

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Legacy Middle School	District Name: Orange
Principal: Dr. Joseph Miller	Superintendent: Dr. Barbara Jenkins
SAC Chair: Mr. Jeff Hancock	Date of School Board Approval: January 29, 2013

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	Dr. Joseph Miller	Ed.D/Educational Leadership Certifications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> School Principal (all levels) 	2	24	<p><i>Jackson Middle</i>: 2009-2010, B (512), FCAT Level 3 and above: Reading 60%, Math 59%, Writing 87%, Science 33%, Learning Gains: Reading 65%, Math 70%, Lowest 25%: Reading 69%, Math 69%. 79% AYP Met</p> <p><i>Oakridge High</i>: 2010-2011, C (392), FCAT Level 3 and above: Reading 22%, Math 57%, Writing 76%, Science 19%, Learning Gains: Reading 40%, Math 69%, Lowest 25%: Reading 49%, Math 60%. 69% AYP Met</p> <p><i>Legacy Middle</i>: 2011-2012, A (657), FCAT Level 3 and above: Reading 63%, Math 65%, Writing 90%, Science 52%, Learning Gains: Reading 73%, Math 77%, Lowest 25%: Reading 77%, Math 74%</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Subgroups AMO</th> <th>% RDG on target</th> <th>AMO Met</th> <th>% Math on target</th> <th>AMO Met</th> <th>Writing</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Asian</td> <td>81</td> <td>N</td> <td>87</td> <td>Y</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black</td> <td>53</td> <td>Y</td> <td>54</td> <td>Y</td> <td>91</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic</td> <td>56</td> <td>N</td> <td>59</td> <td>Y</td> <td>89</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>78</td> <td>Y</td> <td>79</td> <td>Y</td> <td>92</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ELL</td> <td>30</td> <td>N</td> <td>37</td> <td>N</td> <td>76</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SWD</td> <td>31</td> <td>Y</td> <td>27</td> <td>N</td> <td>69</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SES</td> <td>57</td> <td>Y</td> <td>61</td> <td>Y</td> <td>89</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Subgroups AMO	% RDG on target	AMO Met	% Math on target	AMO Met	Writing	Asian	81	N	87	Y		Black	53	Y	54	Y	91	Hispanic	56	N	59	Y	89	White	78	Y	79	Y	92	ELL	30	N	37	N	76	SWD	31	Y	27	N	69	SES	57	Y	61	Y	89
Subgroups AMO	% RDG on target	AMO Met	% Math on target	AMO Met	Writing																																																
Asian	81	N	87	Y																																																	
Black	53	Y	54	Y	91																																																
Hispanic	56	N	59	Y	89																																																
White	78	Y	79	Y	92																																																
ELL	30	N	37	N	76																																																
SWD	31	Y	27	N	69																																																
SES	57	Y	61	Y	89																																																
Assistant Principal	Dr. Kimberly Marlow	Ed.D/Educational Leadership English Certifications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> School Principal (all levels) 	2	16	<p><i>Arbor Ridge K-8</i>: 2009-2010, A (642), FCAT Level 3 and above: Reading 93%, Math 89%, Writing 90%, Science 69%, Learning Gains: Reading 76%, Math 77%, Lowest 25%: Reading 72%, Math 76%. 97% AYP Met</p> <p><i>Arbor Ridge K-8</i>: 2010-2011, A (661), FCAT Level 3 and above: Reading 94%, Math 93%, Writing 84%, Science 77%, Learning Gains: Reading 72%, Math 74%, Lowest 25%: Reading 81%, Math 86%. 100% AYP Met</p> <p><i>Legacy Middle</i>: 2011-2012, A (657), FCAT Level 3 and above: Reading 63%, Math 65%, Writing 90%, Science 52%, Learning Gains: Reading 73%, Math 77%, Lowest 25%: Reading 77%, Math 74%</p>																																																

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

					<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Subgroups AMO</th> <th>% RDG on target</th> <th>AMO Met</th> <th>Math on target</th> <th>AMO Met</th> <th>Writing</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Asian</td> <td>81</td> <td>N</td> <td>87</td> <td>Y</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black</td> <td>53</td> <td>Y</td> <td>54</td> <td>Y</td> <td>91</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic</td> <td>56</td> <td>N</td> <td>59</td> <td>Y</td> <td>89</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>78</td> <td>Y</td> <td>79</td> <td>Y</td> <td>92</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ELL</td> <td>30</td> <td>N</td> <td>37</td> <td>N</td> <td>76</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SWD</td> <td>31</td> <td>Y</td> <td>27</td> <td>N</td> <td>69</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SES</td> <td>57</td> <td>Y</td> <td>61</td> <td>Y</td> <td>89</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Subgroups AMO	% RDG on target	AMO Met	Math on target	AMO Met	Writing	Asian	81	N	87	Y		Black	53	Y	54	Y	91	Hispanic	56	N	59	Y	89	White	78	Y	79	Y	92	ELL	30	N	37	N	76	SWD	31	Y	27	N	69	SES	57	Y	61	Y	89
Subgroups AMO	% RDG on target	AMO Met	Math on target	AMO Met	Writing																																																
Asian	81	N	87	Y																																																	
Black	53	Y	54	Y	91																																																
Hispanic	56	N	59	Y	89																																																
White	78	Y	79	Y	92																																																
ELL	30	N	37	N	76																																																
SWD	31	Y	27	N	69																																																
SES	57	Y	61	Y	89																																																
Assistant Principal	Barbara Rumph	Ed.S in Educational Leadership MA in Elementary Education BS in Elementary Education Certification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elementary Education (1-6) 5 – 9 Integrated Curriculum ESOL Endorsement School Principal (all levels) 	0	5	<p><i>Lakemont Elementary: 2009-2010, A (643), FCAT Level 3 and above: Reading 92%, Math 91%, Writing 92%, Science 76%, Learning Gains: Reading 72%, Math 74%, Lowest 25%: Reading 73%, Math 73%. 100% AYP Met</i></p> <p><i>Lakemont Elementary: 2010-2011, A (595), FCAT Level 3 and above: Reading 86%, Math 88%, Writing 92%, Science 76%, Learning Gains: Reading 71%, Math 58%, Lowest 25%: Reading 65%, Math 59%. 90% AYP Met</i></p> <p><i>Castle Creek Elementary: 2011-2012, A (572), FCAT Level 3 and above: Reading 63%, Math 59%, Writing 79%, Science 73%, Learning Gains: Reading 79%, Math 70 %, Lowest 25%: Reading 84%, Math 65%</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Subgroups AMO</th> <th>% RDG on target</th> <th>AMO Met</th> <th>Math on target</th> <th>AMO Met</th> <th>Writing</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Asian</td> <td></td> <td>NA</td> <td></td> <td>NA</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black</td> <td>94</td> <td>NA</td> <td>94</td> <td>NA</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic</td> <td>71</td> <td>Y</td> <td>64</td> <td>Y</td> <td>67</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>54</td> <td>Y</td> <td>52</td> <td>Y</td> <td>84</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ELL</td> <td>66</td> <td>N</td> <td>60</td> <td>N</td> <td>78</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SWD</td> <td>41</td> <td>Y</td> <td>42</td> <td>Y</td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SES</td> <td></td> <td>NA</td> <td></td> <td>NA</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Subgroups AMO	% RDG on target	AMO Met	Math on target	AMO Met	Writing	Asian		NA		NA		Black	94	NA	94	NA		Hispanic	71	Y	64	Y	67	White	54	Y	52	Y	84	ELL	66	N	60	N	78	SWD	41	Y	42	Y	70	SES		NA		NA	
Subgroups AMO	% RDG on target	AMO Met	Math on target	AMO Met	Writing																																																
Asian		NA		NA																																																	
Black	94	NA	94	NA																																																	
Hispanic	71	Y	64	Y	67																																																
White	54	Y	52	Y	84																																																
ELL	66	N	60	N	78																																																
SWD	41	Y	42	Y	70																																																
SES		NA		NA																																																	

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

Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)																																																
Reading Coach	Jenny Hartwigsen	Masters/Elementary Ed. Middle Grades Integrated Curriculum	7	5	<p><i>Legacy Middle:</i> 2009-2010, A (565), FCAT Level 3 and above: Reading 73%, Math 69%, Writing 82%, Science 44%, Learning Gains: Reading 71%, Math 76%, Lowest 25%: Reading 74%, Math 76%</p> <p><i>Legacy Middle:</i> 2010-2011, A (548), FCAT Level 3 and above: Reading 73%, Math 70%, Writing 75%, Science 49%, Learning Gains: Reading 66%, Math 71%, Lowest 25%: Reading 67%, Math 77%. 69% AYP Met</p> <p><i>Legacy Middle:</i> 2011-2012, A (657), FCAT Level 3 and above: Reading 63%, Math 65%, Writing 90%, Science 52%, Learning Gains: Reading 73%, Math 77%, Lowest 25%: Reading 77%, Math 74%. 82%</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Subgroups</th> <th>% RDG on target</th> <th>AMO Met</th> <th>Math on target</th> <th>AMO Met</th> <th>Writing</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Asian</td> <td>81</td> <td>N</td> <td>87</td> <td>Y</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black</td> <td>53</td> <td>Y</td> <td>54</td> <td>Y</td> <td>91</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic</td> <td>56</td> <td>N</td> <td>59</td> <td>Y</td> <td>89</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>78</td> <td>Y</td> <td>79</td> <td>Y</td> <td>92</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ELL</td> <td>30</td> <td>N</td> <td>37</td> <td>N</td> <td>76</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SWD</td> <td>31</td> <td>Y</td> <td>27</td> <td>N</td> <td>69</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SES</td> <td>57</td> <td>Y</td> <td>61</td> <td>Y</td> <td>89</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Subgroups	% RDG on target	AMO Met	Math on target	AMO Met	Writing	Asian	81	N	87	Y		Black	53	Y	54	Y	91	Hispanic	56	N	59	Y	89	White	78	Y	79	Y	92	ELL	30	N	37	N	76	SWD	31	Y	27	N	69	SES	57	Y	61	Y	89
Subgroups	% RDG on target	AMO Met	Math on target	AMO Met	Writing																																																
Asian	81	N	87	Y																																																	
Black	53	Y	54	Y	91																																																
Hispanic	56	N	59	Y	89																																																
White	78	Y	79	Y	92																																																
ELL	30	N	37	N	76																																																
SWD	31	Y	27	N	69																																																
SES	57	Y	61	Y	89																																																
Math and Science	Jeff Hancock	Biology Master Ed. Leadership JD, Law	1	3	<p><i>Oakridge High:</i> 2010-2011, C (392), FCAT Level 3 and above: Reading 22%, Math 57%, Writing 76%, Science 19%, Learning Gains: Reading 40%, Math 69%, Lowest 25%: Reading 49%, Math 60%. 69% AYP Met</p> <p><i>Legacy Middle:</i> 2011-2012, A (657), FCAT Level 3 and above:</p>																																																

