

# 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: Winter Park High School	District Name: Orange
Principal: Timothy A. Smith	Superintendent: Dr. Barbara Jenkins
SAC Chair: Gary Barker	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.

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	Timothy A. Smith	Business Education Social Studies Middle Grades Endorsement Administration BS in Business Administration MS in Social Science Education	2	17	2011-2012 School Grade A, Lowest 25% made 63% Learning Gains in Reading and 64% Learning Gains in Math 2010-2011 Winter Park High School graded A Lowest 25% made 45% Learning Gains in Reading and 59% Learning Gains in Math 2005-2010 Freedom Middle School graded A each of the five years. Lowest 25% above 50% learning gains each year 2005 Howard Middle School graded B. Lowest 25% above 50% learning gains each year

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

					2001-2004 Howard Middle School graded C each year 2000 Howard Middle School graded D For more specific school data see the Florida State DOE website																														
Assistant Principal	David Stanley	Administration Supervision, Social Studies,	17	27	2011-2012 School Grade A, Lowest 25% made 63% Learning Gains in Reading and 64% Learning Gains in Math 2010-2011 Winter Park High School graded A Lowest 25% made 45% Learning Gains in Reading and 59% Learning Gains in Math A or B grade for the past 10 years, fifty percent or more of the lowest 25% have met learning gains for 6 out of the 10 past years.																														
Assistant Principal	Dusty Johns	Physical Education Athletic Coach Educational Leadership	3	3	2011-2012 School Grade A, Lowest 25% made 63% Learning Gains in Reading and 64% Learning Gains in Math 2010-2011 Winter Park High School graded A Lowest 25% made 45% Learning Gains in Reading and 59% Learning Gains in Math																														
Assistant Principal	Saraya Miller	English Educational Leadership	1	1	2011-2012 School Grade A, Lowest 25% made 63% Learning Gains in Reading and 64% Learning Gains in Math 2010-2011 Winter Park High School graded A Lowest 25% made 45% Learning Gains in Reading and 59% Learning Gains in Math																														
Assistant Principal	Paul Maldonado	Elementary Ed, BA ED Leadership, M Ed ESOL K-12 Math 5-9	1	3	2011-2012 School Grade A, Lowest 25% made 63% Learning Gains in Reading and 64% Learning Gains in Math East River High School- Improved from a "D" to a "C" school. <table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">2009-2010</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2010-2011</td> </tr> <tr> <td>School Grade:</td> <td style="text-align: center;">D</td> <td style="text-align: center;">C</td> </tr> <tr> <td>AYP:</td> <td style="text-align: center;">59%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">62%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Point Gain:</td> <td style="text-align: center;">432</td> <td style="text-align: center;">443 Only including 8 cat.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>L 25% Math:</td> <td style="text-align: center;">53%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">55%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>L 25% Reading:</td> <td style="text-align: center;">42%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">41%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS Math:</td> <td style="text-align: center;">69%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">69%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS Reading:</td> <td style="text-align: center;">45%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">46%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Science:</td> <td style="text-align: center;">30%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">34%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Writing:</td> <td style="text-align: center;">82%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">81%</td> </tr> </table> Avalon Middle School- Maintained an "A" school status for the past 5 years.		2009-2010	2010-2011	School Grade:	D	C	AYP:	59%	62%	Point Gain:	432	443 Only including 8 cat.	L 25% Math:	53%	55%	L 25% Reading:	42%	41%	HS Math:	69%	69%	HS Reading:	45%	46%	Science:	30%	34%	Writing:	82%	81%
	2009-2010	2010-2011																																	
School Grade:	D	C																																	
AYP:	59%	62%																																	
Point Gain:	432	443 Only including 8 cat.																																	
L 25% Math:	53%	55%																																	
L 25% Reading:	42%	41%																																	
HS Math:	69%	69%																																	
HS Reading:	45%	46%																																	
Science:	30%	34%																																	
Writing:	82%	81%																																	
Assistant Principal	Wilma Baez-Flores	ED Leadership, M Ed	1	1	New Assistant Principal																														

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

Assistant Principal	Maureen Scanlan	BA English/Language Arts MA ED Leadership NBCT English/Language Arts English 5-9 English 6-12 Ed Leadership K-12	14	1	New Assistant Principal
---------------------	-----------------	---	----	---	-------------------------

### 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	Elizabeth Frawley McClure	BA.MS., Ed.S/Reading, ESOL, Ed. Leadership, Ele. Ed.	4	11	2011-2012 School Grade A, Lowest 25% made 63% Learning Gains in Reading and 64% Learning Gains in Math in 2011-2012. A or B grade for the past 4 years. 50% or more of the lowest 25% have met learning gains for 2 of the past 4 yrs.
Inclusion Coach	Anne Kerben	ESE pre-k -12 Master's in counseling and psychology –guidance certified k-12	9 years	3 years	2011-2012 School Grade A, Lowest 25% made 63% Learning Gains in Reading and 64% Learning Gains in Math in 2011-2012. A or B grade for the past 4 years. 50% or more of the lowest 25% have met learning gains for 2 of the past 4 yrs.

### Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

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

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

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	Mentors, Lead Teachers, Instructional Coach	6/14/12
2. Beginning Teacher Meetings	Instructional Coach	6/14/12
3. PLC Collaboration	PLC Facilitators	6/14/12
4. Curriculum Celebrations	Curriculum Resource Teacher/ Literacy Coach	6/14/12
5. Professional Development	Curriculum Resource Teacher/ Literacy Coach	6/14/12

***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 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
9 instructional staff members.	<p>Completing ESOL Endorsement classes.</p> <p>Completing the reading endorsement.</p> <p>School based professional development which includes, “Ruby Payne: A Framework for Understanding Poverty”</p> <p>School based professional development which includes, “The Art and Science of Teaching” Book Study.</p> <p>Participating in school based professional development which includes the Beginning Teacher Program</p>

***Staff Demographics***

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

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

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

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

Total number of Instructional Staff	% of first-year teachers	% of teachers with 1-5 years of experience	% of teachers with 6-14 years of experience	% of teachers with 15+ years of experience	% of teachers with Advanced Degrees	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
187	3%	20%	42%	35%	48%	95%	7%	13%	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
Lynn Carlyle	Mark Schellhammer	Expert teacher matched with like content beginning teacher	Observations, conferencing on a regular basis, beginning teacher meetings, completion of beginning teacher portfolio.
Stacy Julian	Daniel Johnson	Expert teacher matched with like content beginning teacher	Observations, conferencing on a regular basis.
Amanda Stewart	Sarah Austin	Expert teacher matched with like content beginning teacher	Observations, conferencing on a regular basis, beginning teacher meetings, completion of beginning teacher portfolio.
Mary Boergers	Evangeline Dunbar	Expert teacher matched with like content beginning teacher	Observations, conferencing on a regular basis.
David Haynes	Abraham Jackson	Expert teacher matched with like content beginning teacher	Observations, conferencing on a regular basis, beginning teacher meetings, completion of beginning teacher portfolio.
Cathy Hurn	Brett Schlosser	Expert teacher matched with like content beginning teacher	Observations, conferencing on a regular basis, beginning teacher meetings, completion of beginning teacher portfolio.
Vivan Ivey	Thuc Truong, Megan Sample, Christine Bleu	Expert teacher matched with like content beginning teacher	Observations, conferencing on a regular basis, beginning teacher meetings, completion of beginning teacher portfolio.

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

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

Other  
**NA**



**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
<p>Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.            Tim Smith, Principal            Maureen Scanlan, Assistant Principal, RtI contact            Wilma Baez-Flores Assistant Principal,            David Stanley, Senior Administrator, 9th grade center            Paul Maldonado, Assistant Principal, 9th grade center            Dusty Johns, Assistant Principal            Elisa Mora, Testing Coordinator            Faith Cotter, RtI Contact and ASL teacher            Demetrious Summerville, Chill Counselor            Betsy McClure, Literacy Coach            Rafalar Lynch, Curriculum Resource Teacher            Ann Kerben, Inclusion Coach            Tanya Alvarado, Chill coordinator            Chris Emig, Safe Coordinator            Brandon Rouhlac, Interim Technology Coordinator,            Professional Learning Committee Coordinators/Curriculum Leaders as designed by referral process</p>
<p>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 leadership team meeting focus is based on the essential question: How do we develop and maintain a support system that will increase student achievement and overall school performance? The team meets regularly to review referral needs by reviewing data and differentiate or modify instructional decisions; reviewing progress monitoring data to determine effectiveness of interventions. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources. The team will also collaborate regularly to problem solve, share researched based best practices, evaluate implementation, modify instruction and provide remediation if necessary. This team collaborates with guidance, staffing specialists, AVID, School Social Worker, School Psychologist, School Nurse, ESE Teachers, Curriculum Leaders, Resource Officers, SAFE Coordinator and CHILL Counselors to provide a full spectrum of support. Support received from district led professional development in the problem solving process will reinforce the RtI implementation.</p>
<p>Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?            The MTSS Leadership Team members, who are part of the School Advisory Council, will help develop and implement the SIP. The Team will review student achievement data; academic and social-emotional areas that may need to be addressed; and clear expectations for instruction (rigor, relevance, relationships); to ensure a systematic approach to teaching is developed and supported by the SIP.</p>
MTSS Implementation
<p>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: Florida Assessment in Reading (FAIR), Benchmark Data, Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) EOC            Progress Monitoring: FAIR, Curriculum based measurement(formative and summative) Benchmark Data, Mini Assessments            End of Year: FAIR, FCAT, EOC            English Language Learning, Assessment (CELLA),</p>

