FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Tavares Middle School	District Name: Lake County
Principal: Trella Mott	Superintendent: Dr. Susan Moxley
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.

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Trella Mott	Bachelor of Arts – Consumer Science, Florida State University. Master of Science – Educational Leadership, Nova Southeastern University. Certification: Principal, State of Florida	4	15	2010-2011 Principal Tavares Middle School Grade A 66% Reading mastery 63% Mathematics mastery Tavares middle school did not meet federal adequate yearly progress under no child left behind. AYP: 70% White, 51% African American, 55% Hispanic, 58% Economically Disadvantaged and 36% students with disabilities made AYP in Reading. AYP: 66% White, 43% African American, 56% Hispanic, 53% Economically Disadvantaged and 38% students with disabilities made AYP in mathematics. 2009-2010 Principal Tavares Middle School Grade A 67% Reading mastery 62% Mathematics mastery Tavares middle school did not meet federal adequate yearly progress under no child left behind. AYP: 30% White, 33% African American, 35% Hispanic, 42% Economically Disadvantaged and 62% students with disabilities did not make AYP in Reading. AYP: 33% White, 66% African American, 42% Hispanic, 49% Economically Disadvantaged and 64% students with disabilities did not make AYP in mathematics. 2008-09 Assistant Principal – Leesburg HS Grade D 37% Reading Mastery 65% Math Mastery AYP: 73% SWD, 55% African Americans, and 45% Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in Math. 54% Whites, 85% SWD, 83% African Americans, and 74% Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in Reading. Ms Mott was charged with the 9th grade class which made gains in all categories. Additionally, the 9th grade had a 49% decrease in discipline. 2007-08 Assistant Principal Leesburg HS Grade D Significant gains over the previous year. 2007-08 Assistant Principal – Leesburg HS Grade D Significant gains over the previous year. 2006-07 Assistant Principal – Leesburg HS Grade D Significant gains over the previous year.

Assistant Principal	Dominick Clayton	Exceptional Student Education (K-12)
		Ed Leadership (All Levels)
		 School Principal (All Levels)
			1	7	Leesburg High 2011-12 Grade: Pending, Reading Proficiency: Increased from 33% to 42%, Math Proficiency: 49%, Writing Proficiency: 72%. Reading AYP: Increased from 39% to 58%, Math AYP: 35%, Lowest Quartile AYP Reading: Increased from 34% to 67%. Lowest Quartile Math: 54%
					
					Leesburg High 2010-11 Grade: C
					Reading:
					  Total population: decreased from 42% to 33%
					  White: decreased from 49% to 40%
					  Black: decreased from 26% to 22%
					  Economically Disadvantaged: decreased from 33% to 27%
					Math:
					  Total population: decreased from 69% to 65%
					  White: decreased from 76% to 74%
					  Black: decreased from 49% to 42%
					  Economically Disadvantaged: decreased from 64% to 59%
					Writing:
					  Total population: decreased from 95% to 94%

					White: maintained at 95% Black: decreased from 94% to 89% Economically Disadvantaged: decreased from 94% to 92% Students with Disabilities: decreased from 80% to 67% South Lake High School 2006-2010 Grade C: Meeting High Standards in : Reading: 40% - 48% Math: 66% - 67% Percent Making Learning Gains: Reading: 48% - 49% Math: 68% - 72%
Assistant Principal	Jessica Velez-Smith	Bachelor of Science, English Education, Florida State University. Master of Science – Educational Leadership, University of Central Florida. Certification: Ed Leadership, State of Florida	3	5	2010-2011 Asst Principal Tavares Middle School Grade A 66% Reading mastery 63% Mathematics mastery Tavares middle school did not meet federal adequate yearly progress under no child left behind. AYP: 70% White, 51% African American, 55% Hispanic, 58% Economically Disadvantaged and 36% students with disabilities made AYP in Reading. AYP: 66% White, 43% African American, 56% Hispanic, 53% Economically Disadvantaged and 38% students with disabilities made AYP in mathematics. 2009-2010 Assistant Principal School – South Lake High School C 48% Reading mastery 76% Mathematics mastery
Assistant Principal	Charlotte Williams	Bachelor of Arts, Special Education, University of Florida. Master of Science – Educational Leadership, Certification: Education leadership, State of Florida	4	5	2010-2011 Assistant Principal – Tavares Middle School Grade A 72% Reading mastery 66% Mathematics mastery 60% lowest quartile students made AYP in Reading 61% lowest quartile students made AYP in Mathematics Tavares middle school did not meet federal adequate yearly progress under no child left behind. AYP: 30% White, 33% African American, 35% Hispanic, 42% Economically Disadvantaged and 62% students with disabilities did not make AYP in Reading. AYP: 33% White, 66% African American, 42% Hispanic, 49% Economically Disadvantaged and 64% students with disabilities did not make AYP in mathematics. 2008-09 Assistant Principal – Leesburg HS Grade D 37% Reading Mastery 65% Math Mastery AYP: 73% SWD, 55% African Americans, and 45% Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in Math. 54% Whites, 85% SWD, 83% African Americans, and 74% Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in Reading. Ms Mott was charged with the 9th grade class which made gains in all categories. Additionally, the 9th grade had a 49% decrease in discipline.