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

					Reading 63%, Math 65%, Writing 90%, Science 52%, Learning Gains: Reading 73%, Math 77%, Lowest 25%: Reading 77%, Math 74%																																																
					<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Subgroups</th> <th>% RDG on target</th> <th>AMO Met</th> <th>Math on target</th> <th>AMO Met</th> <th>Writing</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Asian</td> <td>81</td> <td>N</td> <td>87</td> <td>Y</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black</td> <td>53</td> <td>Y</td> <td>54</td> <td>Y</td> <td>91</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic</td> <td>56</td> <td>N</td> <td>59</td> <td>Y</td> <td>89</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>78</td> <td>Y</td> <td>79</td> <td>Y</td> <td>92</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ELL</td> <td>30</td> <td>N</td> <td>37</td> <td>N</td> <td>76</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SWD</td> <td>31</td> <td>Y</td> <td>27</td> <td>N</td> <td>69</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SES</td> <td>57</td> <td>Y</td> <td>61</td> <td>Y</td> <td>89</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Subgroups	% RDG on target	AMO Met	Math on target	AMO Met	Writing	Asian	81	N	87	Y		Black	53	Y	54	Y	91	Hispanic	56	N	59	Y	89	White	78	Y	79	Y	92	ELL	30	N	37	N	76	SWD	31	Y	27	N	69	SES	57	Y	61	Y	89
Subgroups	% RDG on target	AMO Met	Math on target	AMO Met	Writing																																																
Asian	81	N	87	Y																																																	
Black	53	Y	54	Y	91																																																
Hispanic	56	N	59	Y	89																																																
White	78	Y	79	Y	92																																																
ELL	30	N	37	N	76																																																
SWD	31	Y	27	N	69																																																
SES	57	Y	61	Y	89																																																

Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Mentoring Program	Ms. Hartwigsen	June 7, 2013
2. Informal Observations	Dr. Miller, Dr. Marlow, Ms. Rumph, Ms. Hartwigsen and Mr. Hancock	June 7, 2013
3. Alternative Certification Program	Ms. Hartwigsen	June 7, 2013
4. Staff Development Trainings: Common Core, Marzano Teacher Evaluation/High Probability Strategies, Response to Intervention, IMS (Instructional Management System), ELL Strategies	Ms. Hartwigsen, Mr. Hancock, Ms. Faberlle, Ms. James, reading and math black belt teams	June 7, 2013
5. Continuous Improvement Model: Data Meetings and Grade Level PLCs	Administrative and grade level teams	June 7, 2013

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 who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).

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

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
<p>Out of Field: 13% (7/54)</p> <p>Less than an effective rating: 2% (1/40)</p>	<p>Professional Development Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On-Site PD: Marzano iObservation Model/lesson planning, instructional strategies, coaching by resource teachers • PLC: regularly scheduled AVID, departmental and team PLC meetings to discuss data trends and instructional strategies (FCIM). • Timely communications informing of district PD opportunities for ELL/instructional strategies/Common Core <p>Mentoring and Coaching</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Category 1/2B (new to school or position) assigned a mentor. • Regularly walk-throughs by Administrative team. • Timely feedback regarding instructional, curricular and/or classroom routines. • Mutually planned support and follow up with instructional coach (es) as appropriate. • Professional Improvement Plan developed in collaboration with Employee Relations.

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]).

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

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	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
54	7 (12.9%)	21 (38.9%)	20 (37.0%)	6 (11.2%)	13 (24.0%)	53 (98%)	7 (12.9)	0	8 (14.8%)

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
Crangle, Lisa	EJ Nieves	Second year teacher. Coach and provide PD regarding how to incorporate AVID strategies within Art program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scheduled meetings between mentee/mentor. Scheduled meetings with Ms. Hartwigsen, Mentoring Coordinator. Informal Observations by mentee/mentor as appropriate.
Knapp, Amanda	Ospina, Diana	First year teacher. Provide support regarding planning and designing curriculum, classroom management strategies and Code of Ethics/Professionalism.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scheduled meetings between mentee/mentor. Scheduled meetings with Ms. Hartwigsen, Mentoring Coordinator. Informal Observations by mentee/mentor as appropriate.
Stubbs, Sherry	Johnson, Ja-kera	Ms. Johnson is a 1 st year teacher who interned with Mrs. Stubbs at Legacy Middle School in 2011-2012. Mrs. Stubbs will continue to provide support regarding planning and designing curriculum, classroom management strategies and Code of Ethics/Professionalism.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scheduled meetings between mentee/mentor. Scheduled meetings with Ms. Hartwigsen, Mentoring Coordinator. Beginning Teacher Portfolio Informal Observations by mentee/mentor as appropriate.
Stafford, Paige	Lecusay, Pedro and McGovern, Claire	Mentees are new to Legacy. Provide support regarding school culture, standards and expectations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scheduled meetings between mentee/mentor. Scheduled meetings with Ms.

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

			<p>Hartwigsen, Mentoring Coordinator</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informal Observations by mentee/mentor as appropriate
Smith, Lyn	Almaguer, Barbara	<p>Ms. Almaguer is transitioning from being a resource specialist to social studies teacher. Provide support regarding planning and designing curriculum, classroom management strategies and Code of Ethics/Professionalism.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scheduled meetings between mentee/mentor. • Scheduled meetings with Ms. Hartwigsen, Mentoring Coordinator. • Informal Observations by mentee/mentor as appropriate.
Tiwari, Melanie	Michael, Angela	<p>Mrs. Michael is transitioning from being a Media Specialist to Language Arts teacher. Provide support regarding planning and designing curriculum, classroom management strategies and Code of Ethics/Professionalism.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scheduled meetings between mentee/mentor. • Scheduled meetings with Ms. Hartwigsen, Mentoring Coordinator. • Informal Observations by mentee/mentor as appropriate.

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

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

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

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

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

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. Joseph Miller, Kim Marlow, Stephanie James, Martina Study, Mabel Lopez, Monica Ladino, Jeff Hancock, Jen Hartwigsen, Nelson Torres
Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts? The team will meet on a monthly basis to review student data, social issues, identify new students and students who are at risk academically or socially. Team will make decisions based on data and information. Problem solving and discussion will determine if there is a need for teacher professional learning, program implementations, adjustment of student schedules, enrichment activities, tutoring or community service involvement. The focus will be: What do we want our students to know, understand and be able to do? If they don't learn - what are we doing. If they master- what are we doing?
Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? The MTSS team will provide information to the School Advisory Committee regarding how the school will meet the needs of Tier 1, 2 and 3 students and how the MTSS Problem Solving process will be used to help meet the SIP goals for all students. A member of the MTSS Leadership Team will also be a member of the School Advisory Committee and will continue to provide updates at the monthly SAC meetings.
MTSS Implementation
Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior. Baseline data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR, District Benchmark Tests in Reading, Math and Science. School based Writing prompts. School based discipline reports. The district EDW data base will help manage all data sources.
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. All teachers and staff will receive the MTSS Overview. The MTSS team will receive more in- depth training in the area of student data, data bases and intervention process
Describe the plan to support MTSS. The school administrators are team members and will participate in all trainings and meetings.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Dr. Miller, Principal Dr. Marlow, Assistant Principal (API) Ms. Mahaffey, Media Specialist Ms. Hartwigsen, CRT/Reading Coach Mr. Hancock, Administrative Resource Ms. Reyes Mr. Nieves, Art Teacher Dr. Smith, Reading Teacher Ms. Perez-Gonzalez, Reading Teacher Ms. Faberlle, CCT/Reading Teacher Ms. Petrin, Language Arts Teacher Ms. Barnes, Language Arts Teacher
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The Literacy Team will meet every 3rd Monday morning of the month. The team's focus is to promote reading and writing school-wide and in the community.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? The Literacy Leadership Team's major initiative will be to promote school-wide literacy and to support teacher and student with a rich literacy program that includes technology and resources that will prepare students for high school and college level reading and writing requirements.

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?

All teachers participate in weekly professional development opportunities that addresses research based strategies that yield a high probability of academic growth. Each member of every team (grade level and departmental) are tracking and discussing student progress in reading/content areas. On-going discussions are held on how content areas teachers can support our FCIM process

****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. Meeting the needs of students requiring Tier 2/3 intervention.	1A.1. Create Master Schedule that will maximize the number of personnel available to help manage intervention block and provide additional help beyond schedule intervention block. Use data to design intervention/enrichment groups Align instructional resources with the needs of the students assigned to those groups Implement instructional focus calendar beginning in August.	1A.1. Principal Assistant Principal RTI Coordinator/Team Guidance Department CRT/Reading Coach Core/Elective Teachers	1A.1. Monthly monitoring of intervention schedules Ongoing informal classroom walkthrough and targeted feedback PLC data meetings	1A.1. FCIM Mini-Assessments/ District Benchmark Assessments Yearly analysis of FCAT/CELLA Results Analysis of FAIR (Sept/Jan/April) iObservation Reports Progress Book Reports
<u>Reading Goal #1A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
By June 2013, the percentage of students scoring at Level 3 will increase by 5%.	29% (250/855)	28% (237/845)					
			1A.2. Inconsistency of integrating reading strategies in content areas	1A.2. School Professional Development plan focus on integration of reading strategies PLC collaborates on how content area support/integrate reading strategies (nonfiction)	1A.2. Principal Assistant Principals CRT/Reading Coach Department Chairs/Team Leaders	1A.2. On-going monitoring of PLC meetings via visitations and posted agenda/minutes Professional Development Log	1A.2. FCIM Mini-Assessments/ District Benchmark Assessments Yearly analysis of FCAT/CELLA Results Analysis of FAIR (Sept/Jan/April) iObservation Reports Progress Book Reports