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

Benchmark Data All data will be made available to teachers via the district's Instructional Management System and examined/analyzed in professional development and PLC groups on a regular basis. Students in subgroups as well as the lowest 30% will be targeted for interventions. PLC groups will collaborate regarding instruction for Tier 1 students as well as interventions needed for Tier 2 and 3 students.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Members of the MTSS attended a national conference on RtI and developed an action plan for our school. Members of this Team provided an overview of the RtI process to all staff during preplanning. During the school year this process will be reinforced to instructional staff via small group professional development during teachers' common planning time and small sessions throughout the year. The Team will evaluate additional staff professional development needs during the year.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The goal is to create a systematic process that ensures every child receives the additional time and support needed to learn at high levels. The MTSS Team developed a Three – Tier Academic Intervention plan as well as a Three – Tier Behavior Intervention Plan, that was distributed and reviewed with all staff.

### *Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)*

#### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).

Winter Park High School has a Literacy Leadership team comprised of 25 teachers and administration from both campuses, representing all content areas.

Our June, 2012 revision team included:

Joanne Pryor and Lisa Nix-Powers, Media Specialists

Rafalar Lynch and Betsy McClure, CRT/Literacy Coaches

Ben Fottler, ESOL English Instructor

Penny Steffey, Math instructor

Stewart Parker, Social Science instructor

Zoraida Velez, Social Science instructor

Deborah Kline, World Languages

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).

We are currently in the *implementation* stage, after having *developed* our 3 core implementation maps in 2010, and revised same in 2011 & 2012. These are the result of collaboration between our school, district, and state levels addressing literacy strategies within all core content areas as an avenue to deliver school wide literacy instruction for all students

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?

The major initiatives of the LLT are to promote literacy across all content areas by implementing a school-wide literacy plan and support interdisciplinary literacy instruction, as outlined below.

October 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

School wide literacy plan:

Action Step	Timeline (target date)	Lead Person(s)	Resources Needed	Specifics of Implementation	Measures of Success
Each department will discuss and outline a plan of how to recognize student work and celebrate student success through PLC.	October-April.	PLCs- Lisa Nix, Joanne Pryor	Hallway showcases Internet & electronic sharing-Announcements Misty Gentile Tech Asst. at main and SGA at ninth campus	Displays in media center, front office, Intranet and Internet. Student work displayed and rotated on a regular basis Student spotlights in weekly announcement Poetry Slam Poetry Out Loud	Student work displayed and rotated. Monthly. Students recognized during weekly announcements. Electronic sharing through wikis, podcasts, videos, etc.
Continue to provide opportunities for all students to engage in authentic literacy experiences.	Year long	classrooms clubs media centers	Publications Dens Club and teacher sponsors Provide samples of authentic literacy experiences.	Electronic Literacy Corner Contribute to school newspapers Club service project Community writing/reading projects Book talks/Dens/Read Alouds Monthly genres of literature highlighted in media centers Author visits/workshops	Club service projects displayed Curriculum Celebrations Student work displayed
Continue to support goals for student reading.	On-going, year long	Everyone	All resources in place	AR Goals Florida Teen Reads Dens/Book talks Real Men Read program	Media center circulation AR and standardized test scores End of year celebration of Real Men Read Student grades increase

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

Supporting interdisciplinary literacy instruction:

Action Step	Timeline (target date)	Lead Person(s)	Resources Needed	Specifics of Implementation	Measures of Success
All teachers will examine student literacy data.	On-going	Resource teachers Classroom teachers	Informal assessment by dept. FCAT , Benchmark FAIR data IMS	Professional development: looking at data to inform instruction  After reviewing student data teachers will determine literacy needs of their students  Use of this data can support flexible grouping	Teachers documentation of students' strengths and weaknesses  IPDP  Student achievement
All teachers will provide assignments that are relevant and meaningful to students.	November -June	Media Specialist	Technology training	Lesson review - relate to current events, prior knowledge, personal experience, and/or other content areas.  Creation of lessons that include podcasts, goggle docs, web pages, online surveys, wikis, Prezis, etc.	Student engagement  Student evaluation
All teachers will participate in swap sessions and/or demonstration classrooms to observe and share relevant lessons that include higher order thinking.	October -April	Resource teachers	Teacher leaders Time	Solicit teacher volunteers to host demonstration classrooms or share lesson/s  Curriculum celebration each semester  Demonstration classrooms throughout the year	Teachers attendance & participation  Document implementation of strategies
Teachers will have an opportunity to see examples of lessons that provide student	November -June	Dept. Chairs, Resource Teachers	Sample lessons that demonstrate choice	Share ideas with peers  Write lessons that incorporate choice	Increase number of assignments that include student choice  Assessment shows mastery of topic

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

choice and develop a lesson that incorporates student choice.					
---	--	--	--	--	--

***Public School Choice***

- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**

*Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.*

***\*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition***

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

**NA**

***\*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?

**NA**

***\*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?

Dual Enrollment, AVID, AP and IB classes prepare students for college.  
 ROTC coursework prepares students for enlistment in the armed services.  
 Other Electives offered are: John Merlet (Drafting and Engineering) / Arlene Palumbo (Culinary) / Web Design / English II Standard w/ World History. Each of these course pathways help students to see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future, helping them to be prepared upon graduation to enter the workforce with certification, enlistment into the armed services or college entrance.

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?

Students will meet with their Guidance Counselor at least twice a year to assist them with the direction that is needed for them to be successful throughout their high school career. Guidance Counselors continuously review student schedules to meet graduation and student-goal requirements.

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

The College and Career Resource Center is an additional resource for students where they receive assistance and information regarding college, careers, skills needed, how to develop the skills, and finances.

PSAT data is examined and used as a guide for course selection and college/career guidelines. Ninth grade study skills classes complete a college/career unit including field trips to postsecondary institutions.

### *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](#).

College and Career Resource Center: The College and Career Center's focus is to assist students with College and University readiness, including assistance with SAT, ACT and college applications. This center also focuses on Career Preparation which includes student training in resume and interview skills and guidance regarding military careers. Students attend a College and Career Fair in which post-secondary educational institutions and local employers send representatives to meet with students during the school day.

**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
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.</b>			1A.1. Historically bubble students (high level 2 and low level 3 scorers) drop taking the 10 <sup>th</sup> grade FCAT.	1A.1. Identify bubble students and ensure that their teachers are adding rigor to all content area instruction to support learners.	1A.1. Classroom teachers Supervising Administrator Reading Coach	1A.1. monitoring of teacher lesson plans and materials Teachers monitoring student performance through informal assessments	1A.1. Student work samples demonstrating mastery, benchmark assessments
Reading Goal #1A: By June 2013, 24% (378) of our students will score level 3 on FCAT Reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	In July, 2012 21% (330) of our students scored level 3.	In June, 2013, 24% (378) of our students will score level 3 on FCAT Reading.					
			1A.2.	1A.2. Expect that teachers are matching students' lexile levels to text lexile levels. Exposing students to more informational text and utilizing instructional reading strategies for accessing same will be implemented, along with efficient reading of technical	1A.2. Classroom teachers Supervising Administrator, Reading Coach	1A.2. Monitoring of teacher lesson plans and materials Teachers monitoring student performance through informal assessments	1A.2. Common assessments, student work, Benchmark assessments