Instructional Coaches

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

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Felicia Thibodeau	Bachelor's of Arts Degree in International Studies Certified: Elementary. Ed. K-6 Middle Grades Integrated Curriculum 5-9 Social Science 6-12 ESOL Endorsed Reading Endorsed	6	2	2011-2012 Grade B 59% Reading mastery 55% Mathematics mastery Tavares middle school did not meet federal adequate yearly progress under no child left behind. AYP: 64% White, 33% African Americans, 51% Hispanic, 47% Economically Disadvantaged, and 32% of students with disabilities made AYP in Reading. AYP: 58% White, 39% African American, 52% Hispanic, 47% Economically Disadvantaged, and 31% of students with disabilities made AYP in Mathematics. 2010-2011 Grade A 66% Reading mastery 63% Mathematics mastery Tavares middle school did not meet federal adequate yearly progress under no child left behind. AYP: 70% White, 51% African American, 55% Hispanic, 58% Economically Disadvantaged and 36% students with disabilities made AYP in Reading. AYP: 66% White, 43% African American, 56% Hispanic, 53% Economically Disadvantaged and 38% students with disabilities made AYP in mathematics. 2009-2010 Grade A 72% Reading mastery 66% Mathematics mastery 60% lowest quartile students made AYP in Reading Tavares middle school did not meet federal adequate yearly progress under no child left behind. AYP: 30% White, 33% African American, 35% Hispanic, 42% Economically Disadvantaged and 62% students with disabilities did not make AYP in Reading. AYP: 33% White, 66% African American, 42% Hispanic, 49% Economically Disadvantaged and 64% students with disabilities did not make AYP in mathematics. 2008-2009 Grade A Reading-Level 3 and above 67% Learning Gains- 68% AYP Lowest 25%- 67% Math-Level 3 and above 65% Learning Gains- 73% AYP Lowest 25%- 78% 2007-2008 Grade A Reading-Level 3 and above 67% Learning Gains- 68% AYP Lowest 25%- 67% Math-Level 3 or above 65% Learning Gains- 73% AYP Lowest 25%- 79%

Highly Effective Teachers

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

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. National Board Certified Teachers will mentor new and veteran teachers. Regular meetings are scheduled with newly hired teachers as a component of Tavares Middle School's on-going induction plan	Pat Rogers Sharon Lolley Diane Reid-Goolsby Michelle Metheny	On-going
2. Tavares Middle's strategies to recruit and retain highly qualified and high quality teachers includes, but is not limited to, on line advertising, District Applications, word-of-mouth, printed flyers, job fairs, and more.	Principal, all assistant principals, department chairs, grade level chairs, and other existing teachers.	On-going
3.		
4.		

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

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
62	10	27	28	35	35	n/a	21	6	61

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
Felicia Thibodeau	Angela Reese	Literacy Coach to help reading teachers	PLCs/lesson studies/in-service trainings
Diane Hulse	Elizabeth Roman-Tucker	Both are Language Arts teachers	PLCs/lesson studies

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

Additional Requirements

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

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

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

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

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) /Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI) School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. Administrative Team: Trella Mott, Principal; Dominick Clayton, Assistant Principal; Jessica Velez-Smith, Assistant Principal; Charlotte Williams, Assistant Principal;

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?

Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI, conducts assessment of RtI skills of school staff, ensures implantation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities through website, SAC, phone contact, and meetings. Select General Education Teachers (Wolfe-Science, Harris-Math, Richardson-Language Arts) provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials to instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.

Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Specialist, Anthony Fazio, participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching.

The Reading Coach (Instructional Specialist), Felicia Thibodeau, provides guidance on the k-12 reading plan and specifically the 6-8 reading plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities, assists in data analysis, provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning, and supports the implementation of Tier1, Tier 2, and Tier 3intervention plans.

Avid Leader, Kelly Cook, develops, leads, and evaluates the Avid program for struggling students.

School Psychologists, Anne Shutze and Davis Johnson (Interim), participate in the collection, interpretation, and analysis of school data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including: data collection, data analysis, intervention planning; and program evaluation; facilitates data-based decision making activities.

Speech Language Pathologist educates the team in the role language plays in curriculum, assessment, and instruction, as a basis for appropriate program design; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systematic patterns of student need with respect to language skill.

Student Services Personnel (school-based counselors): Joani Westmoreland, Brenda Lettsome, and Lisa Veazey: provide quality service and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students and their needs. In addition to providing interventions, the school social worker, Rachael Sadelmeyer, continues to link child-serving and community agencies to the school and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.

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?

MTSS Implementation

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

The Leadership Team will focus meetings around one question: How do we develop and maintain a problem-solving system to bring out the best in our schools, teachers, and our students?

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

The Team meets once a month to review universal screening data and link to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the grade and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks or are at moderate or high risk of not meeting benchmarks. Date will be drawn from FAIR (reading), Edusoft baseline date (math, science, social studies, and language arts). Based on the above information, the team will: identify professional development and resources, collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional Development will be provided during teacher planning times, with small sessions occurring weekly. Other training dates include: Professional Development days, teacher workdays, PLCS meetings, faculty meetings, and on early release days (Wednesdays).

Professional development sessions will take place starting in September of 2012. RtI related trainings include, but are not limited to: challenges to implementation; data-based decision making; supporting and evaluating interventions. The RtI problem solving model includes; building consensus, implementing and sustaining problem-solving portfolio training, e-Sembler, Exam View, FAIR, and Edusoft training. Last, the RtI team will review differentiated instruction: materials, resources, focus lessons, methods, and technology.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The RtI Leadership Team will also meet once a month to develop and upgrade the SIP, reporting to the School advisory Council (SAC) at each SAC meeting. The RtI Team makes recommendations on: student achievement including Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets. Meeting focus points include: academic, social, or emotional areas that need to be addressed; setting clear expectations for instruction (rigor, relevance, relationship, differentiated instruction, instructional focus calendars, Edusoft, Learn 360, e-Sembler, data documentation, and PLCs). The team will also facilitate the development of a systematic approach to teaching (gradual release, essential questions, activating and teaching strategies, extending, refining, and summarizing), as well as aligning processes and procedures.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

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

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). The Literacy Leadership Team consists administration, the literacy coach, media specialist, and teachers of multiple content areas. Membership oscillates between 8-10 permanent faculty members per year, including various interim attendees. Administrator: Trella Mott Literacy Coach: Felicia Thibodeau Media Specialist: Sharon Lolley Language Arts Dept. Chairperson: Lillian Richardson 6th Grade Geography teacher: Annemarie Munroe 7th Grade Language Arts teachers: Linda Wooten & Dorothy Mallona 8th Grade Language arts teacher: Linda Wooten
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The Literacy Team meets during the first week of each month. The team functions under the leadership of the Principal and Literacy Coach. Notes are taken during the meetings and are shared with membership and faculty. Updates are given to the school at large.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? Planning literacy week activities. Work to ensure that students participate in the Superintendent's Reading Challenge. Continuum of revolving sustained reading silent program. Incorporating Informational text reports as a cross-curricular reading and writing requirement throughout the school.