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 or 5 in reading.			2A.1. Instruction that does not meet the level of rigor measured by FCAT 2.0.	2A.1. Provide professional development in Common Core-CCSS ELA that addresses higher Webb's of knowledge questioning. Schedule regular time for grade level PLC to focus on literacy. Implement Common Core elements in Reading/Language Arts to provide opportunities to apply skills and concepts in an authentic task.	2A.1. Principal Assistant Principals CRT/Reading Coach Core/Elective Teachers	2A.1. Professional Development Roster Departmental PLC Agenda and minutes Lesson plans Ongoing informal classroom walkthrough and targeted feedback	2A.1. FCIM Mini-Assessments/ District Benchmark Assessments Yearly analysis of FCAT/CELLA Results Ongoing formative (classroom) assessments iObservation Reports Progress Book Reports Accelerated Reader Report
Reading Goal #2A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>By June 2013, the percentage of students scoring levels 4 and 5 will increase by 5%.</i>	32% 269/855	30% (253/845)					
			2A.2. Lack of grade appropriate non-fiction text to meet complexity level of state assessment.	2A.2. Provide funding to purchase non-fiction reading materials in content areas.	2A.2. Principal CRT/Reading Coach Literacy Team Core/Elective Teachers	2A.2. Budget Book Orders Lesson Plans	2A.2. Monthly Circulation Reports Accelerated Reader Reports
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3A.1. Lack of small group instruction/varied grouping strategies to address targeted needs.	3A.1. Provide professional development regarding grouping strategies that yields higher probabilities of academic growth. Utilize Marzano assessment tool for coaching purposes. Incorporate discussions on instructional design during Language Arts/Reading PLC.	3A.1. Principal Assistant Principals CRT/Reading Coach Language Arts Department	3A.1. Weekly departmental PLC Agenda and minutes Ongoing informal classroom walkthrough and targeted feedback Professional Development Roster Lesson Plans	3A.1. FCIM Mini-Assessments/ District Benchmark Assessments Analysis of FAIR (Sept/Jan/April) Yearly analysis of FCAT/CELLA Results Ongoing formative (classroom) assessments iObservation Reports Progress Book Reports
Reading Goal #3A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>By June 2013, the percentage of students achieving a learning gain will increase by 5%.</i>	68.9% (580)	71.9% (605)					

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

		3A.2. Inconsistent identification of students requiring Tier 2 and Tier 3 Services.	3A.2. Master Schedule developed to ensure time to intervene for each tier. Provide a continuum of services of differentiation (maintenance /enrichment) for Tier 1, interventions for Tiers 2/3 Continue to structure the RtI/Problem Solving Process to ensure timely response to literacy needs.	3A.2. Principal Assistant Principals Guidance Department RtI Coordinator/CCT CRT/Reading Coach Core/Elective Teachers ESE Department	3A.2. Professional Development RtI Leadership Team Agenda/Minutes On-going monitoring of intervention list Ongoing informal classroom walkthrough and targeted feedback Observations/Checklists	3A.2. FCIM Mini-Assessments/ District Benchmark Assessments Analysis of FAIR (Sept/Jan/April) Yearly analysis of FCAT/CELLA Results Ongoing formative (classroom) assessments iObservation Reports Progress Book Reports
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.		4A.1. Inconsistent Tier II and Tier III interventions and student identification	4A.1. Master Schedule developed to ensure time to intervene for each tier. Provide a continuum of services of differentiation (maintenance /enrichment) for Tier 1, interventions for Tiers 2/3 Continue to structure the RtI/Problem Solving Process to ensure timely response to literacy needs.	4A.1. Principal Assistant Principals RtI Leadership Team CRT/Reading Coach Core/Elective Teachers Guidance Department ESE Department	4A.1. Professional development log RtI Leadership Team Agenda/Minutes On-going monitoring of intervention list Ongoing informal classroom walkthrough and targeted feedback Observations/Checklists	4A.1. FCIM Mini-Assessments/ District Benchmark Assessments Yearly analysis of FCAT/CELLA Results Analysis of FAIR (Sept/Jan/April) Ongoing formative (classroom) assessments iObservation Reports Progress Book Reports
Reading Goal #4: <i>By June 2013, the percentage of the lowest 25% subgroup making a learning gain will increase by 10%.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	70.5% (147)	71.5% (149)				
		4A.2. Inconsistent use of a variety of research-based instructional strategies in all core and elective courses.	4A.2. Provide professional development in identified strategies that are applicable across subject areas. Structure departmental and grade level PLCs to follow the continuous improvement model: Plan-Do-Check-Act.	4A.2. Principal Assistant Principals RtI Leadership Team CRT/Reading Coach Core/Elective Teachers Guidance Department	4A.2. Professional development log Lesson Plans RtI Leadership Team Agenda/Minutes On-going monitoring of intervention list Ongoing informal classroom walkthrough and targeted	4A.2. FCIM Mini-Assessments/ District Benchmark Assessments Yearly analysis of FCAT/CELLA Results Analysis of FAIR (Sept/Jan/April) Ongoing formative (classroom) assessments

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

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

				ESE/ELL Departments	feedback	iObservation Reports	
					Observations/Checklists	Progress Book Reports	
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 Asian: 83% Black: 48% Hispanic: 54% White: 75% ELL: 34% SWD: 22% SES: 52%	Asian: 84% Black: 52% Hispanic: 58% White: 77% English Language Learners: 40% Students with Disabilities: 29% Economically Disadvantaged: 56%	Asian: 86% Black: 57% Hispanic: 62% White: 79% English Language Learners: 45% Students with Disabilities: 35% Economically Disadvantaged: 60%	Asian: 87% Black: 61% Hispanic: 66% White: 81% English Language Learners: 51% Students with Disabilities: 42% Economically Disadvantaged: 64%	Asian: 89% Black: 65% Hispanic: 69% White: 83% English Language Learners: 56% Students with Disabilities: 48% Economically Disadvantaged: 68%	Asian: 90% Black: 70% Hispanic: 73% White: 85% ELL: 62% Students with Disabilities: 55% Economically Disadvantaged: 72%	Asian: 92% Black: 74% Hispanic: 77% White: 88% English Language Learners: 67% Students with Disabilities: 61% Economically Disadvantaged: 76%
Reading Goal #5A: <i>By June 2017, the percentage of students not making satisfactory progress in reading in each subgroup will be reduced by 50% or 10% each year.</i>							
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. White: Consistency with Intervention Services within Tier I and Tier II Black: Consistency with intervention services within Tiers I and II Hispanic: Consistency monitoring of ANI and ELL Services	5B.1. Provide professional development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How to create a culturally responsive classroom through group strategies, relevant curriculum and materials reflective of diversity. Instructional Management System (IMS) to assist with data disaggregation. Supportive ELL Strategies Structured PLC Focus on FCIM (Continuous Improvement Model) and on-going discussions about effective instructional strategies across core and elective courses.	5B.1. Principal Assistant Principals CRT/Reading Coach Departmental and Grade level PLCs ELL/ESE Departments	5B.1. Professional Development Roster Lesson plans Ongoing informal classroom walkthrough and targeted feedback Weekly grade level and departmental PLC agendas and minutes	5B.1. FCIM Mini-Assessments/ District Benchmark Assessments Yearly analysis of FCAT/CELLA Results Analysis of FAIR (Sept/Jan/April) Ongoing formative (classroom) assessments including iObservation Reports Progress Book Reports	
Reading Goal #5B: <i>By June 2013, the percentage of students not making satisfactory progress in each subgroup will be reduced by 10%.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	White: 23% (46/207) Black: 49% (62/126) Hispanic: 43% (206/488) Asian: 19% (7/38) American Indian: n/a	White: 19% (41/207) Black: 44% (55/126) Hispanic: 38% (185/488) Asian: 16% (6/38) American Indian: n/a					

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

		5B.3. Challenges with students in all subgroups requiring multi-services.	5B.3. Create Master Schedule that will prioritize the multitude of services Provide professional development in culturally responsive instructional strategies to meet literacy needs. Follow district CAI Blueprints and instructional pacing calendar.	5B.3. Principal Assistant Principals Grade Level Teams ESE/ELL Departments Guidance Department RtI Leadership Team	5B.3. Weekly grade level/departmental PLC Agenda and minutes Ongoing informal classroom walkthrough and targeted feedback Lesson Plans Teacher Schedules	5B.3. FCIM Mini-Assessments/ District Benchmark Assessments Yearly analysis of FCAT/CELLA Results Analysis of FAIR (Sept/Jan/April) Ongoing formative (classroom) assessments iObservation Reports Progress Book Reports
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.		5C.2. Lack of monitoring of ESOL strategies being utilized during instruction.	5C.2. Provide professional development on instructional strategies that support literacy achievement for second language learners. Document instructional strategies utilized to support literacy and content area learning of ELL.	5C.2. Principal Assistant Principals CCT Resource Teacher CRT/Reading Coach Core/Elective Teachers	5C.2. Lesson Plans Ongoing informal classroom walkthrough and targeted feedback Weekly departmental/grade level PLC Agenda and minutes	5C.2. FCIM Mini-Assessments/ District Benchmark Assessments Yearly analysis of FCAT/CELLA Results Analysis of FAIR (Sept/Jan/April) Ongoing formative (classroom) assessments Accelerated Reader Reports iObservation Reports Progress Book Reports
Reading Goal #5C: <i>By June 2013, the percentage of ELL students not making satisfactory progress will be reduced by 10%.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	71% (126/178)	67% (119/178)				
		5C.3. Inconsistent Tier II and Tier III interventions and identification for English Language Learners by core instructors.	5C.3. Master Schedule developed to ensure time to intervene for each tier. Provide a continuum of services of differentiation (maintenance/enrichment) for Tier 1, interventions for Tiers 2/3 Continue to structure the	5C.3. Principal Assistant Principals RtI Coordinator/Team CRT/Reading Coach CCT Resource Teacher	5C.3. RtI Leadership Team meeting Agenda/Minutes ANI Team Minutes Monthly monitoring of intervention list Ongoing informal classroom walkthrough and targeted	5C.3. FCIM Mini-Assessments/ District Benchmark Assessments Yearly analysis of FCAT/CELLA Results Analysis of FAIR (Sept/Jan/April)