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

			print.			
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.</b>			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Reading Goal #1B:  NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	NA	NA				
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.</b>			2A.1. Due to the increased rigor of the 10 <sup>th</sup> grade FCAT, bubble students (high level 3 and low level 4) scores drop.	2A.1. Provide ongoing enrichment activities for students in daily classroom lessons.  Utilize ongoing data chats between teachers and students.	2A.1. Supervising Administrator, Reading Coach, Classroom teacher	2A.1. Classroom walkthroughs, Monitoring of teacher lesson plans and materials Teachers monitoring student performance through informal assessments	2A.1. Benchmark assessments, common assessments, unit tests
<u>Reading Goal #2A:</u>  By June 2013, 46% (714) will score at Level 4 and 5 on FCAT Reading.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>  In June, 2012, 44% (700) of students scored at level 4 and 5 on FCAT Reading.	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>  By June, 2013, 46% (714) will score at Level 4 and 5 for FCAT Reading.					
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.</b>			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
<u>Reading Goal #2B:</u>  NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>  NA	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>  NA					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</b>  <b>Reading Goal #3A:</b>  By June 2013, 65% (1060) of students will make learning gains on FCAT Reading.			3A.1. Lack of student motivation and/or stamina to make learning gains.	3A.1. Ensure teachers are using instructional strategies (Personal Assisted Learning Strategies; P.A.L.S.) that incorporate motivation and scaffold rigorous activities to support student success. Data Chats.	3A.1. Administration Reading and /or Instructional Coach	3A.1. Informal assessing by classroom teacher to adjust instruction Formal assessments	3A.1. Informal and formal assessments Increased student scores		
			2012 Current Level of Performance: * In July 2012, 62% (1012) of students made learning gains on FCAT Reading.	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * By June 2013, 65% (1060) of students will make learning gains on FCAT Reading.	3A.2. Text complexity increases with grade level increase.	3A.2. Ensure that teachers are using appropriate lexile leveled text to support student learning. Also using more informational text and technical print as instructional tools for implementing quality reading strategies to support same. Providing students with monitoring tools to check on their own progress will also be implemented.	3A.2. Administration Reading Coaches Classroom teachers	3A.2. Classroom walkthroughs monitoring of teacher lesson plans and materials	3A.2. Student work samples demonstrating mastery, benchmark assessments, teacher developed common assessments
					3A.3. Differentiated instruction is not occurring within classrooms.	3A.3. Ensure teachers are grounded in differentiation instruction. Use the coaching cycle to support teachers with instruction and	3A.3. Administration Reading Coach Instructional Coach Classroom teacher	3A.3. Classroom walkthroughs and monitoring of teacher lesson plans and materials	3A.3. Student work samples demonstrating mastery benchmark assessment results

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

			instructional delivery.			common assessment results
<b>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</b>		3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Reading Goal #3B:  N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	NA	NA				
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<p><b>4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b></p> <p><u>Reading Goal #4:</u></p> <p>By June 2013, 63% (260) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains.</p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p> <p>In July 2012, 58% ( 232 ) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains.</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p> <p>By June 2013, 63% ( 260 ) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains.</p>	<p>4A.1. Additional intervention time for students already receiving intensive intervention in reading.</p>	<p>4A.1. Adult mentors, RtI intervention team working with students, tutoring during the school day.</p>	<p>4A.1. Principal RtI team</p>	<p>4A.1. Student survey Classroom walkthroughs</p>	<p>4A.1. Benchmark data, survey data, common assessment data, tutoring rosters</p>
			<p>4A.2. Test complexity increases with each grade level.</p>	<p>4A.2. Ensure that teachers are using appropriate lexile leveled text to support student learning. Also using more informational text and technical print as instructional tools for implementing quality reading strategies to support same. Provide students with monitoring tools to check on their own progress.</p>	<p>4A.2. Administration Reading Coach Instructional Coach Classroom teachers</p>	<p>4A.2. Classroom walkthroughs and monitoring of teacher lesson plans and materials</p>	<p>4A.2. Student work samples demonstrating mastery Benchmark assessments teacher developed common assessments</p>
			<p>4A.3. Differentiated instruction is not occurring within classrooms.</p>	<p>4A.3. Ensure teachers are grounded in differentiation instruction. Use the coaching cycle to support teachers with instruction and instructional delivery.</p>	<p>4A.3. Administration Academic Coaches</p>	<p>4A.3. Classroom walkthroughs Professional development activities on the topic of differentiation and using student data to plan for instruction for optimal student success.</p>	<p>4A.3. Classroom walkthroughs documentation Assessment results Lesson Plan and delivery of same</p>

**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
<b>55A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b> <b>Reading Goal #5A:</b> Our baseline data shows that 69% of our total population scored satisfactorily in Reading. By the year 2013 we will have 74% of our students scoring satisfactory on the Reading Assessment.	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b> 69%	5A.1. Our baseline data shows that 69% of our total population scored satisfactorily in Reading.	5A.1. By the year 2013 we will have 74% of our students scoring satisfactory on the Reading Assessment.	5A.1. By the year 2014 we will have 77% of our students scoring satisfactory on the Reading Assessment.	5A.1. By the year 2015 we will have 79% of our students scoring satisfactory on the Reading Assessment.	5A.1. By the year 2016 we will have 82% of our students scoring satisfactory on the Reading Assessment.	5A.1. By the year 2017 we will have 85% of our students scoring satisfactory on the Reading Assessment.
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	
<b>55B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b> <b>Reading Goal #5B:</b> By June 2013, The following increases will occur: White:86% Black:46% Hispanic:64% Asian:85% American Indian:N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White:83% Black:31% Hispanic:49% Asian:71% American Indian:N/A	5B.1. Teaching faculty is unaware of what student progress looks like and the implications it has on student achievement.	5B.1. Provide professional development for teachers on what student progress looks like : specifically how to "drill" down the data by student and their performance and how teachers can enhance student learning through Differentiated Instruction (DI). Data chats with students and teachers to support development of understanding of this barrier.	5B.1. Administration CRTs Inclusion coach	5B.1. Classroom walkthroughs Monitoring of student data Sample lesson plans incorporating Differentiated instruction	5B.1. Student assessment data Mini assessments Common assessments embedded within all the content area	
	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White:86% Black:46% Hispanic:64% Asian:85% American Indian:N/A						

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

		5B.2. There is a predominance of female faculty working with struggling male students.	5B.2. Provide an opportunity for students to develop positive relationships with male faculty with the continuation of "Real men Read"	5B.2. Media Specialist, selected male teachers	5B.2. Targeted mentoring Weekly discussion all male groups identified through reading courses	5B.2. Feedback from participants Sign in sheets
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5C.1. Teaching faculty is not proficient in identifying areas of improvement, i.e. What are students' strengths? weaknesses?, and the implications it has on student achievement.	5C.1. Ensure all staff is trained on identifying areas of improvement (what are students' strengths? weaknesses?) and the implications it has on student achievement.	5C.1. Administration CRT/Academic & Inclusion coach	5C.1. Classroom walkthroughs On-going conversations with students and teachers Monitoring of student data	5C.1. Student assessment data Mini assessments Common assessments Lesson Plan and delivery of same
Reading Goal #5C:  17% of the ELL subgroup will be proficient in 2013	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	12% of the ELL subgroup were proficient in 2011-2012.	17% of the ELL subgroup will be proficient in 2013.					
			5C.2. Teachers may have misconceptions about different cultures.	5C.2. Provide comprehensive training to heighten the understanding of the various programs and subgroups within our school Ruby Payne training	5C.2. Administration Academic Coaches PLCs District support as needed	5C.2. Classroom walkthroughs On-going conversations with students and teachers	5C.2. PLC response sheets, Professional development agendas and sign-in sheets
		5C.3. Systematic capacity to promote tolerance and/or change not evident	5C.3. Provide comprehensive training to heighten the understanding of the various programs and subgroups within our school: Ruby Payne training	5C.3. Administration Academic Coaches PLCs District support as needed	5C.3. Continuously work in PLCs (defined by content, grade level, and critical need student population) to promote change school wide, across all content areas	5C.3. PLC response sheets, Professional development agendas and sign-in sheets	



**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
<b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5D.1. Teachers are not incorporating differentiation in their instructional delivery model.	5D.1. Provide professional development for teachers on how teachers can enhance student learning through Differentiated Instruction (DI). Data chats with students and teachers to support development student growth.	5D.1. Administration Academic Coaches	5D.1. Classroom walkthroughs	5D.1. Classroom walkthroughs documentation Assessment results Lesson Plans
<u>Reading Goal #5D:</u> 39% of the SWD subgroup will be proficient in 2013.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 34% of the SWD subgroup was proficient in 2011-2012.	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 39% of the SWD subgroup will be proficient in 2013.					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5E.1. Teachers are not incorporating differentiation in their instructional delivery model.	5E.1 Provide professional development for teachers on how teachers can enhance student learning through Differentiated Instruction (DI). Data chats with students and teachers to support development student growth.	5E.1. Principal Assistant Principals Academic Coaches	5E.1. Classroom walkthroughs Formal and informal assessments	5E.1. Classroom walkthroughs documentation Assessment results Lesson Plan and delivery of same
<u>Reading Goal #5E:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
46 % of the ED group will be proficient in 2013.	41% of the ED group were proficient in 2011-2012.	46% of the ED groups will be proficient in 2012-2013.					
			5E.2 Teachers are not utilizing on-going formative assessments to guide instruction.	5E.2 Provide time for teachers and coaches to construct common formative assessments and how to use formative assessment as a tool for instruction.	5E.2 Administration CRTs Inclusion coach Teachers	5E.2 Monitoring of formative assessment data through team and grade level meetings Formal assessments	5E.2 Assessment results
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

