph. These steps include: list of details, main idea, topic sentence, detailed sentences, and concluding sentence.	1A.2. All academic core teachers

Dept. Heads

Administrators | 1A.2. Students write extended responses to fiction, nonfiction, poetry, and drama in all classes in the content areas. Strategy can be taught during mini lessons and students can practice when writing journal entries, quick writes, and essays. | 1A.2. District Timed Writings: Teacher data and Write Score Data(ELA teacher shares data with all team teachers)

Conferencing with Student

Exit Slips

Portfolio assignments | |

		1A.3. Lack of knowledge of different types of details and examples. Creating a variety of supporting details that fully develop the writer's thoughts and ideas.	1A.3. Teach FRIESS strategy in all academic core classes to help students increase the use of details and examples to illustrate elaboration of their reasons and ideas. This strategy will improve the development of sentences and paragraphs. FRIESS (facts, reasons, incidents, examples, sensory details, etc.)	1A.3. All academic core teachers Dept. Heads Administrators	1A.3. Use FRIESS when planning, drafting, and revising writing. Strategy can be used with all types of writing in the content areas such as expository and persuasive writing. FRIESS is helpful when elaborating ideas whether it's writing an extended response, essay, or research paper. Improves mature command of language.	1A.3. District Timed Writing Scores Write Score Data (ELA teacher shares data with all team teachers). Conferencing with student Portfolio assignments Class essays/research papers and projects Exit slips Extended responses	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.	1B.1. *	1B.1. *	1B.1. *	1B.1. *	1B.1. *		
Writing Goal #1B: *	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	*	*					

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

		1B.2.*	1B.2.*	1B.2.*	1B.2.*	1B.2.*	
		1B.3.*	1B.3.*	1B.3.*	1B.3.*	1B.3.*	

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Writing-FCAT	8/ELA	Jill Budd	8th ELA Teachers	Once a quarter	Portfolios/ DTW/Write Score	Administrator
Writing-Common Core Standards	6-8 /ELA	District Coach	All ELA Teachers	TBA	DTW/Write Score	Dept. Chair/Administrators

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
Word Wise Vocabulary/Spelling Workbooks 6th – 8th grade	Vocabulary and spelling workbooks to teach writing skills to improve literacy.	10000 51510	$1,792
Write Score Materials 6th – 1 test 7th – 4 tests 8th -3 tests	Materials printed by Write Score are used by students to take FCAT style district timed writing. Write Score assesses essays with feedback with writing rubric.	6001.00 51510	$8,208
Subtotal: $10,000			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal: $0.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal: $0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal: $0.00			
Total: $10,000			

End of Writing Goals

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

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

Civics EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student					

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

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

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

Civics Goal #2: *	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	*	*				
		2.2. *	2.2. *	2.2. *	2.2. *	2.2. *
		2.3. *	2.3. *	2.3. *	2.3. *	2.3. *

Civics Professional Development

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

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded			

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

End of Civics Goals

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

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

U.S. History EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student				

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

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

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

U.S. History Goal #2: *	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	*	*					
		2.2. *	2.2. *	2.2. *	2.2. *	2.2. *	
		2.3. *	2.3. *	2.3. *	2.3. *	2.3. *	

U.S. History Professional Development

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

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

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

End of U.S. History Goals

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance						
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Attendance	1.1. Attendance correctly being recorded in Oncourse system.	1.1. Parent attendance letters sent from the attendance clerk every week.	1.1. Teachers, Attendance Clerk	1.1. Tardy data from Genesis and Oncourse will be analyzed and AIP meeting will be scheduled.	1.1. Tardy data from Genesis and Oncourse system.		
Attendance Goal #1: Based on the analysis of attendance data an area in need of improvement is the overall absentee rate.	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
	97.2%	98%					

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

	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	15% (177)	10% (115)					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	% (?)	% (?)					