**August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011**

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

			RtI/Problem Solving Process to ensure timely response to literacy needs. IMS (Instructional Management System) professional development	Core/Elective Teachers	feedback Observations/Checklists	Ongoing formative (classroom) assessments Accelerated Reader Reports iObservation Reports Progress Book Reports
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.		5D.1. Performance level of majority of subgroup is more than 1 year below grade level.	5D.1. Structure master schedule and intervention schedule to ensure acceleration of literacy achievement due to more explicit, direct instruction. Implement FCIM (Continuous Improvement Model) as part of departmental/grade level PLC. On-going professional development opportunities regarding differentiated instructional strategies, Marzano's High probability strategies and AVID strategies.	5D.1. Principal Assistant Principals RtI Coordinator/Team CRT/Reading Coach ESE Department	5D.1. Lesson Plan Intervention/Master Schedule ESE Continuum of Services IEP Review Ongoing informal classroom walkthrough and targeted feedback	5D.1. FCIM Mini-Assessments/ District Benchmark Assessments Analysis of FAIR (Sept/Jan/April) Ongoing formative (classroom) assessments iObservation Reports Progress Book Reports Accelerated Reader Reports
Reading Goal #5D: <i>By 2013, the percentage of students not making satisfactory progress will be reduced by 10%.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	78% (80/112)	68% (76/112)				
		5D.2. Low level of student engagement in literacy and content area lessons.	5D.2. Provide professional development on differentiating activities, assignments and homework that are relevant and appropriate.	5D.2. Principal Assistant Principals RtI Coordinator/Team CRT/Reading Coach ESE Department Core/Elective Teachers	5D.2. Lesson Plan ESE Continuum of Services IEP Review Ongoing informal classroom walkthrough and targeted feedback	5D.2. FCIM Mini-Assessments/ District Benchmark Assessments Analysis of FAIR (Sept/Jan/April) Ongoing formative (classroom) assessments iObservation Reports Progress Book Reports
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.		5E.1. Low expectations of student performance	5E.1. Schedule common planning time/ PLC to focus on literacy strategies	5E.1. Principal	5E.1. Weekly departmental/team PLC meeting agenda and minutes	5E.1. FCIM Mini-Assessments/ District Benchmark

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

<p>Reading Goal #5E:</p> <p><i>By June 2013, the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress will be reduced by 10%.</i></p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p> <p>45% (271/600)</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p> <p>43% (257/600))</p>		<p>to accelerate student growth.</p> <p>Utilize FCIM/RtI to ensure an ongoing focus on accelerated growth in the six components of literacy.</p> <p>Schedule on-going professional development with cross-curricular instructional strategies as the focus.</p>	<p>Assistant Principals</p> <p>RtI Coordinator/Team</p> <p>CRT/Resource Teacher</p> <p>Core/Elective Teachers</p>	<p>Ongoing informal classroom walkthrough with targeted feedback</p> <p>Lesson Plans</p>	<p>Assessments</p> <p>Yearly analysis of FCAT/CELLA Results</p> <p>Analysis of FAIR (Sept/Jan/April)</p> <p>Ongoing formative (classroom) assessments</p> <p>iObservation Reports</p> <p>Progress Book Reports</p> <p>Accelerated Reader Reports</p>
				<p>5E.2. History of poor academic performance as indicated by universal screeners—FAIR and Edusoft Benchmark assessments.</p>	<p>5E.2. Professional development to focus on the six components of an effective reading classroom.</p> <p>Grade level PLC devises a plan to support struggling students beyond extended learning time (intervention).</p>	<p>5E.2. Principal</p> <p>Assistant Principals</p> <p>RtI Coordinator/Team</p> <p>CRT/Resource Teacher</p> <p>Core/Elective Teachers</p>	<p>5E.2. Weekly departmental/team PLC meeting agenda and minutes</p> <p>Ongoing informal classroom walkthrough with targeted feedback</p> <p>Lesson Plans</p>

Reading Professional Development

<p>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities</p> <p>Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.</p>						
<p>PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus</p>	<p>Grade Level/ Subject</p>	<p>PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader</p>	<p>PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)</p>	<p>Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)</p>	<p>Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>
<p>Rigor in all content areas</p>	<p>Grades 6-8</p>	<p>Jen Hartwigsen</p>	<p>School-wide</p>	<p>Monthly beginning in September and ending in May</p>	<p>Classroom visits / coaching</p>	<p>CRT/Reading Coach Principal/Assistant Principals</p>
<p>Reading in content areas</p>	<p>Grades 6-8</p>	<p>Jen Hartwigsen</p>	<p>School-wide</p>	<p>Monthly beginning in September and ending in May</p>	<p>Classroom visits / coaching</p>	<p>CRT/Reading Coach Principal/Assistant Principals</p>

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

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

Writing Strategies	Grades 6-8	Jen Hartwigsen	School-wide	Monthly beginning is September through PLC's – ending in May	Classroom visits / coaching	CRT/Reading Coach Principal/Assistant Principals
RTI process	Grades 6-8	Jen Hartwigsen Joe Miller	School-wide	Monthly beginning in October and ending in May	Classroom visits / coaching	CRT/Reading Coach Principal/Assistant Principals
AVID Strategies	Grades 6-8	Joe Miller Lisa Crangle	School-wide	Monthly beginning September and ending in May	Classroom visits / coaching	Principal AVID Coordinator

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Reading in the content area	School reading Resources	School budget	\$100.00
Rigor in the classroom	Marzano Strategies	n/a	\$ 0.00
			Subtotal:\$100.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 0.00
			Subtotal:\$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Reading in the context area	Reading materials; strategies listed for gradual release of differentiated instruction for strategies of low, middle, and high level reading.	School budget	\$100.00
Rigor in the classroom	Marzano Strategies	n/a	\$ 0.00
			Subtotal: \$100.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
AVID strategies	AVID materials from district and AVID Summer Institute	School budget	\$500.00
			Subtotal:
			Total:\$700.00

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

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

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.		1.1. Lessons that lack the research-based strategies that promote listening and speaking proficiency.	1.1. Provide professional development on SIOP model as a strategy to ensure language attainment in content areas.	1.1. Principal Assistant Principals CCT Resource Teacher	1.1. Lesson Plans Ongoing informal classroom walkthrough with targeted feedback Professional Development Log	1.1. FCIM Mini-Assessments/ District Benchmark Assessments Yearly analysis of FCAT/CELLA Results Analysis of FAIR (Sept/Jan/April) Ongoing formative (classroom) assessments Observation Reports
CELLA Goal #1: <i>By June 2013, the percentage of ELL students scoring proficient in the listening and speaking portion of CELLA will increase by 5%.</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: <i>XX out of XX or XX% of ELL Students scored a level of proficient on the Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA).</i>	1.2. Lack of variety in differentiation strategies	1.2. Provided targeted professional development in differentiated strategies that promote student growth in listening and speaking skills.	1.2. Principal Assistant Principals CCT Resource Teacher Core/Elective Teachers	1.2. Lesson Plans Ongoing informal classroom walkthrough with targeted feedback Professional Development Log	1.2. FCIM Mini-Assessments/ District Benchmark Assessments Yearly analysis of FCAT/CELLA Results Analysis of FAIR (Sept/Jan/April) Ongoing formative (classroom) assessments Observation Reports
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.		2.1. Inconsistency in reading instruction/strategies in core content areas.	2.1. Professional development in the six components of an effective reading program.	2.1. Principal Assistant Principals CCT Resource Teacher Core/Elective Teachers	2.1. Lesson Plans Ongoing informal classroom walkthrough with targeted feedback Monitoring of ANIs	2.1. FCIM Mini-Assessments/ District Benchmark Assessments Yearly analysis of FCAT/CELLA Results Analysis of FAIR (Sept/Jan/April) Ongoing formative (classroom) assessments Observation Reports Progress Book Reports Accelerated Reader Reports
CELLA Goal #2: <i>By June 2013, the percentage of ELL students scoring proficient in reading on CELLA will increase by 5%.</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: XX out of XXX or XX% of ELL students scored a level of proficient on the reading Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA).					
		1.2. Lack of variety in differentiation strategies	1.2. Provided targeted professional development in differentiated strategies that promote student growth in listening and speaking skills.	1.2. Principal Assistant Principals CCT Resource Teacher Core/Elective Teachers	1.2. Lesson Plans Ongoing informal classroom walkthrough with targeted feedback Monitoring of ANIs	1.2. FCIM Mini-Assessments/ District Benchmark Assessments Yearly analysis of FCAT/CELLA Results Analysis of FAIR (Sept/Jan/April) Ongoing formative (classroom) assessments Observation Reports
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. Writing not explicitly taught across content areas.	2.1. Utilize Black Belt ELA team to provide leadership during departmental PLC. Utilize Language Arts/Reading teachers to provide leadership in grade level PLC how to utilize writing as a tool for learning and	2.1. Principal Assistant Principals CCT Resource Teacher Core/Elective Teachers	2.1. Lesson Plans Ongoing informal classroom walkthrough with targeted feedback Monitoring of ANIs	2.1. FCIM Mini-Assessments/ District Benchmark Assessments Yearly analysis of FCAT/CELLA Results Analysis of FAIR (Sept/Jan/April)
CELLA Goal #3: <i>By June 2013, the percentage of ELL students scoring proficient in the</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : Review data for actual #					

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

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

<p><i>Writing portion of the CELLA will increase by 5%.</i></p>			<p>communication.</p>	<p>Team Leaders/Departmental Chairs</p>		<p>Ongoing formative (classroom) assessments Observation Reports</p>
---	--	--	-----------------------	---	--	--

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

<p>Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.</p>			
<p>Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)</p>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA			
			Subtotal: \$0
<p>Technology</p>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA			
			Subtotal: \$0
<p>Professional Development</p>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA			
			Subtotal: \$0
<p>Other</p>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA			
			Subtotal: \$0
			Total: \$0