Public School Choice

- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**
  Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.

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

Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

Describe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs as applicable.

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

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

Silent, sustained reading is mandatory in each content area on a weekly basis. Likewise, all content and elective area teachers are incorporating various informational, primary, and secondary texts into their curriculum to provide rigor and complex text to students. Marzano, CRISS and CIS (Comprehension Instruction Strategy) are also widely utilized throughout all classrooms.

High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.			1A.1. 7th and 8th grade students are not scheduled in a reading class.	1A.1. Elective and content area teachers become NGCAR-PD trained.	1A.1. Principal, Trella Mott Grade level administrators, Dominick Clayton, Charlotte Williams and Jessica Velez. Literacy Coach, Felicia Thibodeau	1A.1. TEAM Increased on reading scores on all standardized reading tests. Increased classroom grades.	1A.1. TEAM evaluation FCAT results, LBA results, FAIR results Classroom grades
Reading Goal #1A: _A minimum of 31% of students will maintain or increase a level and make annual learning gains._ _A 5% increase in learning gains for level 3 students is anticipated for the 2012-2013 school year._	2012 Current Level of Performance:* _26% [291]_	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* _31% [326]_					
			1A.2. Weak guidelines for SSR.	1A.2. Structure with complex text and informational text, WICOR, and accountability for students.	1A.2. Grade level administrators, Dominick Clayton, Charlotte Williams and Jessica Velez. Literacy Coach, Felicia Thibodeau Classroom teachers	1A.2. Completion of reading requirements for LA.	1A.2. Classroom grades
			1A.3. Low participation in Superintendent's reading challenge/district reading requirements.	1A.3. Incorporate more informational text into class curriculums.	1A.3. Literacy Coach, Felicia Thibodeau Classroom teachers	1A.3. Completion of reading requirements for LA.	1A.3. Portfoilo documentation of student work.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.							
Reading 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
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.		2A.1. 7th and 8th grade students are not scheduled in a reading class.	2A.1. Elective and content area teachers become CAR-PD trained.	2A.1. Principal, Trella Mott Grade level administrators, Dominick Clayton, Charlotte Williams and Jessica Velez. Literacy Coach, Felicia Thibodeau	2A.1. TEAM Increased on reading scores on all standardized reading tests. Increased classroom grades.	2A.1. TEAM evaluation FCAT results, LBA results, FAIR results Classroom grades
Reading Goal #2A: *A minimum of 31% of students will maintain or increase a level and make annual learning gains.* *A 5% increase in learning gains for level 4 students is anticipated for the 2012-2013 school year.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *26% [273]* / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *31% [326]*					
		2A.2. Weak guidelines for SSR.	2A.2. .Structure with complex text and informational text, WICOR, and accountability for students.	2A.2. Grade level administrators, Dominick Clayton, Charlotte Williams and Jessica Velez. Literacy Coach, Felicia Thibodeau Classroom teachers	2A.2. Completion of reading requirements for LA.	2A.2. e-Sembler
		2A.3.Not enough higher lexile level books available in fiction and nonfiction.	2A.3.utilizing EBSCO Utilizing other media centers in the county Purchase of higher level texts for the media center. Pull high lexile level texts from the web.	2A.3.classroom teacher Media Specialist, Sharon Lolley	2A.3. classroom grade	2A.3. e-Sembler
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.						
Reading Goal #2B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.

			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.
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. 7th and 8th grade students are not scheduled in a reading class.	3A.1. Elective and content area teachers become CAR-PD trained.	3A.1. Principal, Trella Mott Grade level administrators, Dominick Clayton, Charlotte Williams and Jessica Velez. Literacy Coach, Felicia Thibodeau	3A.1. TEAM Increased on reading scores on all standardized reading tests. Increased classroom grades.	3A.1. TEAM evaluation FCAT results, LBA results, FAIR results Classroom grades
Reading Goal #3A: *70% of all students will make learning gains in reading for the 2012-2013 school year.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *59% [620]*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *70% [735]*					
			3A.2. Weak guidelines for SSR.	3A.2. Structure with complex text and informational text, WICOR, and accountability for students.	3A.2. Grade level administrators, Dominick Clayton, Charlotte Williams and Jessica Velez. Literacy Coach, Felicia Thibodeau Classroom teachers	3A.2. Completion of reading requirements for LA.	3A.2. e-Sembler
			3A.3. .Not enough higher lexile level books available in fiction and nonfiction.	3A.3. utilizing EBSCO Utilizing other media centers in the county Purchase of higher level texts for the media center. Pull high lexile level texts from the web.	3A.3. classroom teacher Media Specialist, Sharon Lolley	3A.3. classroom grade	3A.3. e-Sembler
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.							
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.

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4A.1. Not enough rigor in the reading classes.	4A.1. Text chosen to meet the test item specs and to meet common core standards. .High yield strategies such as DBQ.	4A.1. Literacy Coach, Felicia Thibodeau Reading Department Head, Mariela Brink Grade level Chair Social Studies Department Head, Claire Moore	4A.1.Reports from Diagnostics, Lake Benchmark Assessments, FAIR results DBQ results	4A.1. Read 180 LBA's FAIR TEAM DBQ
Reading Goal #4A: *Improve lowest 25% students making learning gains in reading by 8%*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *57% [627]*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *65% [683]*					
			4A.2. Reading passages are not long enough for testing time.	4A.2. Provide lengthier text to meet test item specs and common core standards. High yield strategies such as DBQ.	4A.2. Literacy Coach, Felicia Thibodeau Reading Department Head, Mariela Brink Grade level Chair Social Studies Department Head, Claire Moore	4A.2. Reports from Diagnostics, Lake Benchmark Assessments, FAIR results DBQ results	4A.2. Read 180 LBA's FAIR TEAM DBQ
			4A.3.Lack of prior knowledge.	4A.3. Utilize CRISS strategies across the content areas to access prior knowledge.	4A.3. Literacy Coach, Felicia Thibodeau Reading Department Head, Mariela Brink Grade level Chair Social Studies Department Head, Claire Moore	4A.3. Reports from Diagnostics, Lake Benchmark Assessments, FAIR results DBQ results	4A.3. Read 180 LBA's FAIR TEAM DBQ
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4B.1.	4B.1.		4B.1.	4B.1.
Reading Goal #4B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	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
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**						
Reading Goal #5A: *A yearly 10% increase in learning gains will help reduce the achievement gap by 10% each year, thus resulting in the attainment of the 50% gap.*							