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

Attendance Professional Development

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

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

End of Attendance Goals

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension						
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Suspension	1.1. Parent agreement and participation in Alternative to Outside School (ATOSS). Intervention Suspension.	1.1. Increase Administrative and teacher duty with fidelity; Student Behavior Modification Contract; School-wide Code of Conduct Expectation Assembly; ATOSS Benefits.	1.1. Administrative Staff; ATOSS Staff.	1.1. Daily Suspension Report	1.1 Monthly Referral Report		

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

Suspension Goal #1: Based on the analysis of suspension data an area in need of improvement is to decrease student suspensions by 3% for 2013-14 school years.	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions				
	619	600				
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School				
	619	600				
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions				
	118	114				
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School				
	118	114				

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

		1.2. Number of teacher Referrals	1.2. Foundations (CHAMPS) Professional Development for teachers and staff	1.2. Administrators	1.2 Disciple Report	1.2. Disciple Report	

Suspension Professional Development

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

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			

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

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

End of Suspension Goals

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

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	1.1. *	1.1. *	1.1. *	1.1. *	1.1. *	
Dropout Prevention Goal #1: *	2012 Current Dropout Rate:*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*				
	*	*				
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*				
	*	*				
		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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)
Upload Option-For schools completing the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) please include a copy for this section.
Online Template- For schools completing the PIP a link will be provided that will direct you to this plan.

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. **Parent Involvement**	1.1. Volunteers/ Mentors/ Parents not documenting volunteer hours.	1.1. Improve upon the current volunteer tracking system for parent volunteer hours (September) including taking the log book to PTSA/SAC meetings.	1.1. House Office	1.1. Volunteer notebook containing applications and log book.	1.1. Quarterly volunteer documentation submitted to Community Involvement Office DCPS.		

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

Parent Involvement Goal #1: Based on the analysis of parent involvement data an area in need of improvement is to increase parent involvement.	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*					
	67% (799) Parent / Stude nts to volunt eer	75% (895) Parent / Stude nts to volunt eer	75% (895) Parent / Stude nts to volunt eer	75% (895) Parent / Stude nts to volunt eer				
		1.2. Advertise monthly PTSA and SAC meeting dates via the Parent Link phone system (ongoing)	1.2. APC	1.2. Notification to parents through The Wave (school Newsletter), on website, and the FMS Minute PTA Newsletter.	1.2. Attendance at SAC and PTSA meetings.	1.2.	

		1.3. Provide parents with training opportunities for Compass Odyssey, and Oncourse.	1.3. Principal	1.3. Parent participation	1.3. Number of hits the websites receive and feedback during surveys.	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

Parent Involvement Budget

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

STEM Goal(s)	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student**				

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

	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: Teach students to be able to define questions and problems, design investigations to gather data, collect and organize data, draw conclusions, and then apply understandings to new and novel situations.	1.1. Teachers thinking technology and engineering are additional courses to be taught. Also thinking that inquiry activities must be open-ended.	1.1. Do inquiry activities that have students creatively use science, mathematics, and technology concepts and principles by applying them to their own design process within the sciences.	1.1. Academic administrator for science; science fair coordinator.	1.1. Increased numbers of students participating in the school science fair as competitors in the areas of physics, engineering, computer science, environment, and chemistry. Increased FCAT Science scores in area of "Nature of Science."	1.1. Science or engineering project; Inquiry lab reports;

STEM Professional Development

Professional						

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

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

End of 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: Based on the analysis of school data our goal is to Introduce the CTE program to Fletcher. To enroll 150 students into the Microsoft IT Academy Program and to have them try to complete the course or achieve level of completion that can be continued into high school.	1.1. Knowledge of software and student data. 1st year implementation	1.1. Convert Business Technology Into a Career Education class aligned with the high school.	1.1. Merritt	1.1. Student success in the program. Test and completion of the Academy.	1.1. Program testing included in software.
	1.2. Computer issues as at times we have technology issues that can result in lost data.	1.2. Work with DCPS Tech to avoid issues.	1.2. Merritt	1.2. Keeping up with updates and downloads.	1.2. Program testing included in software / working computers.

	1.3. Program issues getting the kids certified.	1.3. Use FHS for testing	1.3. Merritt	1.3. Number of student showing progress and completing courses.	1.3. Program testing included in software.

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

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: $0.00			

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

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

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

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

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

1. Additional Goal	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Additional Goal #1:	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Additional Goals Professional Development

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

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

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

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

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	
	Total:
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:
STEM Budget	
	Total:
CTE Budget	
	Total:
Additional Goals	
	Total:

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

	Grand Total:

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.
Assist in the evaluation of the SIP. Assist the school principal with the SIP budget. Perform functions described by the school board. Decide jointly with the faculty how to spend the SIP monies.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount

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