**Reading Professional Development**

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

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

PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
CCS by content area	9-12/ all	Each PLC has its own facilitator	School wide	Year round	Sign-in sheets and minutes, Teacher Evaluation and Collaboration	Administration
Marzano's High Yield strategies	9-12/ all	Each PLC has its own facilitator	School wide	Year round	Sign-in sheets and minutes, Teacher Evaluation and Collaboration	Administration, Curriculum Leaders, Instructional/Reading Coaches
Utilizing IMS to plan instruction	9-12/ all	Each PLC has its own facilitator	School wide	Year round	Sign-in sheets and minutes, Teacher Evaluation and Collaboration	Administration, Curriculum Leaders, Instructional/Reading Coaches

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

**Reading Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Reading Materials</b>	<b>Edge</b>	<b>SAI</b>	<b>\$21,000.00</b>
<b>Achieve 3000</b>		<b>SAI</b>	<b>\$15,000.00</b>
			<b>Subtotal: \$36,000.00</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
			<b>Subtotal:\$ 0.00</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Consultant</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>Eisenhower</b>	<b>TBD</b>
<b>Conferences</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>Eisenhower</b>	<b>TBD</b>
			<b>Subtotal:\$ 0.00</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
			<b>Subtotal:\$ 0.00</b>
			<b>Total: \$36,000.00</b>

*End of Reading Goals*

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

**Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals**

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

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.</b> CELLA Goal #1: By June 2013 60% of ELL students will be proficient in Listening/Speaking on CELLA.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: In June 2012 57% (25) of ELL students were proficient in Listening/Speaking on CELLA.	1.1. Lack of academic vocabulary.	1.1. Teachers will explicitly teach academic vocabulary as it relates their subject.	1.1. ESOL AP ESOL Teachers	1.1. Classroom walkthroughs	1.1. Ongoing in-class monitoring of students' progress and CELLA results at the end of the year.
		1.2. Lack of opportunities to orally use academic language.	1.2. Teachers will provide opportunities for ELLs to orally use academic language.	1.2. ESOL AP ESOL Teachers	1.2. Classroom walkthroughs	1.2. Ongoing in-class monitoring of students' progress and CELLA results at the end of the year.
		1.3. Due to increased flexibility in exiting students, most of our students are beginning English speakers. Research supports that it takes 2-3 years to develop social language and 6-8 years to develop academic language.	1.3. Students who are not proficient in speaking will have a double reading DLA block to support their language development.	1.3. ESOL AP ESOL Teachers Guidance	1.3. Classroom walkthroughs	1.3. Ongoing in-class monitoring of students' progress and CELLA results at the end of the year.
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
<b>2. Students scoring proficient in reading.</b>		2.1. Students lack materials and	2.1. Books will be purchased for	2.1. ESOL AP	2.1. Classroom walkthroughs	2.1. Ongoing in-class

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

<p><b>CELLA Goal #2:</b> By June 2013 14% of ELL students will be proficient in Reading on CELLA.</p>	<p>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:</p>	<p>books at an appropriate level for their language proficiency.</p>	<p>the library that are age appropriate and at increasingly accessible levels to encourage all of our ELLs to read.</p>	<p>ESOL Teachers Media Specialists</p>		<p>monitoring of students' progress, Reading Benchmark, and mini Benchmark Tests, and CELLA results at the end of the year.</p>
	<p>In June 2012 11%((5) of ELL students were proficient in Reading on CELLA.</p>					
		<p>2.2. Students lack reading skills in their native language.</p>	<p>2.2. Additional reading support is provided with a reading class. The lowest students have a double DLA block of reading. All reading classes include Word Walls to supplement vocabulary instruction. The media center will purchase books at appropriate reading levels and provide book talks as well as individual help with book selection, to encourage ELL students to be successful readers of literature written in English.</p>	<p>2.2. ESOL AP ESOL Teachers Media Specialist</p>	<p>2.2. Classroom walkthroughs</p>	<p>2.2. Ongoing in-class monitoring of students' progress, Reading Benchmark, and mini Benchmark Tests, and CELLA results at the end of the year.</p>
	<p>2.3 Due to increased flexibility in exiting students, most of our students are beginning to intermediate English readers. Research supports that it takes 6-8 years to develop academic language.</p>	<p>2.3 Additional reading support is provided with a reading class. The lowest students have a double DLA block of reading.</p>	<p>2.3 ESOL AP ESOL Teachers Guidance</p>	<p>2.3 Classroom walkthroughs</p>	<p>2.3 Ongoing in-class monitoring of students' progress, Reading Benchmark, and mini Benchmark Tests, and CELLA results at the end of the year.</p>	

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>3. Students scoring proficient in writing.</b>		3.1. Writing standards vary across cultures. For example, in America our essays are very structured and linear. In China, essays are structured in more of a circular pattern where ideas are repeated continuously.	3.1. Students will be explicitly taught how to construct paragraphs and essays in English.	3.1. ESOL AP ESOL Teachers	3.1. Classroom walkthroughs	3.1. Ongoing in-class monitoring of students' progress and CELLA results at the end of the year.
<u>CELLA Goal #3:</u>	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u>					
By June 2013 23% of ELL students will be proficient in Writing on CELLA.	In June 2012, 20% ( 9) of ELL students were proficient in Writing on CELLA.					
		3.2. Lack of opportunities to write.	3.2. Writing will be incorporated at least once a week.	3.2. ESOL AP ESOL Teachers	3.2. Classroom walkthroughs	3.2. Ongoing in-class monitoring of students' progress and CELLA results at the end of the year.
		3.3. Due to increased flexibility in exiting students, most of our students are beginning to intermediate English writers. Research supports that it takes 2-3 years to develop social language and 6-8 years to develop academic language.	3.3. Writing will be reinforced in students' reading class, as well as in English by incorporating writing assignments that align with the reading curriculum.	3.3. ESOL AP ESOL Teachers	3.3. Classroom walkthroughs	3.3. Ongoing in-class monitoring of students' progress and CELLA results at the end of the year.

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

**CELLA Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

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

*End of CELLA Goals*



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

**Elementary School Mathematics Goals**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<b>5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b> Mathematics Goal #5A:  <b>NA</b>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>							
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	
<b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b> Mathematics Goal #5B:  <b>NA</b>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <b>NA</b>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <b>NA</b>	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

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

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

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

*End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals*

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

**Middle School Mathematics Goals**

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<b>5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>  <u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u>  <b>NA</b>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>							
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	
<b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>  <u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u>  <b>NA</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	
	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>						
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

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

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

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

*End of Middle School Mathematics Goals*

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

**Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals**

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.
Mathematics Goal #3:  NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	NA	NA					
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.

*End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals*



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

**High School AMO Mathematics Goals**

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

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
<b>A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>  HS Mathematics Goal A: By July 2013 58% of our students will score satisfactory on Mathematics.	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b> 49% scored satisfactory on Math		<b>66%</b> scored satisfactory on mathematics	<b>58%</b> will score satisfactory on mathematics	<b>62%</b> will score satisfactory on mathematics	<b>66%</b> will score satisfactory on mathematics	<b>70%</b> will score satisfactory on math	<b>75%</b> will score satisfactory on math
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	
<b>B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>  HS Mathematics Goal B: All subgroups made satisfactory progress.			3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: <b>NA</b>	3B.1. <b>NA</b>	3B.1. <b>NA</b>	3B.1. <b>NA</b>	3B.1. <b>NA</b>	
	2012 Current Level of Performance: *  Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance: *  Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:						
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			3C.1. ELL students lack knowledge of Academic Vocabulary	3C.1 Teachers will explicitly teach academic vocabulary.	3C.1. Teacher Administrators	3C.1. Classroom Walkthroughs Teacher Observation Monitoring student data	3C.1 Teacher formative assessments Benchmark Data EOC Algebra test EOC Geometry test
<u>HS Mathematics</u> <b>Goal C:</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
By July, 2013, 41% of ELL students will score satisfactory mathematics	33% of ELL students scored satisfactory in mathematics	41% will score satisfactory in mathematics					
			3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.
			3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			3D.1. Lack of prerequisite math skills to move forward with algebraic and geometric concepts.	3D.1. Provide professional development to teachers by examining student data and to help them target areas of greatest need and plan interventions using differentiated instruction, and small group instruction. Student gaps in mathematic concepts will be the target for intense instruction. Peer, teacher and outside tutoring along with small group instruction will be provided to struggling students.	3D.1. Administrators CRT Inclusion Coach	3D.1. Classroom walkthroughs On-going conversations with students and teachers Monitoring of student data	3D.1. Student assessment data Mini-assessments Teacher made formative assessments EOC Algebra scores
<u>HS Mathematics</u> <b>Goal D:</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
By July 2013. 45% of students with disabilities will score satisfactory in mathematics	37% of students with disabilities scored satisfactory on FCAT Math	45% of students with disabilities will score satisfactory on EOC Algebra					
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.