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. Students lack of prior knowledge to connect with text.	5B.1. CRISS strategies and CIS Model strategies	5B.1. Classroom teacher	5B.1. TEAM	5B.1. TEAM evaluation
Reading Goal #5B: *Student sub groups not making satisfactory progress in reading for the 2011-2012 year are expected to make between10% increase in gains for the 2012-2013 school year.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White: 36% [280] Black: 67% [83] Hispanic: 49% [68] Asian: 26% [7] American Indian: N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White: 26% [189] Black: 57% [62] Hispanic: 39% [53] Asian: 16% [4] American Indian: N/A					
			5B.2. Test data ambiguity for students and staff.	5B.2. PD for FAIR, data chats, FCAT Star, Edusoft and e-Sembler.	5B.2. TQR, Jessica Velez	5B.2. TEAM FAIR results FCAT results	5B.2. TEAM evaluation

		5B.3. Teachers lack of knowledge of which MTSS tier each students in.	5B.3. Collaboration for MTSS team.	5B.3. MTSS team	5B.3 Decrease in referrals. Improved student achievement for tier 2 and 3 students.	5B.3. FIDO FCAT star
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C: *50% more of all ELL students are expected to make satisfactory progress in reaching for the 2012-2013school year.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *21%[210]* / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *43%[482]*	5C.1. Students are unable to speak English without the help of software or an ESOL modified curriculum.	5C.1. Incorporate Rosetta Stone into curriculum for supplemental material.	5C.1. Reading and Language Arts teachers. Guidance Counselors	5C.1. Determination of student grades, progress monitoring of FAIR, SRI, and CELLA testing.	5C.1.PMRN, SAM (scholastic software program)
		5C.2. Students are taking standardized tests in their non-native languages.	5C.2. Provide a dictionary and/or thesaurus to student in his or her native language.	5C.2.Guidance Counselor Testing Coordinator	5C.2. Periodic data analysis and reporting.	5C.2. Guidance Counselors, Literacy Coach-Felicia Thibodeau, classroom teachers
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D: *A 7% decrease in students who are DWS and not making satisfactory progress in reading is expected for the 2012-2013 school year.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *32% [352]* / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *39% [410]*	5D.1. Unsatisfactory progress monitoring of student data.	5D.1. Provide current and pivotal data to progress monitor student achievement and gains or vice versa.	5D.1.Cooperative Consultation teachers, Literacy Coach-Felicia Thibodeau, and classroom teachers.	5D.1. Periodic data analysis and reporting; student/teacher/parent conferences; classroom data chats; I.E.P. reviews.	5D.1. Summative and formative assessment of students; standardized test results; other progress monitoring data to be obtained through software programs.
		5D.2. Accommodations do not meet student needs.	5D.2. Periodic review of student accommodations to determine effectiveness of current action plans.	5D.2. ESE Department, Cooperative Consultation teachers, and Guidance Counselors, Classroom teachers.	5D.2. Progress monitoring student behavior, grades, and gains in areas of concerns.	5D.2. e-Sembler; test data; AS400
		5D.3. Lack of collaboration between general education teachers and inclusion team	5D.3. Inclusion training Reorganization of inclusion teams to subject area teams	5D.3. ESE Specialist Administration	5D.3. FCAT, TEAM Lesson plans, PLC minutes	5D.3. FCAT, FAIR

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E: *A 7% decrease in students who are Economically Disadvantaged is expected for the 2012-2013 school year.*	5E.1. Increased percentage of homeless students.	5E.1 Identify, monitor and support these students.	5E.1 Guidance department District level Social Worker Classroom teachers	5E.1. Attendance report Guidance report Collaboration between district support staff and local agencies.	5E.1. AS400
2012 Current Level of Performance: 47% [517] — *2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 54% [567]	5E.2. Lack of Attendance	5E.2. Collaboration between guidance and district social worker.	5E.2. Administrative team Guidance department District social worker	5E.2. Attendance report	5E.2. AS400
	5E.3. Lack of school supplies	5E.3. Provide school supplies through Adopt a Family.	5E.3. Guidance counselors	5E.3. Classroom grades	5E.3 e-Sembler

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.					
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
FAIR in-service	6-8	Felicia Thibodeau	Reading, LA and ESE teachers	08/31/2012	PMRN monitoring with Reading and Resource teachers	Literacy Coach-Felicia Thibodeau
Re-modification of SSR	6-8	Linda Wooten	All teachers	09/10/2012	Classroom walk-throughs	LA Dept. Chairperson-Lillian Richardson
Text Complexity	6-8	Felicia Thibodeau	All teachers	10/19/2012	Classroom walk-throughs	Literacy Coach-Felicia Thibodeau
Marzano: Learning Scales & Rubrics	6-8	Felicia Thibodeau	All teachers	10/19/2012	TEAM observations	Administration
NGCAR-PD	6-8	Felicia Thibodeau	Elective and content area teacher	01/14/2013	Classroom Observation and Research Action Plans	Literacy Coach-Felicia Thibodeau