End of CELLA Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1A.1. Lack of varied instructional techniques.	1A.1. Provide professional development on research-based strategies. Utilize monthly calendar provided by math lead to vary instruction.	1A.1. Principal Assistant Principals Math Coach/Resource Teacher Math Department/Chairperson Common Core Black Belt team	1A.1. Lesson Plans Ongoing classroom walkthrough with targeted feedback Observation Checklist	1A.1. FCIM Mini-Assessments/FL District Benchmark Assessments Yearly analysis of FCAT Ongoing formative (classroom) assessments iObservation Reports Progress Book Reports
<u>Mathematics Goal #1A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>By June 2013 the percentage of students scoring level 3 will increase by 10%.</i>	26% (218) Grades 6-8	29% (162) Grades 6-7					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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. Lack of enriching activities and assignments to maintain high levels of performance.	2A.1. Utilize Black Belt Common Core team as leaders to disseminate CCS-Math expectations. Create master schedule that provides opportunities for enrichment and support.	2A.1. Principal Assistant Principals Math Coach/Resource Teacher Math Department/Chairperson	2A.1. Weekly math department PLC meetings Ongoing informal classroom walkthrough and targeted feedback Lesson Plans	2A.1. FCIM Mini-Assessments/FL District Benchmark Assessments Yearly analysis of FCAT Ongoing formative (classroom) assessments iObservation Reports Progress Book Reports
<u>Mathematics Goal #2A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>By June 2013, the percentage of students scoring an achievement level of 4 and 5 will increase by 5%.</i>	29% (243) Grades 6-8	30% (179) Grades 6-7					
			2A.2. Percentage of instruction at lower complexity level is greater than high complexity level (Webb's Depth of Knowledge)	2A.2. Follow district CIA Blueprint and pacing guide to ensure focus is on grade level standards. Provide common planning time to provide grade level PLC to develop	2A.2. Principal Assistant Principals Math Coach/Resource Teacher	2A.2. Weekly math department PLC meetings Ongoing informal classroom walkthrough and targeted feedback	2A.2. FCIM Mini-Assessments/FL District Benchmark Assessments Yearly analysis of FCAT

**August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011**

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

			questions, activities and assignments at a higher complexity levels.	Math Department/Chairperson	Lesson Plans	Ongoing formative (classroom) assessments iObservation Reports Progress Book Reports
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1. Lack of knowledge regarding access points for Next Generation State Standards (NGSS) Mathematics,	2B.1. Professional development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matrix • Writing quality IEPs • Alternative Assessment 	2B.1. Principal Assistant Principals Staffing Specialist ESE Math Teacher(s)	2B.1. Ongoing informal classroom walkthrough and targeted feedback Lesson Plans FCIM Mini-Assessments/FL District Benchmark Assessments Yearly analysis of FCAT Ongoing formative (classroom) assessments iObservation Reports Progress Book Reports
<u>Mathematics Goal #2B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>				
<i>By June 2013, the percentage of students scoring an achievement level of 7 and above will remain at 100%.</i>	<i>1/1 100%</i>	<i>1/1 100%</i>				
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
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3A.1. Percentage of instruction at lower complexity level is greater than high complexity level (Webb's Depth of Knowledge)	3A.1. Follow district CIA Blueprint and pacing guide to ensure focus is on grade level standards. Provide common planning time to provide grade level/departmental PLC to develop questions, activities and assignments at a higher complexity levels.	3A.1. Principal Assistant Principals Math Coach/Resource Teacher Math Department/Chairperson Common Core Math Black Belt Team	3A.1. Weekly Math Department PLC meeting agenda and minutes Ongoing informal classroom walkthrough and targeted feedback Lesson Plans FCIM Mini-Assessments/FL District Benchmark Assessments Yearly analysis of FCAT Ongoing formative (classroom) assessments iObservation Reports Progress Book Reports
<u>Mathematics Goal #3A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>				
<i>By June 2013, the percentage of students making learning gains will increase by 5%.</i>	<i>70.5% (594) Grades 6-8)</i>	<i>73.5% (412) Grade 6-7</i>				
			3A.2. Lack of diversity of instructional differentiation strategies to promote math fluency and conceptual development.	3A.2. Provide opportunities to utilize technology to increase math fluency and concepts. Provide common planning time to design lessons that develop concepts from the concrete to the abstract.	3A.2. Principal Assistant Principals Math Coach/Resource Teacher Math Department/Chairperson	3A.2. Weekly Math Department PLC meeting agenda and minutes Ongoing informal classroom walkthrough and targeted feedback Lesson Plans FCIM Mini-Assessments/FL District Benchmark Assessments Yearly analysis of FCAT Ongoing formative (classroom) assessments

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

						iObservation Reports Progress Book Reports
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.		3B.1. Lack of knowledge regarding access points for Next Generation State Standards (NGSS) Mathematics.	3B.1. Professional development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matrix • Writing quality IEPs • Alternative Assessment 	3B.1. Principal Assistant Principals Staffing Specialist ESE Math Teacher(s)	3B.1. Ongoing informal classroom walkthrough and targeted feedback Lesson Plans	3B.1. FCIM Mini-Assessments/FL District Benchmark Assessments Yearly analysis of FCAT Ongoing formative (classroom) assessments iObservation Reports Progress Book Reports
Mathematics Goal #2B: <i>By June 2013, the percentage of students maintaining a learning gain will remain at 100%.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 1/1 100%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 1/1 100%				
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. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.		4A.1. Inconsistent identification of struggling students.	4A.1. Create master schedule to include sufficient instructional support classes. Implement responsive multi-tiered support system based on performance results.	4A.1. Principal Assistant Principal Math/Science Coach/Resource Teacher Math Department/Chairperson Guidance Department RTI Leadership Team	4A.1. Biweekly grade level PLC Agenda and minutes Monthly data meeting agenda and minute Ongoing informal classroom walkthrough and targeted feedback Lesson Plans Intervention Schedules	4A.1. FCIM Mini-Assessments/FL District Benchmark Assessments Yearly analysis of FCAT Ongoing formative (classroom) assessments iObservation Reports Progress Book Reports
Mathematics Goal #4: <i>By June 2013, the percentage of bottom 25% students making learning gains will increase by 10%.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 67.4 (564)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 68.4 (573)				
		4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.

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%. Mathematics Goal #5A: <i>By June 2017, the percentage of students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics in each subgroup will be reduced by 50% or 10% each year.</i>	Baseline data 2010-2011 Asian: 77% Black: 41% Hispanic: 52% White: 74% ELL: 37% SWD: 22% SES: 49%		Asian: 79% Black: 46% Hispanic: 56% White: 76% English Language Learners: 42% Students with Disabilities: 29% Economically Disadvantaged: 53%	Asian: 81% Black: 51% Hispanic: 60% White: 78% English Language Learners: 48% Students with Disabilities: 35% Economically Disadvantaged: 58%	Asian: 83% Black: 56% Hispanic: 64% White: 81% English Language Learners: 53% Students with Disabilities: 42% Economically Disadvantaged: 62%	Asian: 85% Black: 61% Hispanic: 68% White: 83% English Language Learners: 58% Students with Disabilities: 48% Economically Disadvantaged: 66%	Asian: 87% Black: 66% Hispanic: 72% White: 85% ELL: 63% Students with Disabilities: 55% Economically Disadvantaged: 70%	Asian: 89% Black: 71% Hispanic: 76% White: 87% English Language Learners: 69% Students with Disabilities: 61% Economically Disadvantaged: 75%
	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. Mathematics Goal #5B: <i>By June 2013, the percentage of each ethnic subgroup not making satisfactory progress will decrease by 10%.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White: 24% (50/208) Black: 47% (60/127) Hispanic: 44% (198/450) Asian: 13% (5/38%) American Indian: n/a	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White: 22% (45/208) Black: 43% (54/127) Hispanic: 40% (178/450) Asian: 11% (4/38) American Indian: n/a	5B.1. Lack of time to disaggregate student performance data for each subgroup.	5B.1. Provide professional development in Instructional Management System (IMS) to learn how to disaggregate data reports. Provide regularly scheduled PLC and data meetings to discuss grade level and classroom student performance data.	5B.1. Principal Assistant Principals CRT/IMS Champion Math Coach/Resource Teacher Math Department	5B.1. Professional Development roster Weekly math department PLC meeting agenda and minutes Ongoing informal classroom walkthrough and targeted feedback	5B.1. FCIM Mini-Assessments/FL District Benchmark Assessments Yearly analysis of FCAT Ongoing formative (classroom) assessments Observation Reports Progress Book Reports	
			5B.2. Inconsistency of teaching academic vocabulary and	5B.2. Promote continued use of Marzano's Building Academic Vocabulary strategy to build mathematical understanding	5B.2. Principal Assistant Principal	5B.2. Weekly departmental PLC meeting agenda and minutes Ongoing informal classroom	5B.2. FCIM Mini-Assessments/FL District Benchmark Assessments	

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

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

			Promote continued use of Marzano’s High Probability Strategies to increase conceptual understanding.	Curriculum Resource Teacher Leadership Team Classroom Teachers	walkthrough and targeted feedback Lesson Plans Teacher Schedules	Yearly analysis of FCAT Ongoing formative (classroom) assessments Observation Reports Progress Book Reports
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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. Instructional lessons lack the four components research states are a best practice for ELL students.	5C.1. Provide professional development on SIOP model to increase usage of speaking, writing, reading and listening to increase acceleration of English proficiency and content area growth.	5C.1. Principal Assistant Principal Math/Science Coach/Resource Teacher CCT Resource Teacher Leadership Team Core/Elective Teachers	5C.1. Weekly departmental PLC meeting agenda and minutes Ongoing informal classroom walkthrough and targeted feedback Lesson Plans	5C.1. FCIM Mini-Assessments/FL District Benchmark Assessments Yearly analysis of FCAT Ongoing formative (classroom) assessments Observation Reports Progress Book Reports
<u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u> <i>By June 2013, the percentage of ELL students not making satisfactory progress will be reduced by 20%.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 64% (114/178)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 60% (108/178)				
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. Lack of appropriate accommodations to meet student needs.	5D.1. Provide professional development on instructional strategies that develop concepts from the concrete to the abstract. Continue to meet as an IEP team to monitor and review progress towards math goals.	5D.1. Principal Assistant Principal Curriculum Resource Teacher Leadership Team Classroom Teachers ESE Department	5D.1. Weekly departmental PLC meeting agenda and minutes Ongoing informal classroom walkthrough and targeted feedback Lesson Plans	5D.1. FCIM Mini-Assessments/FL District Benchmark Assessments Yearly analysis of FCAT Ongoing formative (classroom) assessments Observation Reports Progress Book Reports
<u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u> <i>By June 2013, the percentage of students with disabilities not making progress will be reduced by 30%.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 78% (85/111)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 72% (80/111)				