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

		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.
--	--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			3E.1. <b>NA</b>	3E.1. <b>NA</b>	3E.1. <b>NA</b>	3E.1. <b>NA</b>	3E.1. <b>NA</b>
<u>HS Mathematics</u> <u>Goal E:</u>  All subgroups made satisfactory progress.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <b>NA</b>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <b>NA</b>					
			3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

*End of HS Mathematics AMO Goals*

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

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

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.</b>			1.1. Complexity of the EOC exam.	1.1. Ensure that teachers are using the district's order of instruction and providing ample practice for higher-level questioning. Teachers will implement learning stations in which the teacher will meet with a small group in one of the stations.	1.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, Classroom Teachers	1.1. Classroom walkthroughs (CWT) and monitoring of teacher lesson plans and materials	1.1. Student work samples demonstrating mastery, Benchmark assessments, Mini Assessments, EOC Algebra scores
Algebra 1 Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
By July 2013, 42% (202) of our students will score Level 3 on EOC Algebra I.	In July 2012, 38% (200) of students scored a Level 3 on EOC Algebra I.	By July 2013, 42% (202) of students will score a Level 3 on EOC Algebra I.					
			1.2. Students coming to algebra classes with lack of basic mathematics skills.	1.2. Intensive math classes will incorporate basic math strategies in additional math periods. Math tutoring	1.2. Teachers Principal Assistant Principals	1.2. Classroom walkthroughs (CWT) and monitoring of teacher lesson plans and materials Formative assessments	1.2. Student work samples EOC Algebra scores
			1.3. Parental (Family) involvement.	1.3. Increase Participation in SAC Curriculum Celebration Increase membership in PTSA/SAC Increase parent volunteers.	1.3. Principal Assistant Principals Administrative Dean	1.3. Parent Survey Conferences Parent involvement activities	1.3. Sign-in sheets from parent and information nights Sign-ins for volunteers Sign-in for conferencing
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
<b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.</b>			2.1. Complexity of the EOC	2.1. Ensure that	2.1. Principal,	2.1. Classroom walkthroughs	2.1. Student work samples

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

Algebra Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	exam.	teachers are using the district's order of instruction and providing ample practice for higher level questioning.	Assistant Principals, Classroom teachers	(CWT) and monitoring of teacher lesson plans and materials	demonstrating mastery, benchmark assessments, mini-assessments
By July 2013, 8% (38) of our students will score Level 4 or 5 on EOC Algebra I.	In July 2012, 7% (21) of students scored Level 4 on FCAT Math.	By July 2013, 8% (38) of students will score a Level 4 or 5 on the Algebra I EOC.	2.2. Most upper level math students complete Algebra 1 in middle school . Those who take it in high school come with weaker basic math skills to enable them to score at the upper levels.	2.2. Teachers provide ongoing monitoring of student progress via formative assessments and provide enrichment activities for students who are successful on formative assessments.	2.2 Teachers. Principal Assistant Principals	2.2. Mini Benchmarks, Exit Slips, Benchmark tests Teacher observation	2.2. Student work samples demonstrating mastery, benchmark assessments, mini-assessments EOC Algebra scores
			2.3 Parental (Family) Involvement.	2.3 Increase attendance at SAC Curriculum Celebration Increase memberships in PTSA/SAC Increase Parent Volunteers.	2.3 Principal Assistant Principals Guidance Counselors Teachers	2.3 Parent survey Conferences Parent involvement activities	2.3 Sign-in sheets from parent and information nights Sign-ins for volunteers Sign-in for conferencing

*End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals*

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

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

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

Geometry EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.</b>			1.1. Complexity of the EOC exam.	1.1. Ensure that teachers are using the district's order of instruction and providing ample practice for higher level questioning.	1.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, Classroom teachers	1.1. Classroom walkthroughs (CWT) and monitoring of teacher lesson plans and materials	1.1. Student work samples Demonstrating mastery, Benchmark assessments, mini Assessments EOC Geometry scores
Geometry Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
By July 2013, 44% (255) of our students will score Achievement Level 3 on EOC Geometry.	In July 2012, 40% (263) scored at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.	By July 2013, 44% (255) of our students will score Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.					
			1.2. Lack of student data on geometric concepts to guide instruction.	1.2. Provide frequent teacher made and district mini assessments to monitor student understanding of concepts.	1.2. Teacher (PLC's) Principal Assistant Principals	1.2. Examination of student data within PLC's	1.2. Formative Assessments Mini Assessments Benchmark Assessments EOC Geometry scores
			1.3. Parental (Family) Involvement.	1.3. Encourage parent participation in all parent meetings. Increase membership in PTSA/SAC. Increase parent volunteers.	1.3. Teachers Principal Assistant Principals Administrative Dean	1.3. Parent Survey Conferences Parent involvement activities	1.3. Sign-in sheets from parent and information nights Sign-ins for volunteers Sign-in for conferencing
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**

<b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.</b>			2.1. Same as Goal 1	2.1. Same as Goal 1	2.1. Same as Goal 1	2.1. Same as Goal 1	2.1. Same as Goal 1
<u>Geometry Goal #2:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
2011-2012 scores were reported in 3 levels. See Goal # 1.	See Goal 1 Same as level 3	See Goal 1 Same as level 3					
			2.2. Same as Goal 1	2.2. Same as Goal 1	2.2. Same as Goal 1	2.2. Same as Goal 1	2.2. Same as Goal 1
			2.3. Same as Goal 1	2.3. Same as Goal 1	2.3. Same as Goal 1	2.3. Same as Goal 1	2.3. Same as Goal 1

*End of Geometry EOC Goals*

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

**Mathematics Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities</b>						
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
Content Area PLC's	9-12/All	Each PLC has its own facilitator	School wide	Year Round	Sign-in sheets and meeting minutes Teacher evaluations	Administration
Differentiating Instruction	9-12/All	CRT/Reading Coach	School wide	Year Round	Lesson plans, Assessment data, and Classroom Walkthroughs	Administration CRT/Reading Coach Curriculum Leaders
Webb's Depth of Knowledge/Higher Level Questions	9-12/All	CRT/Reading Coach	School wide	Year Round	Lesson plans, Assessment data, and Classroom Walkthroughs	Administration CRT/Reading Coach Curriculum Leaders
Marzano's High Yield Strategies	9-12/All	CRT/Reading Coach	School wide	Year Round	Lesson plans, Assessment data, and Classroom Walkthroughs	Administration CRT/Reading Coach Curriculum Leaders



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

**Mathematics Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	\$0.00
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Online virtual manipulatives/simulations</b>	<b>Online/interactive GIZMO math simulations</b>	<b>Site licenses: SAI</b>	<b>\$4,740.00</b>
			<b>Subtotal: \$4,740.00</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Gizmo training</b>	<b>Consultant providing professional development (2 days)</b>	<b>Eisenhower</b>	<b>\$2,500.00</b>
<b>4 Teachers attending FCTM conference</b>	<b>FCTM</b>	<b>Eisenhower</b>	<b>\$500.00</b>
			<b>Subtotal: \$3,000.00</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	\$0.00
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
			<b>Total: \$7,740.00</b>

*End of Mathematics Goals*

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

**Elementary and Middle School Science Goals**

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

<b>Elementary and Middle Science Goals</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
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
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.</b>			1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
Science Goal #1A: <b>NA</b>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.</b>			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Science Goal #1B: <b>NA</b>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.</b>			2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.
Science Goal #2A:  <b>NA</b>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>					
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.</b>			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Science Goal #2B:  <b>NA</b>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