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Classroom libraries	Fiction novels and non fiction selections to be provided for classrooms per grade-level.	Reading Internal Account	$500.00
			Subtotal: $500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Improve quality of testing and maximize performance for all computer-based learning.	Headphones, microphones, and miscellaneous computer equipment.	Reading Internal Account	$200.00
Software	Writing, literary and figurative language supplemental materials.		$100.00
			Subtotal: $300.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Provide a detailed information and text to faculty and staff	Office supplies: folders, jump drives, papers, and miscellaneous artifacts.	Reading Internal Account	$100.00
			Subtotal: $100.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Literacy Week Activities & Incentives	Books, text materials, tablets, crafts, and various supplies.	Reading Internal Account	$200.00
			Subtotal: $200.00
			Total: $1100.00

End of Reading Goals

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

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.		1.1. Student does not speak English fluently.	1.1. ESOL strategies used in the classroom	1.1. Classroom teacher	1.1. classroom grades	1.1. Esembler
CELLA Goal #1: *50% more of all CELLA students are expected to make satisfactory progress in reaching for the 2012-2013school year.*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: *33% of students are proficient in listening/speaking.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.		2.1. Student does not speak or read English fluently.	2.1. ESOL strategies used in the classroom	2.1. Classroom teacher	2.1. classroom grades	2.1. Esembler
CELLA Goal #2: *50% more of all CELLA students are expected to make satisfactory progress in reaching for the 2012-2013school year.*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: *33% of students are proficient in reading.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

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. Student does not speak or read English fluently.	2.1. ESOL strategies used in the classroom	2.1. Classroom teacher	2.1. classroom grades	2.1. e-Sembler
CELLA Goal #3:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
50% more of all CELLA students are expected to make satisfactory progress in reaching for the 2012-2013school year.	*33% of students are proficient in writing.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CELLA Goals

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			Lack of Rigor in Instruction	Develop focus lessons that go in-depth and concentrate on higher order –thinking problems. AVID trained personnel will share AVID strategies with other instructors to implement in classroom instruction throughout the school year	A.P. in charge of curriculum, Dominick Clayton

Classroom teacher

Trained AVID instructors | Chart assessments and incorporate in data folder to discuss in PLC's | Mini assessments and LBA's graded through Edusoft

FCAT 2.0

Class evaluation |
| Mathematics Goal #1A:

Increase students scoring level 3 to level 4 by 15% | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*

29%(270) of school population achieved level 3 in mathematics | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*

40%(414) of school population will achieve level 4. | | | | |
| | | | Students not mastering common assessments will have to be grouped inside the classroom for intervention/enrichment. | Differentiated instruction

Year round after school math tutoring by grade level

PLC's with a focus on Common Cores

Tiered lessons

Continue and Refine CRISS strategies

PENDA Learning | Department head, Dave Harris

Classroom teachers | PLC's

Retesting the common assessments

Teacher observations | Mini assessments

FCAT

LBA's

PLC review |
| | | | Student lack of tracking individual progress | Data chat training for staff.

Data chats with students

Edusoft training

PENDA training | Classroom Teacher

Advisory teachers

PENDA Implemation Manager, Janet Belzano

A.P. in charge of curriculum, Dominick Clayton | Staff feedback

PENDA reports

Edusoft reports | FCAT

PENDA

LBA's

Common Assessments |

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

			1B.1. .	1B.1	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.							
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.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			Lack of emphasis in lesson plans of higher order thinking questions.	Lead math teachers will initiate discussion and coach other teachers during PLC about types of higher-order thinking questions.	A.P. in charge of curriculum, Dominick Clayton Math Dept. Head, Dave Harris Lead math teachers	Teachers incorporate new strategies in lesson plans Results of Common assessments	Mini-Assessment FCIM LBA's FCAT 2.0 Common Assessments Common Core
Mathematics Goal #2A: Increase the percentage of students scoring levels 4 and 5 by 6%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **24% (217)students achieved above proficiency in mathematics.**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **30% (310)of school population will achieve FCAT level 5.**					
			Lack of Rigor in Instruction How the classroom could follow the RtI process while continuing core instruction.	Develop focus lessons that go in-depth and concentrate on higher order –thinking problems. AVID trained personnel will share AVID strategies with instructors to implement in classroom instruction throughout the school year	A.P. in charge of curriculum, Dominick Clayton Classroom teacher Trained AVID instructors	Chart assessments and incorporate in data folder to discuss in PLC's	Mini assessments and LBA's graded through Edusoft FCAT 2.0 LBA's Class evaluation
			How the classroom could follow the RtI process while continuing core instruction.	Focus discussion in math PLC group.	PLC Facilitator PLC's	PLC minutes	FCAT 2.0 Common assessments
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B	2B.1.	2B.1	2B.1.	2B.1.
Mathematics Goal #2B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			Lack of mathematical fundamental skills.	Use math centers with level 1 students. Computer assisted instruction Tiered assignments to meet the needs of individual assignments. Year round after school math tutoring by grade level PLC's with a focus on Common Cores	A.P. in charge of curriculum, Dominick Clayton PLC Facilitator Classroom teachers	PENDA Common Assessments Results	Common assessment data LBA's PENDA Mini-Assessments
Mathematics Goal #3A: Increase the percentage of students making learning by 13%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **63% of students made learning gains in mathematics.**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **76% of students are expected to make learning gains in mathematics.**					
			Lack of Rigor in Instruction Need for practicing mathematical practice across grade level	Develop focus lessons that go in-depth and concentrate on higher order –thinking problems. AVID trained personnel will share AVID strategies with other instructors to implement in classroom instruction throughout the school year	A.P. in charge of curriculum, Dominick Clayton Classroom teacher Trained AVID instructors	Chart assessments and incorporate in data folder to discuss in PLC's	Mini assessments and LBA's graded through Edusoft FCAT Class evaluation Common Core
			How the classroom could follow the RtI process while continuing core instruction.	Focus discussion in math PLC group.	PLC Facilitator Classroom teachers	CWT PLC minutes	FCAT Common assessments
			Lack of reading and writing in math classroom	AVID trained personnel will share AVID strategies with other instructors to implement in classroom instruction throughout the school year-WICRO CRISS Strategies Implementation of Cornell Notes	A.P. in charge of curriculum, Dominick Clayton Classroom Teacher Math Department Head – Dave Harris	Staff feedback	Common Assessments