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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. Lack of numeracy knowledge and strategies	5E.1. Implement an instructional focus calendar to focus on standards biweekly and regularly scheduled formative assessments. Continue utilization of computer-assisted instruction to increase math fluency and concept development. Provide appropriate resources to promote differentiation and tiered instruction.	5E.1. Principal Assistant Principal Curriculum Resource Teacher Leadership Team Classroom Teachers	5E.1. Weekly departmental PLC meeting agenda and minutes Ongoing informal classroom walkthrough and targeted feedback Lesson Plans Teacher Schedules	5E.1. FCIM Mini-Assessments/FL District Benchmark Assessments Yearly analysis of FCAT Ongoing formative (classroom) assessments iObservation Reports Progress Book Reports
<u>Mathematics Goal #5E:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>By June 2013, the percentage of economically disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress will be reduced by 10%.</i>	43% (259/601)	41% (272/601)					

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.			1.1. Students requiring additional support with algebraic concepts.	1.1. Identify and schedule Algebra support during extended learning (interventions). Collaborate with business partner to provide Algebra tutoring after school once a week. Algebra teachers collaborate to create common assessments.	1.1. Principal Assistant Principals Math/Science Coach/Resource Teacher Guidance Department	1.1. Math department PLC meeting agenda/minutes AVID Site team meeting agenda and minutes On-going classroom walk throughs After school tutoring logs	1.1. Enrollment Report- Algebra support classes Algebra Benchmark and mini-assessments
<u>Algebra 1 Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>By June 2013, the percentage of students scoring level 3 in Algebra 1 will increase by 5%.</i>	50% (60/120)	52% (63/120)					

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.			2.1. Students requiring additional support with algebraic concepts.	2.1. Identify and schedule Algebra support during extended learning (interventions). Collaborate with business partner to provide Algebra tutoring after school once a week. Algebra teachers collaborate to create common assessments.	2.1. Principal Assistant Principals Math/Science Coach/Resource Teacher Guidance Department	2.1. Math department PLC meeting agenda/minutes AVID Site team meeting agenda and minutes On-going classroom walk throughs After school tutoring logs	2.1. Enrollment Report- Algebra support classes Algebra Benchmark and mini-assessments IMS/EDW Reports	
Algebra Goal #2: <i>By June 2013, the percentage of students scoring levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1 will increase by 5%.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	5B.2. Lack of opportunity to solve algebraic concepts from a variety of perspectives.	5B.2. Professional Learning Community <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilize resources such as You Tube, School Tube and Safari Montage to model various methods for solving algebraic concepts. AVID Strategies Professional learning for AVID strategies	5B.2. Principal Assistant Principals AVID Coordinator Math/Science Coach/Resource Teacher Algebra Teachers	5B.2. On-going classroom walk throughs Lesson plans	5B.2. Enrollment Report- Algebra support classes Algebra Benchmark and mini-assessments IMS/EDW Reports	
	47% (56/120)	49% (90/185)						
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: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>								
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3B.1. Subgroups requiring additional support with algebraic concepts	3B.1. Identify and schedule Algebra support during extended learning (interventions). Collaborate with business partner to provide Algebra tutoring after school once a week. Instructional strategies include opportunities for group collaboration and elaboration.	3B.1. Principal Assistant Principals AVID Coordinator Guidance Department Math/Science Coach/Resource Teacher Algebra Teachers	3B.1. Math department PLC meeting agenda/minutes AVID Site team meeting agenda and minutes On-going classroom walk throughs After school tutoring logs	3B.1. Enrollment Report- Algebra support classes Algebra Benchmark and mini-assessments IMS/EDW Reports
Algebra 1 Goal #3B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>By June 2013, the percentage of students not making in each subgroup satisfactory progress will be reduced by 10%.</i>	White: 2% (1/41)	White: 0%					
	Black: 7% (1/14)	Black: 0%					
	Hispanic: 0% (0/49)	Hispanic: 0%					
	Asian: 12% (2/16)	Asian: 6% (1/16)					
	American Indian: n/a	American Indian: n/a					
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. ELL requiring additional support with algebraic concepts	3C.1. Identify and schedule Algebra support during extended learning (interventions). Collaborate with business partner to provide Algebra tutoring after school once a week. Instructional strategies include opportunities for group collaboration and elaboration	3C.1. Principal Assistant Principals AVID Coordinator CCT Resource Teacher Guidance Department Math/Science Coach/Resource Teacher Algebra Teachers	3C.1. Math department PLC meeting agenda/minutes AVID Site team meeting agenda and minutes On-going classroom walk throughs Lesson Plans After school Tutoring log Monitor ANI as appropriate	3C.1. Enrollment Report- Algebra support classes Algebra Benchmark and mini-assessments IMS/EDW Reports
Algebra 1 Goal #3C:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>By June 2013, the percentage of ELL students not making satisfactory progress will be reduced by 10%.</i>	0% (0/0)	0% (0/9)					
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.			
Algebra 1 Goal #3D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
NA							

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

			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:							
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3E.1. Students requiring additional support with algebraic concepts	3E.1. Identify and schedule Algebra support during extended learning (interventions). Collaborate with business partner to provide Algebra tutoring after school once a week. Instructional strategies include opportunities for group collaboration and elaboration	3E.1. Principal Assistant Principals AVID Coordinator Guidance Department Math/Science Coach/Resource Teacher Algebra Teachers	3E.1. Math department PLC meeting agenda/minutes AVID Site team meeting agenda and minutes On-going classroom walk throughs After school tutoring logs Lesson Plans	3E.1. Enrollment Report- Algebra support classes Algebra Benchmark and mini-assessments IMS/EDW Reports
Algebra 1 Goal #3E:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>By June 2013, the percentage of economically disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress will be reduced by 10%.</i>	5% (3/69)	2% (1/69)					

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

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

Geometry EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:							
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.			1.1. Students requiring additional support with geometric concepts.	1.1. Identify and schedule Geometry support during extended learning (interventions). Instructional strategies include opportunities for group collaboration and elaboration	1.1. Principal Assistant Principals AVID Coordinator Guidance Department Math/Science Coach/Resource Teacher	1.1. Math department PLC meeting agenda/minutes AVID Site team meeting agenda and minutes On-going classroom walk throughs	1.1. Enrollment Report- Geometry support classes Geometry Benchmark and mini-assessments IMS/EDW Reports
Geometry Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>By June 2013, the percentage of students scoring level 3 Geometry will increase by 5%.</i>	85% (50/59) Passed EOC	90% (59/66) Passed EOC					

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

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

					Algebra Teachers		
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.			2.1. Students requiring additional support with geometric concepts.	2.1. Identify and schedule Geometry support during extended learning (interventions). Instructional strategies include opportunities for group collaboration and elaboration	2.1. Principal Assistant Principals AVID Coordinator Guidance Department Math/Science Coach/Resource Teacher Algebra Teachers	2.1. Math department PLC meeting agenda/minutes AVID Site team meeting agenda and minutes On-going classroom walk throughs Lesson Plans	2.1. Enrollment Report- Geometry support classes Geometry Benchmark and mini-assessments IMS/EDW Reports
Geometry Goal #2: <i>By June 2013, the percentage of students scoring levels 4 and 5 in Geometry will increase by 5%.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 85% (50/59) Passed EOC	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 90% (59/66) Passed EOC					
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: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>							
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. Subgroups requiring additional support with geometric concepts.	3B.1. Identify and schedule Geometry support during extended learning (interventions).	3B.1. Principal Assistant Principals AVID Coordinator	3B.1. Math department PLC meeting agenda/minutes AVID Site team meeting agenda and minutes	3B.1. Enrollment Report- Geometry support classes Geometry Benchmark and mini-assessments
Geometry Goal #3B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

**August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011**

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

<p><i>By June 2013, the percentage of students not making in each subgroup satisfactory progress will be reduced by 10%.</i></p>	<p>White: 3% (1/38 Not Passing)</p> <p>Black: 0% (0/6) (100% passing)</p> <p>Hispanic: 0% (0/22) (100% passing)</p> <p>Asian: 0% (0/4) (100% passing)</p> <p>American Indian: n/a</p>	<p>White: 0% (0/22)</p> <p>Black:0% (0/8)</p> <p>Hispanic: 0% (0/23)</p> <p>Asian: 0% (0/5)</p> <p>American Indian/a</p>		<p>Instructional strategies include opportunities for group collaboration and elaboration</p>	<p>Guidance Department</p> <p>Math/Science Coach/Resource Teacher</p> <p>Algebra Teachers</p>	<p>On-going classroom walk throughs</p> <p>Lesson Plans</p>	<p>IMS/EDW Reports</p>
<p>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:</p>			<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>
<p>3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.</p>			<p>3C.1.</p>	<p>3C.1.</p>	<p>3C.1.</p>	<p>3C.1.</p>	<p>3C.1.</p>
<p>Geometry Goal #3C: NA.</p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p>					
<p>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:</p>			<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>
<p>3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.</p>			<p>3D.1.</p>	<p>3D.1.</p>	<p>3D.1.</p>	<p>3D.1.</p>	<p>3D.1.</p>
<p>Geometry Goal #3D: NA</p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p>					
<p>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:</p>			<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3E.1. Students requiring additional support with geometric concepts.	3E.1. Identify and schedule Geometry support during extended learning (interventions). Instructional strategies include opportunities for group collaboration and elaboration	3E.1. Principal Assistant Principals AVID Coordinator Guidance Department Math/Science Coach/Resource Teacher Algebra Teachers	3E.1. Math department PLC meeting agenda/minutes AVID Site team meeting agenda and minutes On-going classroom walk throughs Lesson Plans	3E.1. Enrollment Report- Geometry support classes Geometry Benchmark and mini-assessments IMS/EDW Reports
Geometry Goal #3E:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>By June 2013, the percentage of students not making in each subgroup satisfactory progress will be reduced by 10%.</i>	0% (0/58)	0% (0/58)					

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
Math strategies for all levels and gradual release of differentiated instruction	Grades 6-8	Jen Hartwigsen Sherry Stubbs Jeff Hartwigsen Administrative Leadership team	Math PLC (all math teachers)	Monthly beginning in September	Classroom visits / coaching	Jen Hartwigsen Jeff Hancock
AVID Strategies	Grades 6-8	Joe Miller Jeff Hancock Lisa Crangle	Math PLC (all Math teachers)	School-side	Classroom visits / coaching	Joe Miller Jeff Hancock Jen Hartwigsen
RTI process	Grades 6-8	Jen Hartwigsen Joe Miller	School-wide	Monthly beginning in October and ending in May	Classroom visits / coaching	Jen Hartwigsen Administrative Leadership team

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Math strategies for all levels and gradual release of differentiated instruction	Math materials provided through school Math materials provided through UCF	School budget	\$1000.00