*End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals*

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

**Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals**

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

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

*End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals*

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

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

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

<b>Biology 1 EOC Goals</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
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
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.</b>			1.1. Students lacking reading skills for technical/scientific reading.	1.1. Increased emphasis on content vocabulary and technical reading.	1.1. Classroom Teachers Administrators	1.1. Classroom walkthroughs (CWT) and monitoring of teacher lesson plans and materials	1.1. Student work samples Demonstrating mastery, Benchmark assessments, mini assessments
<b>Biology 1 Goal #1:</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In June 2013, 52% (415) of students taking Biology EOC will score at Achievement Level 3.	In June 2012 49% (366) scored in Achievement Level 3 in Biology EOC	In June 2013, 52% (415) of students taking Biology EOC will score at Achievement Level 3.					
			1.2. Not understanding the requirements for End of Course Exams.	1.2. CRT/District provide professional development on end of course exams and standards.	1.2. Classroom teachers Administrators Resource Teachers	1.2. Classroom walkthroughs Formative Assessments	1.2. EOC Exam
			1.3. Students not perceiving this assessment as being important.	1.3. Assure students understand the importance of this assessment.	1.3. Classroom Teachers Administrators	1.3. Classroom walkthroughs Administrators	1.3. EOC
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
<b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.</b>			2.1. Same as Goal 1	2.1. Same as Goal 1	2.1. Same as Goal 1	2.1. Same as Goal 1	2.1. Same as Goal 1
<b>Biology 1 Goal #2:</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

2011-2012 scores were reported in 3 levels. See Goal # 1.	See Goal 1 Same as level 3	See Goal 1 Same as level 3					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

*End of Biology I EOC Goals*

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

**Science Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
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
Technical/scientific reading strategies	9-10	PLC Leader CRT Reading Coach	Biology Teachers	PLC Professional Development During Planning Periods	Benchmark Assessments	Administrators

**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	
NA	NA	NA	\$0.00	
				<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
Technology				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
NA	NA	NA	\$0.00	
				<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
Professional Development				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
NA	NA	NA	\$0.00	
				<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
Other				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
NA	NA	NA	\$0.00	
				<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
				<b>Total: \$0.00</b>

*End of Science Goals*

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

**Writing Goals**

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

<b>Writing Goals</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
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
<b>1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.</b>			1A.1. Students not understanding what it takes to score a level 4 on the new FCAT Writing assessment	1A.1. Teachers will teach the FCAT rubric to students and use it to peer score classroom writing assignments.	1A.1. Administration Curriculum Leaders	1A.1. Mini writing assignments scored using the FCAT Writing rubric	1A.1. Scores on the mini writing assignments
Writing Goal #1A: By June 2013 51% of students will score at FCAT level 4 and above in writing.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	Lack of writing Practice.	School wide writing prompts on a scheduled basis.			
	In June, 2012,	By June 2013,					
	91%(724) of our students scored either Level 3 and higher in writing. (49% scored 4 and above)	51% of students will score at FCAT level 4 and above in Writing.					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.</b>			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Writing Goal #1B: <b>NA</b>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.



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

		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.
--	--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

**Writing Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
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
Content Area PLC's	9-12	Each PLC has its own facilitator	School wide	Year round	Sign-in Sheets & Minutes, Teacher Evaluation and Collaboration	Administration
Differentiating Instruction	9-12	CRT/Reading Coach	School wide	Year round	Lesson Plans, Assessment Data and Classroom Walkthroughs	Administration CRT/Reading Coach Curriculum Leaders
Marzano's high Yield Strategies	9-12	CRT/Reading Coach	School wide	Year round	Lesson Plans, Assessment Data and Classroom Walkthroughs	Administration CRT/Reading Coach Curriculum Leaders

**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
<b>Writing Process</b>	<b>Write for the Future</b>	<b>Eisenhower</b>	<b>\$1,000.00</b>
			<b>Subtotal: \$1,000.00</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>

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

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	\$0.00
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
			<b>Total: \$1,000.00</b>

*End of Writing Goals*

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

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

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

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

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

**Civics Professional Development**

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

**Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)**

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

*End of Civics Goals*

**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
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.</b>			1.1. Students who are below proficiency in Reading and Writing skills.	1.1. LA and history students will use Achieve 3000 to improve reading comprehension and writing skills.	1.1. Principal  Assistant Principals  Reading Coach  CRT  Teacher	1.1. Classroom walkthroughs Observations and monitoring of teacher lesson plans and materials.	1.1. Classroom walkthroughs Observation tools
U.S. History Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
21% of students taking the American History EOC will score in Achievement level 3.	Test has never been given	21% of students taking the American History EOC will score in Achievement level 3.					
			1.2. Teachers need time for planning to create rigorous tasks and higher order questions.	1.2. Professional development will be provided for teachers in the areas of common planning (PLC’s), creating higher order thinking questions, and developing rigorous tasks.  Teachers will implement rigorous tasks and higher order questions into their classrooms.  School-based	1.2. Principal  Assistant Principals  Reading Coach  CRT  Teacher	1.2. Classroom walkthroughs Observations and monitoring of teacher lesson plans and materials.	1.2. Classroom walkthroughs Observation tools

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

			administrators will support and monitor implementation.			
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.</b>		2.1. Students may not perceive the importance of this test.	2.1 Explain to students the impact of this score on their year end grade.	2.1. Teachers Principal  Assistant Principals  Reading Coach	2.1. Classroom walkthroughs Observations and monitoring of teacher lesson plans and materials.	2.1. Classroom walkthroughs Classroom and benchmark assessments  Achieve 3000  Observation tools  US History EOC scores
U.S. History Goal #2:  24% will score at level 4 and 18% will score at level 5 on the U.S. History EOC assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Test has never been given. (will base predictions on past reading test scores)	24% will score at level 4 and 18% will score at level 5 on the U.S. History EOC assessment.				
		2.2. Inconsistent implementation of higher order thinking and questioning strategies throughout lessons.	2.2. Teachers will utilize Professional Learning Communities (PLC') to develop lessons and assessments that embed strategies for higher order thinking questions.  History teachers will implement higher order thinking and questioning strategies throughout lessons.  School-based administrators will provide support, give feedback and monitor	2.2. Teachers Principal  Assistant Principals  Reading Coach  CRT	2.2. Classroom walkthroughs Observations and monitoring of teacher lesson plans and materials.	2.2. Classroom walkthroughs Observation tools US History EOC scores

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

			implementation.			
		2.3 Lack of higher level thinking questioning in classroom instruction.	2.3 Ensure teachers are using lesson plans that promote rigorous instruction.	2.3 Teacher Principal  Assistant Principals  Reading Coach  CRT Teacher	2.3 Classroom walkthroughs, Observations and monitoring of teacher lesson plans and materials.	2.3 Classroom walkthroughs and Observation tools

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

**U.S. History Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
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
Data Driven Differentiated Instruction	All Grade Levels	PLC Leader Reading Coach CRT	Social Studies	Wednesday PLC Meetings PD during planning periods	PLC's Classroom walkthroughs and observations	Principal Assistant Principals CRT Reading Coach
Higher order questions to extend student thinking and discourse	All Grade Levels	PLC Leader Reading Coach CRT	Social Studies	Wednesday PLC Meetings PD during planning periods	PLC's Classroom walkthroughs and observations	Principal Assistant Principals CRT Reading Coach
Analyzing data - FAIR, Edusoft Benchmark Assessments, FCAT, Achieve 3000	All Grade Levels	PLC Leader Reading Coach CRT	Social Studies	Wednesday PLC Meetings PD during planning periods	PLC's Classroom walkthroughs and observations	Principal Assistant Principals CRT Reading Coach
Common Core State Standards Text (Complexity and Higher Order Questioning/Thinking/ Vocabulary)	All Grade Levels	PLC Leader Reading Coach CRT	Social Studies	Wednesday PLC Meetings PD during planning periods	PLC's Classroom walkthroughs and observations	Principal Assistant Principals CRT Reading Coach
Marzano's Domains	All Grade Levels	PLC Leader Reading Coach CRT	Social Studies	Wednesday PLC Meetings PD during planning periods	PLC's Classroom walkthroughs and observations	Principal Assistant Principals CRT Reading Coach

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



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

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	\$0.00
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Non Fiction Reading and Writing	Achieve 3000	SAI	\$6,339.40
			<b>Subtotal: \$6,339.40</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Use of Achieve 3000 resources	Nonfiction reading passages, writing prompts, maps/charts/graphs Data analysis	Eisenhower	\$2,500.00
			<b>Subtotal: \$2,500.00</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	\$0.00
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
			<b>Total: \$8,839.00</b>

*End of U.S. History Goals*

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

**Attendance Goal(s)**

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

<b>Attendance Goal(s)</b>			<b>Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance</b>				
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
<b>1. Attendance</b>			1.1. Students off track academically causes lack of interest in school.	1.1. Administrator will work with teachers to assist in monitoring and encouraging students to achieve passing grades. Monitor academic progress and provide interventions where needed. Teacher and Parent mentors will meet on a regular basis with students who have low grade point averages.	1.1. Attendance AP  Administrative Dean  Teachers  Parent volunteers	1.1. Attendance will be monitored by our grade level Deans to determine the effectiveness of our strategy. Our attendance AP and Deans will make changes accordingly.	1.1. Attendance monitoring report.  Plasco tracking System.
<u>Attendance Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					
By June 2013, we will increase overall attendance to 95% (expected attendance-3063).	Our current 2012 attendance rate is 93.65% (3345).	Our expected attendance rate for 2013 is 95% (3063).					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>					
	Our current 2012 number of students with excessive absences is 1505 students.	Our expected number of students with excessive absences by June 2013 is 1405 students.					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>					