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

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			Lack of mathematical fundamental skills.	Use math centers with all level students. Computer assisted instruction Year round tutoring by grade level Tiered assignments to meet the needs of individual assignments.	A.P. of curriculum, Dominick Clayton Math Dept. Head, Dave Harris Classroom teachers PLC's	PENDA Common Assessments Pre and Post Mini-Bench Assessment progression	FCAT Common assessment data LBA's PENDA PLC Disscussion
Mathematics Goal #4A: Increase students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics to 69%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **59% students in lowest 25% made learning gains in mathematics.**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **65% students in lowest 25% are expected to make learning gains in mathematics.**					
			Lack of Rigor in Instruction How the classroom could follow the RtI process while continuing core instruction.	Develop focus lessons that go in-depth and concentrate on higher order –thinking problems. AVID trained personnel will share AVID strategies with other instructors to implement in classroom instruction throughout the school year Common Core	A.P. of curriculum, Dominick Clayton Classroom teacher Trained AVID instructors PLC Facillitator	Chart assessments and incorporate in data folder to discuss in PLC's	Mini assessments and LBA's graded through Edusoft FCAT 2.0 Class evaluation PLC Discussion
			Lack of reading and writing in math classroom	AVID trained personnel will share AVID strategies with other instructors to implement in classroom instruction throughout the school year CRISS Strategies Implementation of Cornell Notes	A.P. for curriculum, Dominick Clayton Classroom Teacher Math Depart. Head – Dave Harris Trained AVID Teachers	Staff feedback	Common Assessments PLC Discussion
			Need for practicing mathematical practice across grade level	PLC – Focus on Common Core	PLC Facilitator Math lead teachers	Common Core Strategies PLC sharing of results discussions	LBA's FCAT 2.0 Common Assessments

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

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**		Student Attendance	Counselors and advisory teachers will monitor attendance and make parent contact.	Guidance Counselors Advisory teachers	Reduction in percentage of absences teacher observation	AS400 attendance report Esembler	
Mathematics Goal #5B: The goal for subgroups as it pertains to AMO is for all groups to increase the percentage of students achieving AMO.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **White:58%** **Black: 39%** **Hispanic: 52%** **Asian: 74%** **American Indian: N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **White: 70%** **Black: 50%** **Hispanic: 58%** **Asian: 77%** **American Indian: N/A**					
		Behavior/disruptions Taught same curriculum regardless of individual need.	PBS New in-school suspension plan Math afterschool lab	PBS school coordinator, Doris Weizenecker Math Dept. Head, Dave Harris	Reduction in percentage of discipline referrals teacher observation	AS400 discipline report	
		Scaffold and tiered instruction. Differentiated instruction.	Dept. Head, Dave Harris	CWT PLC	FCAT LBA's PLC minutes	Common Assessments	
		Lack of Rigor in Instruction	Develop focus lessons that go in-depth and concentrate on higher	A.P. in charge of curriculum, Dominick Clayton	Chart assessments and incorporate in data folder to discuss in PLC's	Mini assessments and LBA's graded through Edusoft	

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

			order –thinking problems. AVID trained personnel will share AVID strategies with other instructors to implement in classroom instruction throughout the school year	Classroom teacher Trained AVID instructors		FCAT Class evaluation
		How the classroom could follow the RtI process while continuing core instruction.	Focus discussion in math PLC group.	Math Dept. Head, Dave Harris Math lead teachers PLC's	CWT PLC minutes	FCAT Common assessments CWT

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			Need for practicing mathematical practice across grade level	Develop and Practice 1 or more of the 8 mathematical practice standards in the classroom	Math Dept. Head, Dave Harris Math lead teachers PLC's	AVID Strategies PLC sharing of results discussions	Advanced math course lesson plans LBA's FCAT 2.0 Common Assessments
Mathematics Goal #5C: 43% of students are expected to make AMO in mathematics	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **21% students with disabilities did not make AMO.**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **43% students are expected to make AMO in mathematics.**	Scaffold and tiered instruction. Differentiated instruction.	Dept. Head, Dave Harris	PLC	FCAT LBA's PLC minutes	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			Lack of Rigor in Instruction	Develop focus lessons that go in-depth and concentrate on higher order –thinking problems. AVID trained personnel will share AVID strategies with other instructors to implement in classroom instruction throughout the school year	A.P. in charge of curriculum, Dominick Clayton Classroom teacher Trained AVID instructors	Chart assessments and incorporate in data folder to discuss in PLC's	Mini assessments and LBA's graded through Edusoft FCAT Class evaluation
Mathematics Goal #5D: 46% of students are expected to make AMO in mathematics	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **31% students with disabilities did not make AMO.**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **46% students are expected to make AMO in mathematics.**	Need for practicing mathematical practice across grade level	Develop and Practice 1 or more of the 8 mathematical practice standards in the classroom	Math Dept. Head, Dave Harris Math lead teachers PLC's	AVID Strategies PLC sharing of results discussions	Advanced math course lesson plans LBA's FCAT 2.0 Common Assessments
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

DRAFT

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			Lack of Rigor in Instruction How the classroom could follow the RtI process while continuing core instruction.	Develop focus lessons that go in-depth and concentrate on higher order –thinking problems. AVID trained personnel will share AVID strategies with other instructors to implement in classroom instruction throughout the school year	A.P. in charge of curriculum, Dominick Clayton Classroom teacher Trained AVID instructors	Chart assessments and incorporate in data folder to discuss in PLC's	Mini assessments and LBA's graded through Edusoft FCAT Class evaluation
Mathematics Goal #5E: 54% of students are expected to make AMO in mathematics	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **47% of students did not make AYP in mathematics.**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **54% of students are expected to make AYP in mathematics.**					
			Homeless students	Identify and monitor students	Guidance counselors Guidance report attendance report		AS400 attendance report Guidance homeless report
			Lack of Rigor in Instruction How the classroom could follow the RtI process while continuing core instruction.	Develop focus lessons that go in-depth and concentrate on higher order –thinking problems. AVID trained personnel will share AVID strategies with other instructors to implement in classroom instruction throughout the school year	A.P. in charge of curriculum, Dominick Clayton Classroom teacher Trained AVID instructors	Chart assessments and incorporate in data folder to discuss in PLC's	Mini assessments and LBA's graded through Edusoft FCAT Class evaluation