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

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

AVID strategies	AVID materials from district and AVID Summer Institute		
Subtotal:\$1000.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA			
Subtotal: \$0			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Math strategies for all levels and gradual release of differentiated instruction	Math materials provided through school Math materials provided through UCF	School budget	\$1000.00
AVID strategies	AVID materials from district and AVID Summer Institute	n/a	\$ 0.00
Subtotal:\$1000.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA			
Subtotal:			
Total: \$2000.00			

End of Mathematics Goals

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. Implementation of new Fusion Science Curriculum.	1A.1. Incorporate differentiation strategies to increase student engagement and meet diverse needs of students.	1A.1. Principal Assistant Principals Math/Science Coach	1A.1. Professional Development Roster Lesson plan	1A.1. Analysis of district benchmark and FCAT assessments Ongoing formative (classroom) assessments
Science Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

<p><i>By June 2013, the percentage of students scoring level 3 will increase by 5%.</i></p>	<p>38.% (118/309)</p>	<p>41% (110/270) based on 270 in grade level</p>		<p>Structured departmental PLC to discuss curricular strategies and pacing.</p>	<p>Science Department</p>	<p>Ongoing informal classroom walkthrough and targeted feedback Weekly departmental PLC meeting agenda and minutes</p>	<p>iObservation Reports Progress Book Reports</p>
---	---------------------------	--	--	---	---------------------------	---	---

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. Providing honors/advance science courses to support number of students who perform above grade level.	2A.1. Create Master Schedule that provide advanced science courses Incorporate STEM strategies within CIA Blueprint/pacing guide Provide professional development that increase teacher growth in science strands and process skills <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AVID Strategies • STEM Strategies • Marzano High Probability strategies • Rigor/Relevance • Differentiated Instruction 	2A.1. Principal Assistant Principals Math/Science Coach Guidance Department Science Department	2A.1. Professional Development Roster Lesson plan Ongoing informal classroom walkthrough and targeted feedback Weekly departmental PLC meeting agenda and minutes	2A.1. Enrollment Reports Analysis of district benchmark and FCAT assessments Progress Book/SMS reports Ongoing formative (classroom) assessments iObservation Reports Progress Book Reports
Science Goal #2A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>By June 2013, the percentage of students scoring levels 4 and 5 will increase by 5%.</i>	13.9% (43/309)	15% (41/270) based on 270 in grade level					

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

Biology 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Biology 1 Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
NA							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Biology 1 Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
NA							

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Student Performance Effective Science Practices	Grades 6-8	PLC Facilitator	Science Department	On-going Weekly scheduled	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional Development Rosters Professional Development Agenda and Minutes iObservation Reports/Teacher Evaluation Lesson Plans 	Principal Assistant Principals Curriculum Resource Teachers Science Departmental Chair
Instructional Management System	Grades 6-8	Champion Co-Champion	Science Department	During Pre-Planning As Needed at PLC (Monthly)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agenda/Minutes Data PLCs Daub Data Discussions (Quarterly Review) 	Principal Assistant Principals Curriculum Resource Teachers Science Departmental Chair

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
Science Strategies and Best Practices	Publisher-provided materials	None	\$ 0.00

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

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

Subtotal: \$0.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA			
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Science Strategies and Best Practices	Publisher-provided materials	None	\$ 500.00
Subtotal: \$500.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA			
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Total: \$500.00			

End of Science Goals

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. Inconsistent focus on writing instruction across content areas	1A.1. Utilize common core black belt team as teacher leaders to increase writing focus in all content areas. Incorporate writing focus in language arts instructional focus calendar. Collaboration between language arts and content area teachers team meetings.	1A.1. Principal Assistant Principals CRT/Reading Coach Common Core ELA Black Belt Team Language Arts Department Core/Elective Teachers	1A.1. Professional Development Roster Lesson Plans Weekly departmental and grade level PLC meeting agendas and minutes Ongoing informal classroom walkthrough and targeted feedback	1A.1. School Performance Data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing Prompts grades 6-8 • Orange Writes! iObservation Reports
Writing Goal #1A: <i>By June 2013, the percentage of students scoring 3.0 and higher will increase by 5%.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	90.3% (252/279)	95% (265/279)					

**August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011**

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

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Writing Strategies	Grades 6-8	Jen Hartwigsen	School-wide	Monthly beginning is September through PLC's – ending in May	Classroom visits / coaching	Jen Hartwigsen Administrative Leadership team
RTI process	Grades 6-8	Jen Hartwigsen Joe Miller	School-wide	Monthly beginning in October and ending in May	Classroom visits / coaching	Jen Hartwigsen Administrative Leadership team
AVID Strategies	Grades 6-8	Joe Miller Lisa Crangle	School-wide	Monthly beginning September and ending in May	Classroom visits / coaching	Joe Miller Lisa Crangle Administrative Leadership team

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Writing Strategies	School -provided and teacher provided materials	School budget	\$ 500.00
RTI process	School-provided materials	School budget	\$500.00
			Subtotal: \$1000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA			
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
AVID strategies	Materials provided by school and AVID Summer Institute	School budget	\$ 100.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA			

**August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011**

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

Subtotal: \$0.00
Total: \$0.00

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

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
NA						

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

End of Civics Goals

**August 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:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
NA							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
NA							

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
NA						

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

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

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

End of U.S. History Goals

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

**August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011**

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

1. Attendance			1.1. Mobility rate above 25%.	1.1. Follow district/state Attendance policy and protocols. Implement intervention strategies to increase attendance rate. Provide referrals to resources to assist with parenting and/or social services	1.1. Principal Assistant Principals Social worker Guidance Counselors	1.1. Monitoring of attendance letters and social worker referrals Monitoring of attendance related meetings Monitoring of referral provided to parents.	1.1. SMS/ Progress Book Attendance Reports	
Attendance Goal #1: <i>By June 2013, the percentage of students with excessive absences and tardies of 10 or more days will be reduced by 5%.</i>	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u> 94.50% (798/845) present	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u> 95% (803/845) present						
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u> 32% (269/845)	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u> 30% (255/845)						
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u> 8% (68/845)	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u> 7% (62/845)						
			1.2. Influx of families from outside the state/country	1.2. Provide attendance policy and protocol to families at registration. If available, provide information translated in native language. Invite families to participate in school events and provide translators as a support for the family.	1.2. Principal Assistant Principals Core/Elective Teachers	1.2. Track the number of school events that provide translation services. Track the percentage of school communications sent to families translated.	1.2. EDW Reports SMS Reports Progress Book Reports	

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
RTI process	Grades 6-8	Jen Hartwigsen Joe Miller	School-wide	Monthly beginning in October and ending in May	Classroom visits /coaching	Jen Hartwigsen Administrative Leadership team

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
RTI process	School materials	School budget	\$100.00
			Subtotal: \$100.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA			
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
RTI process	School materials	School budget	\$100.00
			Subtotal: \$100.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Total: \$0.00

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

End of Attendance Goals

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. Inconsistency of school-wide and classroom behavioral expectations	1.1. Document all levels 2 through 4 offences in SMS. Analyze referral trends and devise proactive approach to extinguish disciplinary concerns. Develop Behavior RtI model Review Code of Conduct expectation on in Fall/Winter.	1.1. Principal Assistant Principals Administrative Resource Teacher/Dean	1.1. Quarterly review of discipline statistics	1.1. EDW Quarterly Reports
Suspension Goal #1:	2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions					
	8	7					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School					
	1% (8/869)	1% (7/869)					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	273	259					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School					
	17% (149/869)	16% (141/869)					

Suspension Professional Development

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
RTI process	Grades 6-8	Jen Hartwigsen Joe Miller	School-wide	Monthly beginning in October and ending in May	Classroom visits /coaching	Jen Hartwigsen Administrative Leadership team

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
RTI process	School materials	School budget	\$100.00
			Subtotal: \$100.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA			
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
RTI process	School materials	School budget	\$100.00
			Subtotal: \$100.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: \$200.00

End of Suspension Goals

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Dropout Prevention			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
<u>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</u> <i>By June 2013, the number of students retained in grades 6-8 will be reduced by 5%.</i>	<u>2012 Current Dropout Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*</u>	11% or 16 out of the 149 retained students have been retained twice.	1.1. Create Master Schedule that provides opportunities for course recovery. Follow district's Pupil Progression Plan Early identification and placement of students in appropriate courses.	1.1. Principal Assistant Principals CRT/Reading Coach Math/Science Coach CCT Resource Teacher Staffing Specialist Guidance Department	1.1. On-going monitoring of course failures RtI agenda/meeting minutes Report cards	1.1. Course Recovery Tracking Document Progress Book/SMS reports Compass Learning Reports Analysis of FCAT/CELLA/Benchmark Assessments
	17% (149/845)	17% (142/845)					
	<u>2012 Current Graduation Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*</u>					
	83% (701/845)	83% (703/845)					

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
NA						

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
Extended Learning classroom	Two hours per week of extended learning built in as a class, fluid in nature, based on data points every two –to-three weeks on	None	\$0

**August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011**

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

	standards in Math, Reading, Writing, and Science.		
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA			
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA			
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA			
Subtotal:			
Total: \$0.00			

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement	1.1. Lack of monitoring the	1.1. Track attendance of curricular	1.1. Principal	1.1. Sign In rosters	1.1. Parent Surveys

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>Legacy will increase the number of parents who participate in school sponsored activities such as School Advisory Council (SAC), Parent Teacher Association (PTA), and Parent Leadership Council (PLC), by 5%.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>	amount of parent involvement in planned school events.	events and Open house. Communicate in a variety ways such as through School Messenger, postings on website, school and teacher newsletters and flyers.	Media Specialist Departmental/Elective Teachers ADDitions/ Partners in Education Coordinator	School Messenger Report 5 Star Evidence Golden School Evidence	Sign In Rosters School Message Log
	<i>60% of families involved in at least 2 events per year.</i>	<i>70% of families involved in at least two events per year</i>					
			1.2. Lack of translation services for the growing ELL population.	1.2. Plan to have brochures and flyers translated prior to distribution Plan to have at least 2 bi-lingual personnel available during events to meet parent needs. Communicate in a variety of ways such School Messenger, postings on website, school and teacher newsletters and flyers.	1.2. Principal Assistant Principals CCT Resource Teacher	1.2. Recruit instructional personnel to volunteer for translations	1.2. Monitor amount of communication going home translated Parent Surveys Sign in Rosters