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

	Our current 2012 number of students with excessive tardies is 252.	Our expected number of students with excessive tardies by June 2013 is 152.					
			1.2. Students with family issues such as financial hardships, childcare, and language barriers.	1.2. Our Administrative team will work with the SAFE Coordinator, District Social Workers and Compliance Resource Teacher to provide assistance to these students and families.	1.2. Attendance AP Administrative Dean SAFE Coordinator District Social Worker	1.2. Administrative Dean will retrieve information on the family's needs. Our Administrative team will monitor the effectiveness assuring that we meet the family's needs.	1.2. Attendance monitoring report
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

**Attendance Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
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
Content area PLC's	9-12/All	Each PLC has its own facilitator	School wide	Year round	Sign-in Sheets and Minutes, Teacher Evaluation and Collaboration	Administration

**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
NA	NA	NA	\$0.00
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	\$0.00
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	\$0.00
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	\$0.00
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
			<b>Total: \$0.00</b>

*End of Attendance Goals*

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

**Suspension Goal(s)**

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

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1. Suspension</b>			1.1. Students may not have knowledge of the Orange County Student Code of Conduct.	1.1. At the beginning of each nine weeks, Teachers will review and discuss the Orange County Student Code of Conduct.	1.1. Discipline AP	1.1. Sign off sheets will be provided for each teacher that has all students in their classes.	1.1. Discipline Report
Suspension Goal #1:  By June 2013, we will reduce the number of In-School suspensions by 36% (50 Students), and Out-of-School suspensions by 18.5% (57 students).	2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions	Student's feeling out-of-place in the school.	Provide students with mentors.	Administrative Deans	Student Names will then be checked off for compliance.	Suspension Report
	Total number of In-School Suspensions in 2012 is 243.	Our expected number of In-School Suspensions by June 2013 is 148.					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School					
	Total number of students suspended In School in 2012 is 138.	Our expected number of students suspended In School by June 2012 is 88.					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	Number of Out-of-School Suspensions in 2012 is 542.	Our expected number of Out-of-School Suspensions by June 2012 is 400.					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School					
	Total number of	Our expected					

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

	Students Suspended Out of School in 2011 is 307.	number of Students Suspended Out of School by June 2012 is 250.					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

**Suspension Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
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
Content area PLC's	9-12/All	Each PLC has its own facilitator	School wide	Year round	Sign-in Sheets and Minutes, Teacher Evaluation and Collaboration	Administration

**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
NA	NA	NA	<b>\$0.00</b>
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	<b>0.00</b>
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	<b>\$0.00</b>
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	<b>\$0.00</b>
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
			<b>Total: \$0.00</b>

*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
<b>1. Dropout Prevention</b>			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
<b>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</b>  Due to a lag in data, we have projected our estimates based on our 2011 data.  <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>	<u>2012 Current Dropout Rate:*</u> Our 2011 dropout rate is .2%(7).	<u>2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*</u> Our expected dropout rate by June 2013 is .2%(7).	Students off track academically causes lack of interest in school.	Guidance counselors and teachers collaborate to identify students off track, and will communicate with parents through parent/teacher conferences.  Students Lacking credits will be placed in a credit retrieval course.	Assistant Principals  Administrative Deans  Guidance Counselors  Teachers PLC's	Guidance Counselors and PLC teams will monitor credits, GPA's and assessment information. Interventions will be added or changed accordingly.	Benchmark Test Data  Progress Reports  Report Cards
	<u>2012 Current Graduation Rate:*</u> Our 2011 Graduation Rate is 95.3%(711).	<u>2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*</u> Our expected 2013 Graduation Rate is 97%(800).	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			Students Currently reading at a level I or II have not met the requirements for FCAT.	All Level I and II students will be placed in a second Reading Course. (Intensive Reading)	Assistant Principals  Curriculum Resource Teacher Reading PLC.	Benchmarks, class room assessments and FCAT level of students will increase.	Benchmark Test Data  Classroom Assessments  FCAT scores
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

### Dropout Prevention Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Content area PLC's	9-12/All	Each PLC has its own facilitator	School wide	Year round	Sign-in Sheets and Minutes, Teacher Evaluation and Collaboration	Administration

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



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

**Dropout Prevention Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

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

*End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)*

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

**Parent Involvement Goal(s)**

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1. Parent Involvement</b>			1.1. Some parents are working parents and have a difficult time coming to events during the school day.	1.1. Schedule a number of events in the late afternoon or early evening.	1.1. Assistant Principal  Administrative Dean	1.1. Retrieve Parental Involvement participation information from our ADDitions report for analysis.	1.1. ADDitions Parental Involvement report.
<b>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</b>  By June 2013, we will increase overall parental involvement hours with an emphasis on events and collaborations that directly affect student growth and learning.	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: *  Our 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement shows 20,292 volunteer hours.	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: *  Our 2013 expected Level of Parent Involvement will be 22,000 volunteer hours.	1.2. Some Parents are hesitant to become involved in areas of service (PTSA, SAC).	1.2. PTSA parents will reach out to other parents to gain their involvement. PTSA and SAC parents will request their parents to volunteer any extra time for the school.	1.2. Assistant Principal  PTSA President  SAC Chair	1.2. Analyze attendance at SAC and PTSA events.	1.2. ADDitions Parental Involvement report.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

**Parent Involvement Professional Development**

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Content area PLC's	9-12/All	Each PLC has its own	School wide	Year round	Sign-in Sheets and Minutes, Teacher Evaluation and	Administration

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

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

	facilitator		Collaboration	
--	-------------	--	---------------	--

**Parent Involvement Budget**

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

*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
<b>STEM Goal #1:</b> Initiate STEM PLC to guide future planning.	1.1. Understanding the STEM requirements.	1.1. Study of what has been done regarding STEM in other high schools.	1.1. Administrators Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math Teachers	1.1. Reports from the PLC	1.1. Final planning report and beginning of implementation.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

**STEM Professional Development**

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Review of STEM goals and processes	9-12	Teacher	Interdisciplinary Team (Science, Technology, Engineering and Math teachers)	Monthly, after school	Reports from the PLC	Administration

**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
NA	NA	NA	\$0.00
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	\$0.00
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	\$0.00
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	\$0.00
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
			<b>Total: \$0.00</b>

*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
<b>CTE Goal #1:</b> By June, 2013 92% of the students will take the Career Pathways Exam; of the 92% taking the exam 90% will pass.	1.1. Students preconceived understanding of available careers.	1.1. Career exploration activities and projects.	1.1. CTE Teachers and Assessing Administrator.	1.1. Teacher monitoring of various activities that make up the career exploration project	1.1. Teacher assessment of individual student activities and completed project.
	1.2. Time constraints of testing and receipt of materials for exams.	1.2. Prepare for Career Pathway Exams (specific for subjects).	1.2. CTE Teachers and Assessing Administrator.	1.2. Tests and portfolios	1.2. Exam scores; passing rates
	1.3. Students' lack of knowledge of post-secondary choices.	1.3. Guest speakers from colleges/career industry.	1.3. CTE Teachers and Assessing Administrator.	1.3. Speaker exit survey slips	1.3. Pre/post survey results

**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
Content area PLC's	9-12/All	Each PLC has its own facilitator	School wide	Year round	Sign-in Sheets and Minutes, Teacher Evaluation and Collaboration	Administration

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

**CTE Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

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

*End of CTE Goal(s)*

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

**Additional Goal(s)**

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

<b>Additional Goal(s)</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
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
<b>1. Additional Goal</b>			1.1. Students' self-confidence to be successful in higher level classes.	1.1. AVID	1.1. Guidance Teachers	1.1. Reviewing enrollment records	1.1. Enrollment records Test Scores
<u>Additional Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>					
<b>Enrollment and Performance in Advanced Programs will increase 3%.</b>	In September 2012 there are 2,103 enrollments in AP classes, 509 in the IB/Pre IB program, 56 students enrolled in AVID and 5,456 Honors classes being taken. There was a 67% pass rate for AP tests, a 91% pass rate for IB tests in June 2012.	In September, 2013, Enrollment and Performance in Advanced Programs will increase by 3%.					
<b>2. Additional Goal</b>			2.1. Students need to begin taking higher level classes earlier in their	2.1. Using student data to identify students who are strong math and science	2.1. Guidance Teachers Administrators	2.1. Reviewing test and classroom data	2.1. Enrollment records Test scores
<u>Additional Goal #2:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>					