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

High School Mathematics Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.* 2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.* 2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.
Mathematics Goal #3: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.
Mathematics Goal #4: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.
			4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1. Algebra 1 Goal #1: Increase student scores from 3 to 4 by 13%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 47% (64/136) students scored a 3 on the Algebra EOC.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 60% of students will score a 3 on the Algebra EOC.	1.1. Students not grasping basic pre-algebra concepts leading to entry level Algebra class Lack of mathematical fundamental skills	1.1. Develop joint instructional strategies amongst 8th grade Algebra teachers to bring student up to their proper level within the first week of school Year round tutoring amongst grade level teams	1.1. Classroom teacher Math Department Chair, Dave Harris	1.1. 8th grade Algebra PLC	1.1. Common Assessments
			Lack of Rigor in Instruction How the classroom could follow the RtI process while continuing core instruction. Need for practicing mathematical practice across grade level.	Develop focus lessons that go in-depth and concentrate on higher order –thinking problems. AVID trained personnel will share AVID strategies with other instructors to implement in classroom instruction throughout the school year Common Core Strategies	A.P. in charge of curriculum, Dominick Clayton Classroom teacher Trained AVID instructors PLC Facilitator	Chart assessments and incorporate in data folder to discuss in PLC's	Mini assessments and LBA's graded through Edusoft FCAT Class evaluation
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1. Algebra Goal #2: Increase higher order thinking and Rigor	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 34% (46/136) students scored a 4 or higher on the Algebra EOC.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 40% students score a 4 or 5 on the Algebra EOC.	Lack of emphasis in lesson plans of higher order thinking questions.	Lead math teachers will initiate discussion and coach other teachers during PLC about types of higher-order thinking questions.	A.P. in charge of curriculum, Dominick Clayton Classroom Teacher	Teachers incorporate new strategies in lesson plans Results of Common assessments	Advanced math course lesson plans LBA's FCAT 2.0 Common Assessments

		Lack of Rigor in Instruction How the classroom could follow the RtI process while continuing core instruction.	Develop focus lessons that go in-depth and concentrate on higher order –thinking problems. AVID trained personnel will share AVID strategies with other instructors to implement in classroom instruction throughout the school year	A.P. in charge of curriculum, Dominick Clayton Classroom teacher Trained AVID instructors	Chart assessments and incorporate in data folder to discuss in PLC's	Mini assessments and LBA's graded through Edusoft FCAT Class evaluation

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.**		Lack of Rigor in Instruction	Develop focus lessons that go in-depth and concentrate on higher order –thinking problems. AVID trained personnel will share AVID strategies with other instructors to implement in classroom instruction throughout the school year	A.P. in charge of curriculum, Dominick Clayton Classroom teacher Trained AVID instructors	Chart assessments and incorporate in data folder to discuss in PLC's	Mini assessments and LBA's graded through Edusoft FCAT Class evaluation	
Algebra 1 Goal #3B: Increase student scores passing rates by 10%.	**2012 Current Level of Performance:*** White: 79% Black: 80% Hispanic: 85% Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:*** White: 77% Black: 88% Hispanic: 94% Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A					
		Differentiated instruction	Scaffold and tiered instruction Common Core	Classroom Teacher PLC Facilitator	FCAT LBA's PLC minutes	Common Assessments	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			Lack of Rigor in Instruction How the classroom could follow the RtI process while continuing core instruction.	Develop focus lessons that go in-depth and concentrate on higher order –thinking problems. AVID trained personnel will share AVID strategies with other instructors to implement in classroom instruction throughout the school year	A.P. in charge of curriculum, Dominick Clayton Classroom teacher Trained AVID instructors	Chart assessments and incorporate in data folder to discuss in PLC's	Mini assessments and LBA's graded through Edusoft FCAT Class evaluation
Algebra 1 Goal #3E: Increase student scores passing rates by 10%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 75% (53/136) students scored a 3 on the Algebra EOC.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 83% of students will score a 3 on the Algebra EOC.					
			How the classroom could follow the RtI process while continuing core instruction.	Identify and monitor students	Guidance counselors	Guidance report attendance report	AS400 attendance report Guidance homeless report
			Homeless students Lack of Rigor in Instruction	Develop focus lessons that go in-depth and concentrate on higher order –thinking problems. AVID trained personnel will share AVID strategies with other instructors to implement in classroom instruction throughout the school year	A.P. in charge of curriculum, Dominick Clayton Classroom teacher Trained AVID instructors	Chart assessments and incorporate in data folder to discuss in PLC's	Mini assessments and LBA's graded through Edusoft FCAT Class evaluation

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

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

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

Geometry EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Geometry Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Geometry Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

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

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

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.			1A.1. Reading Comprehension	1A.1. Practice reading throughout the school year in all subjects	1A.1. Administrator	1A.1. Practice test	1A.1. Semester exams
Science Goal #1A: *The 2012- 2013 science goal is to increase students scoring at level 3 by 2%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *36%(109)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *38% (116)*					
			1A.2. Students thinking test does not matter to graduate	1A.2. SSR (Monday – Friday)	1A.2. Science teacher	1A.2. Benchmark test	1A.2.FCAT
			1A.3. Deficit in math skills	1A.3.	1A.3. Inclusion teacher	1A.3. LBA test	1A.3.EOC exam
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: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.			2A.1. Time from when sixth and seventh grade science material was presented.	2A.1. Have sixth and seventh grade teachers review their subject matter in January	2A.1. Current science teacher	2A.1. Practice tests	2A.1. Semester Exams
Science Goal #2A: The 2012 - 2013 science goal is to increase students scoring at or above levels 4 and 5 by 2%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *13% (40)*	2013Expected Level of Performance:* *15% (46)*					
			2A.2.	2A.2. FCAT Bell ringers	2A.2. Life science teacher	2A.2. Benchmark tests	2A.2. FCAT
			2A.3.	2A.3. FCAT Review materials	2A.3. Earth/space science teacher	2A.3.	2A.3. EOC exam
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: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