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
NA						

Parent Involvement Budget

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Parent flyers	Paper	School budget	\$300.00
			Subtotal: \$300.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA			

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

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

			Subtotal: \$0
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA			
			Subtotal: \$0
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA			
			Subtotal: \$0
			Total: \$300.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<p>STEM Goal #1:</p> <p><i>By June 2013, initiate a STEM PLC to guide implementation.</i></p>	<p>1.1. Determine how to integrate STEM related activities in Math, Science and elective courses.</p>	<p>1.1. Develop partnerships with STEM related professionals to assist with implementation support.</p> <p>Explore professional development opportunities on and off campus.</p> <p>Explore how to integrate technology within curricular standards.</p> <p>Explore and design STEM focus calendar.</p>	<p>1.1. Principal</p> <p>Assistant Principals</p> <p>Math/Science Coach/Resource Teacher</p> <p>STEM Coordinator</p> <p>STEM Academic Teams</p>	<p>1.1. Professional Development log</p> <p>Lesson Plans</p> <p>Planned Stem-related events</p> <p>Tracking volunteer/mentor hours of Stem professionals.</p>	<p>1.1 Partnership Log</p> <p>2013 – 2014 Planning Calendar</p> <p>2013- 2014 Professional Development Plan</p> <p>2013- 2014 STEM Focus Calendar</p>

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
Academic STEM teams	Grades 6-8	Lisa Crangle Joe Miller	Academic Team meeting Department meetings	Monthly beginning in September and ending in May	Classroom visits / coaching	Principal Assistant Principals STEM Coordinator Math/Science Coach/Resource Teacher

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
STEM Team AVID strategies	School materials	None	none
			Subtotal: \$0
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Website and PDS learning	Computers	None (existing in classrooms)	none
			Subtotal: \$0
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
AVID strategies as they relate to problem solving – tutorials.	School materials	None	none
			Subtotal: \$0
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
None	None	None	none
			Subtotal: \$0
			Total: \$0

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: By June 2013, initiate a Career and Technical Education PLC to guide implementation.	1.1. Determine how to integrate CTE related activities within academic calendar.	1.1. Develop partnerships with CTE related professionals to assist with implementation support. Explore professional development opportunities on and off campus.	1.1. Principal Assistant Principals Curriculum Resource Teachers Guidance Department	1.1. Leadership Team Agenda/minutes	1.1. 2013 – 2014 Master Schedule 2013 – 2014 Planning Calendar

CTE Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
CTE Integration Research Activities	Grades 6-8	Principal Assistant Principals	NA	On-going	Scheduled Administrative Team Meetings	Principal Assistant Principals

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
NA			
			Subtotal:\$0.00

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

Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA			
			Subtotal:\$0
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No data			
			Subtotal:
			Total: \$0

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Additional Goal #1: Fine Arts Enrollment			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
			Reducing the percentage of students who require remedial coursework	Professional Development • AVID Strategies • Common Core • Marzano High Probability Strategies • ELL/ESE Strategies	Principal Assistant Principals CRT/Reading Coach Resource Teacher Math/Science	Professional development logs Weekly departmental PLC meeting agenda/minutes	Enrollment Reports Analysis of district benchmark, FCAT and mini-assessments Progress Book/SMS reports
Additional Goal #1:	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
<i>By June 2013, increase the percentage of students participating in fine arts programs such as Art,</i>	59% (495/845)	62% (520/845)					

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

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

<i>Chorus, and/or band by 5%.</i>				Structure extended learning (intervention) to close gaps as measured by FAIR/benchmarks	Coach/Resource Teacher Reading and Math Department		
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	
Additional Goal #2: Enrollment and Performance in Advanced Programs		1.1. Increasing percentage of students who perform at levels 4 and 5 as measured by FCAT in Reading, Mathematics and Science.	1.1. Professional Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AVID Strategies • Increase rigor and relevance • Common Core • Marzano High Probability Strategies Structure extended learning (intervention) to include support for honors/high school courses.	1.1. Principal Assistant Principals CRT/Reading Coach/Resource Teacher Math/Science Coach/Resource Teacher Guidance Department	1.1. Professional development logs Weekly departmental PLC meeting agenda/minutes	1.1. Enrollment Reports Analysis of district benchmark, FCAT and EOC assessments Progress Book/SMS reports	
Additional Goal #2:	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>					
<i>By June 30, 2016, increase enrollment and performance in advanced programs by 5%.</i>	48% <i>(409/845)</i>	51% <i>(430/845)</i>					
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	
Additional Goal #3: Closing Achievement Gaps between subgroups		1.1. Lack of focus on	1.1. Provide professional	1.1. Principal	1.1. PLC Agenda/Minutes	1.1. IMS Reports	

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

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

Additional Goal #3:			disaggregating data to monitor progress of subgroups.	development from on structuring PLC teams for data analysis.	Assistant Principals	Professional development rosters	Edusoft Reports
By June 30, 2016, decrease the achievement gap for each subgroup by 5% as measured by FCAT.		White: 77% (161\207) Proficient		Champion and Co-Champion provide professional development in the Instructional Management System (IMS)	CRT/Reading Coach/Resource Teacher		
		Black: 27% (64\126)	Black:26% (67\126)	Schedule and structure PLC meetings to focus on FCIM-review data, plan instructional strategies, check progress and remediate.	Math/Science Coach/Resource Teacher		
		Hispanic: 25% 239\450	Hispanic: 24% (251\450)		Staffing Specialist		
		Asian: 1% (31\38)	Asian: 1% (33\38)				
		American Ind: (2\6)	American Indian: 1% (3\6)				
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
Additional Goal #4: College and Career Awareness			1.1. Less than 100% of faculty trained in AVID and STEM related strategies.	1.1. Budget funding to send instructors to AVID Summer Institute	1.1. Principal Assistant Principals	1.1. AVID site team and departmental PLC agenda and minutes	1.1. Enrollment reports
Additional Goal #4:		<u>2012 Current Level</u> :*	<u>2013 Expected Level</u> :*				
By June 2013, increase the percentage of courses that utilizes AVID and/or STEM strategies by 5%.		46% <i>(128\278)</i>	48% <i>(135\278)</i>	Collaborate with community partners to develop STEM implementation	CRT/Reading Coach	Professional development log	
		Courses with AVID/STEM strategies	Courses with AVID/STEM strategies		Math/Science Coach/Resource Teacher		
					STEM Coordinator		
					AVID Coordinator		
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
Additional Goal #5: Decrease Disproportionate Classification in Special Education			1.1. Parents coming into school requesting 504/IEP/Testing and other services provide under IDEA	1.1. Conduct meeting with parents and explain the RtI process and other appropriate measures to meet the child's need with the least restrictive methodology.	1.1. Principal Assistant Principal	1.1. RtI Committee	1.1. SMS ESE Classification Report
Additional Goal #5:		<u>2012 Current Level</u> :*	<u>2013 Expected Level</u> :*				
					LEA/RtI Coordinator	Agenda/Minutes	

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

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

<i>By June 2013, decrease the percentage of students disproportionately classified in Special Education by 5%.</i>	13% (108/845)	12% (102/845)			ESE Department	ESE Meeting Notes from PEER	
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
Additional Goal #6: Increase enrollment in high school courses			1.1. Increasing the percentage of students who meet the minimum performance requirement for enrollment as measured by FCAT.	1.1. Professional Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common Core Math expectations • Increased rigor • AVID Strategies • Thinking Maps Increased parent communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awareness of High School Magnets • Course availability and expectations 	1.1. Principal Assistant Principals Guidance Department Science Department Math Department	1.1. Weekly departmental PLC agenda/minutes Academic Team meetings	1.1. Enrollment report Analysis of FCAT and EOC data results
Additional Goal #6:	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>					
<i>By June 2013, increase the percentage of students enrolled in high school courses by 5%.</i>	17% (142/845) <i>Enrolled in Algebra, Geometry, and/or Earth/Space Honors Science</i>	18% (149/845)					

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	Grade	PD Facilitator	PD Participants	Target Dates (e.g. , Early	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for

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

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

and/or PLC Focus	Level/Subject	and/or PLC Leader	(e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)		Monitoring
RTI process	Grades 6-8	Jen Hartwigsen Joe Miller	School-wide	Monthly beginning in October and ending in May	Classroom visits / coaching	Jen Hartwigsen Administrative Leadership team
AVID Strategies	Grades 6-8	Joe Miller Lisa Crangle	School-wide	Monthly beginning September and ending in May	Classroom visits / coaching	Joe Miller Lisa Crangle Administrative Leadership team

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

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

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	Total: \$700.00
CELLA Budget	Total: \$ 300.00
Mathematics Budget	Total: \$2000.00
Science Budget	Total: \$500.00
Writing Budget	Total: \$0.00
Civics Budget	Total: \$ 0.00
U.S. History Budget	Total: \$ 0.00
Attendance Budget	Total:\$ 200.00
Suspension Budget	Total:\$ 200.00
Dropout Prevention Budget	Total: \$ 0.00
Parent Involvement Budget	Total:\$ 300.00
STEM Budget	Total:\$0.00
CTE Budget	Total: \$ 00.00
Additional Goals	Total: \$ 3000.00
	Grand Total: \$8,200.00

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	Total: \$700.00
CELLA Budget	Total: \$ 300.00
Mathematics Budget	Total: \$2000.00
Science Budget	Total: \$500.00
Writing Budget	Total: \$0.00
Civics Budget	Total: \$ 1000.00
U.S. History Budget	Total: \$ 0.00
Attendance Budget	Total:\$ 200.00
Suspension Budget	Total:\$ 200.00
Dropout Prevention Budget	Total: \$ 0.00
Parent Involvement Budget	Total:\$ 300.00
STEM Budget	Total:\$0.00
CTE Budget	Total: \$ 200.00

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

Additional Goals	
	Total: \$ 3000.00
	\$9,400.00
	Grand Total:

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		
<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent

Are you reward school? Yes No

(A reward school is any school that has improved their letter grade from the previous year or any A graded school.)

- 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.
The School Advisory Council (SAC) will meet monthly to discuss school related topics such as the School Improvement Plan (SIP), Budget updates, Parent and Student Surveys, Destination College. The SAC committee is composed of school parents, a member of the community, and school staff members. The Committee will work together to discuss

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

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

decisions that are in the best interest of the school and the students.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
We project that we will use SAC funds to train SAC members in data use, and will use SAC funds to support Professional Learning explained in the School Improvement Plan.	\$3000.00