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

Increased Enrollment in Upper Level Mathematics (Beyond Algebra II) and Science Courses (beyond Biology, Chemistry, and Physics) by 3%.	In September 2012, there are 1,127 (35%) students enrolled in upper level math classes. There are 950 (30%) students enrolled in upper level science classes .	In September 2013, 38% of students will be enrolled in upper level math classes. 33% students will be enrolled in upper level science classes.	school career.	students.			
<b>3. Additional Goal</b>			3.1. Students who do not pass PERT are now required to enroll in College Readiness Classes their senior year which limits capacity to enroll in dual enrollment classes.	3.1. Work with students to improve pass rate on PERT.	3.1. Teachers	3.1. Administrators Guidance	3.1. Student enrolled in dual enrollment classes.  Student scores
<b>Additional Goal #3:</b>  Enrollment and Performance in College Dual Enrollment Programs will increase to 9% with 100% of students enrolled earning C or better grades.	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>					
	In September, 2012, 93 (6%)students are enrolled in dual enrollment programs 98% of those enrolled earned C or better grades.	In September 2013 student enrollment will increase to 9%.					
			3.2. Students are not aware of this opportunity.	3.2. Field trips to the dual enrollment sites to encourage enrollment Application and explanation of program is on the guidance website.	3.2. Teachers Students Parents	3.2. Guidance	3.2. Student enrollment
<b>4. Additional Goal</b>			4.1. Students with	4.1. Utilize common	4.1. Classroom teachers	4.1. Pre Test	4.1. Teacher created common

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

<p><u>Additional Goal #4:</u> Increase College and Career Readiness.</p>	<p>2012 Current Level :*</p> <p>In September, 2012, 29%(234) of seniors are in Math for College Readiness and 19%(157) of seniors are in English for College Readiness.</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level :*</p> <p>In September 2013, 26% Of seniors will be in Math for College Readiness and 16% of seniors will be in English for College Readiness.</p>	<p>achievement gaps, lack fundamental knowledge needed to be successful on PERT tested material.</p>	<p>assessments to identify specific strands of knowledge that is lacking and teach specifically to students' weaknesses.</p>	<p>PLC's</p>	<p>Identify weaknesses and weakest standards Post Test</p>	<p>assessments and curriculum package assessments designed to prep students for PERT</p>
<p><b>5. Additional Goal</b></p>			<p>5.1. Student awareness and/or availability to access test prep resources.</p>	<p>5.1. Advertise the availability and access of test prep resources to students from information shared by teachers, media specialists, daily announcements, school website and parent newsletter, college and career center and guidance.</p>	<p>5.1. Guidance Media Specialist Teachers Parent Volunteers</p>	<p>5.1. Reviewing inquiries and/or enrollment records in test prep courses</p>	<p>5.1. Test Prep Inquiry logs Enrollment records</p>
<p><u>Additional Goal #5:</u> Increase by 3 % - Student Earning at or Above 22.4 on the ACT.</p>	<p>2012 Current Level :*</p> <p>455 (57%) of our students passed with a composite score of 22.4.</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level :*</p> <p>Increase percentage of students passing composite score to 60%.</p>					
<p><b>6. Additional Goal</b></p>			<p>6.1.</p>	<p>6.1.</p>	<p>6.1. Guidance</p>	<p>6.1. Reviewing enrollment records</p>	<p>6.1. Enrollment records</p>
<p><u>Additional Goal #6:</u> Decrease the Achievement Gap for Each Identified Subgroup by 10% by June 30, 2016.</p>	<p>2012 Current Level :*</p> <p>Refer to identified subgroups in SIP Goals Reading/Algebra and</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level :*</p>					

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

	Geometry.						
<b>7. Additional Goal</b>			7.1. Lack of knowledge about these programs.	7.1. Encourage student enrollment through student information sessions specific to FA classes during registration time.	7.1. Administration Guidance	7.1. Review enrollment records	7.1. Enrollment records
<u>Additional Goal #7:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>					
Increase Fine Arts Enrollment in our music, art and drama classes by 3% in each area listed.	2012 enrollment in Fine Arts classes is: Art (704) 22% Drama (214) 7% Music (877) 27%	2013 enrollment in Fine Arts will increase by: Art: 25% Drama: 10% Music: 30%					
<b>8. Additional Goal</b>			8.1. Generating student interest and availability (scheduling)	8.1. Encourage student enrollment through student information sessions specific to utilizing technical centers during registration time	8.1. Guidance	8.1. Reviewing enrollment records	8.1. Enrollment records
<u>Additional Goal #8:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>					
Working Cooperatively with Technical Centers to increase participation by 3%.	Total enrollment of 52 (100%) juniors/seniors in tech center programs. <b>Orlando Tech:</b> 44% (23) <b>Mid-FL Tech:</b> 35% (18) <b>Westside Tech:</b> 2% (1) <b>Winter Park</b>	Increase total participation by 3% for the year 2013.					

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

	<b>Tech:</b> 20%(10)					
<b>9. Additional Goal</b>			9.1. Proper placement of all students with individual instructional needs within the classroom and providing matched support as described in our RtI process.	9.1. Informing all faculty of the RtI process in place that supports quality interventions within the regular classroom, with regard to Tier 1 and Tier 2 responses and review of same.	9.1. RtI Team  Guidance Administration All faculty	9.1. RtI meetings  Reviewing enrollment records
<u>Additional Goal #9:</u>  Decrease disproportionate classification in Special Education.	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>  84% (306) of ESE students are enrolled in regular education classrooms.	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>  The expected enrollment of ESE students in regular education classrooms will increase by 3% (9) students				9.1. RtI meeting agendas  Enrollment records
<b>10. Additional Goal</b>			10.1. Students may lack the prerequisite skills to be successful in Algebra I.	10.1. Identified students lacking the prerequisite skills will be placed in Intensive math classes in addition to Algebra I.	10.1. Math Teachers, Administration, and Guidance	10.1. Reviewing benchmark scores, classroom assessments and End of Course scores.
<u>Additional Goal #10:</u>  Increase successful completion of Algebra I prior to 10 <sup>th</sup> Grade by 3%.	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>  In June, 2012, 59% (272) students successfully completed Algebra I prior to 10 <sup>th</sup> grade	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>  By June, 2013 62% will successfully complete Algebra 1 prior to 10 <sup>th</sup> grade.				10.1. Benchmark scores Classroom assessments, both formative and summative End of Course Exam

**Additional Goals Professional Development**

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

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Content area PLC's	9-12/All	Each PLC has its own facilitator	School wide	Year round	Sign-in Sheets and Minutes, Teacher Evaluation and Collaboration	Administration
CCS by content area	9-12/ all	Each PLC has its own facilitator	School wide	Year round	Sign-in sheets and minutes, Teacher Evaluation and Collaboration	Administration
Marzano's High Yield strategies	9-12/ all	Each PLC has its own facilitator	School wide	Year round	Sign-in sheets and minutes, Teacher Evaluation and Collaboration	Administration, Curriculum Leaders, Instructional/Reading Coaches
Utilizing IMS to plan instruction	9-12/ all	Each PLC has its own facilitator	School wide	Year round	Sign-in sheets and minutes, Teacher Evaluation and Collaboration	Administration, Curriculum Leaders, Instructional/Reading Coaches

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

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

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

*End of Additional Goal(s)*

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

**Final Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
<b>Reading Budget</b>	<b>Total:\$36,000.00</b>
<b>CELLA Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
<b>Mathematics Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$7,740.00</b>
<b>Science Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
<b>Writing Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$1,000.00</b>
<b>Civics Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
<b>U.S. History Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$8,839.00</b>
<b>Attendance Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
<b>Suspension Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
<b>Dropout Prevention Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
<b>Parent Involvement Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
<b>STEM Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
<b>CTE Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
<b>Additional Goals</b>	<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
	<b>Grand Total: \$53,579.00</b>

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

**Differentiated Accountability**

**School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance**

Please choose the school’s DA Status. (To activate the checkbox: 1. Double click the desired box; 2. When the menu pops up, select *Checked* under “Default value” header; 3. Select *OK*, this will place an “x” in the box.)

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent
N/A	N/A	N/A

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 will meet eight times during the 2012-2013 school year. The Council will monitor student progress on a quarterly basis, by looking at student data, FCAT, End of Course, district Benchmark tests and the FAIR reading assessment. The SAC will conduct a needs assessment survey of WPHS stakeholders to inform and guide the necessary revisions of the SIP. In addition, the SAC will plan and present a Parent/Community Open House to showcase new and existing initiatives at Winter Park High School.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
There are no funds allocated in the SAC budget.	N/A