High School Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Science Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Science Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

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

Biology 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Biology 1 Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Biology 1 Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

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

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

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Science Common Core – Blue Print	All grades Science	S. Wolfe	All science teachers (6th, 7th, 8th)	Meet once a month on the second Wednesday at 8:15	Send out an email	Susan Wolfe

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
8th grade Purple FCAT Practice booklet to review benchmarks	Already have plenty in stock		$0
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Benchmark tests	Already possess		$0
Annual assessed benchmarks as bell ringers	Already possess		$0
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Practice Science FCAT for 6th and 7th graders to take while 8th graders take the real Science FCAT	Teacher made		$0
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
The 6th and 7th grade teachers will switch	Teachers will rotate with other teachers for		$0

places with the 8th grade science teachers in January to review "Life science and Earth/Space science" with the 8th graders.	a day or two.		
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Science Goals

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

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.			1A.1. Unknown if state's score scale of proficiency will change.	1A.1. TMS passing score will continue to be 4.0.	1A.1. Principal, Trella Mott	1A.1. LBA's Parallel writes MyAccess DBQ's FCAT writes	1A.1. Edusoft MyAccess Classroom grades FCAT results
Writing Goal #1A: *80% of 8th graders will achieve a 3.0 or better on FCAT Writes.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *79%(238) Satisfactory or higher score*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *80% Satisfactory or higher*					
			1A.2. Lack of authentic writing in all content area.	1A.2. Incorporate authentic writing in all content area instruction.	1A.2. Classroom teachers	1A.2. Classroom grades LBA's	1A.2. Esembler edusoft
			1A.3. Inconsistency in curriculum and students understanding of writing styles.	1A.3. Collaboration and creation of a writing plan.	1A.3. Writing team	1A.3. LBA's MyAccess	1A.3. Edusoft MyAccess
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.			1B.1 Lack of authentic writing in all content area.	1B.1. Incorporate authentic writing in all content area instruction.	1B.1. Classroom teachers	1B.1. Classroom grades LBA's	1B.1. Esembler edusoft
Writing Goal #1B: *50% of 8th graders will achieve a 4.0 or better on FCAT Writes.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *29%(88) 4.0 or higher score*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *50% 4.0 or higher*					
			1B.2. Inconsistency in curriculum and students understanding of writing styles.	1B.2. Collaboration and creation of a writing plan.	1B.2. Writing team	1B.2. LBA's MyAccess	1B.2. Edusoft MyAccess
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
AVID PLC	7-8	Claire Moore	PLC	On-going		Claire Moore
CRISS	all		School-wide	On-going		Trella Mott

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

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

Civics EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Civics Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Civics Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Civics Professional Development

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

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Civics Goals

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

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

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

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

U.S. History EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
U.S. History Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
U.S. History Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

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

U.S. History Professional Development

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

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

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

End of U.S. History Goals

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

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			1.1. Awareness of students approaching the excessive levels has not been monitored	1.1. Weekly attendance reports will be given to Administration and guidance counselors.	1.1. Administration, data clerk, and guidance counselors	1.1. Esembler attendance reports data	1.1. AS400
Attendance Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Attendance Rate:* *93.82%* 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) *383* 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) *156*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* *95%* 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) *200* 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) *100*					
			1.2. Student's lack of enthusiasm for school due to adult disconnect.	1.2. PBS model will encourage positive students and school staff behavior.	1.2. PBS coach, Doris WeizeneckerMr Clayton, AP	1.2. Esembler and attendance report data	1.2. AS400
			1.3. Student tardies	1.3. PBS model rewards and consequences.	1.3. PBS coach, Doris WeizeneckerMr Clayton, AP	1.3. Esembler and attendance report data	1.3. AS400

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:
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 Attendance Goals

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

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension			1.1. Changing the mindset of the student body.	1.1. Behavioral lessons in the Advisory Mod Continuation of the PBS Model known as patriot Pride at TMS	1.1. Administration and PBS Team	1.1. Discipline data	1.1. AS400
Suspension Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions					
	235	*200*					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					
	79	*60*					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	133	*100*					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	61	*50*					
			1.2. Perception of ISS	1.2. Continue OSI (opportunity for self improvement) and provide a structure to the daily lesson, activities, lunch, and procedures. Utilize OSI as a long term intervention for repeat students prior to OSS.	1.2. Administration	1.2. Discipline Data	1.2. AS400
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Suspension Professional Development

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

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Due to the very small number of parents that participated in the 2012 Climate Survey, TMS will make an effort to increase overall parent participation in all school functions.*	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*	1.1. Reaching the parents of the student body and involving them in daily activities as well as their students' academics.	1.1. Utilize the call out system Encourage positive calls home Advertise with local newspaper Create a Public Relations Committee	1.1. Administration Public Relations Committee	1.1. Call Out system data Increased percentage of parents who participate in the climate survey	1.1. Call out system report School climate survey
	6%	*25%*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: *In an effort to increase the types of projects completed at TMS, we will change the science fair to a curriculum fair. Now projects from the math and CTE fields will be eligible for entry.*	1.1. Timeline	1.1. Form a committee to execute the changes	1.1. Leadership Team	1.1. Regular meetings to monitor progress	1.1. Parent and public feedback
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

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

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

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
CTE Goal #1: *Research the extension of our current CTE course offerings. We wish to expand our culinary and tech ed course offerings to include the advance curriculum.*	1.1. Scheduling Class size Finance Allocations	1.1. Removal of out dated course offerings	1.1. Leadership Team	1.1. Regular meetings to facilitate master schedule changes Increased enrollment in advanced CTE courses	1.1. Student interest survey Parent feedback
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

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

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

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)

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

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

Additional Goals Professional Development

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

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

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	
	Total:
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:
	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.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount