Florida Department of Education

DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Pasco Middle School	District Name: Pasco
Principal: Kimberly Anderson	Superintendent: Heather Fiorentino
SAC Chair: Richard Hunt	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.
School Grades Trend Data (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)
High School Feedback Report
K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

Administrators

List your school's administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress.

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Kimberly Anderson	Masters in Educational Leadership BA in Science Education	3	13	10-11 B grade AYP not met, 09-10 C grade, AYP not met 08-09 A grade, AYP met 07-08 A09-10 C grade, AYP not met 08-09 A grade, AYP met 07-08 A grade, AYP not met 06-07 A Grade, AYP not met grade, AYP not met 06-07 A Grade, AYP not met

Assistant Principal	Jeff Wolff	Bio K-12, M/J Science, Ed. Leadership	3	5	10-11 B grade AYP not met, 09-10 C grade, AYP not met 08-09 D grade, AYP not met 07-08 C grade, AYP not met

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	Dr. Jill Mink	Doctorate	0	15	05-06 D, 06-07 D, 07-08 C,08-09 B 09-10 B, 10-11 A

Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. An organized structure of monthly meetings to support new teachers	New Teacher Liaison	May 2013
2. Three formal and weekly informal observations and coaching cycles for all new teachers	Administration	May 2013
3. Mentor assignment to all new teachers	New Teacher Liaison	Fall 2012 or as hired
4.		

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
1	Coaching and financial assistance for teacher to take the certification test.

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total number of Instructional Staff	% of first-year teachers	% of teachers with 1-5 years of experience	% of teachers with 6-14 years of experience	% of teachers with 15+ years of experience	% of teachers with Advanced Degrees	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
60	3% (2)	23% (14)	30% (18)	43% (26)	28% (17)	100% (60)	10% (6)	2% (1)	40% (24)

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
Master Teachers at PMS. Teachers as needed.	Teachers as needed	Weaknesses and Strengths	As needed

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

Title I, Part A Title I funds will be used to provide professional development opportunities to teachers and administrators to address the specific academic achievement needs of the students at Pasco Middle School. Title I funds will also provide extra support by offering parent education opportunities. Level 1 and 2 students will be given the opportunity to attend tutoring sessions after school in the core subject areas. Additional opportunities for academic support will be coordinated through extended school day, and extended school year for any student in need of recovering courses.
Title I, Part C- Migrant Migrant counselors and social workers support the migrant students and their families to ensure stability in education. Needs of the families are addressed to ensure that students come to school with the supplies and support they need to be successful. Extra tutoring services are also provided to help fill learning gaps that occur as the students transition from school to school.
Title I, Part D
Title II Title II and Title I funding will be used to provide professional development opportunities to teachers and administrators to address the specific academic achievement needs of students at PMS. IDEA funding will be used in conjunction with Title II funds to train teachers in the MTSS strategies. These strategies are research based and proven to work with all students, including students with disabilities and students with behavior concerns.
Title III
Title X- Homeless Title X will coordinate with Title I funds to support Students in Transition. The goal is to provide as much stability as possible for homeless students and their families to help education continue to be a priority in these students live.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) SAI funds are used to pay salary for part of two SSAP/Drop Out Prevention Teachers' salaries. These teachers assist students by monitoring grades, attendance, and behavior and providing direction, teaching, and guidance through pullout and directly assigned classes.
Violence Prevention Programs Pasco Middle School partners with Sunrise Spouse Abuse Shelter to provide healthy relationships seminars. The shelter also mentors students on campus to help create a safe and harassment free zone.
Nutrition Programs All Pasco Middle School students are provided a free breakfast and 73% of all students are on free or reduced lunch status. We also follow all nutritional guidelines and provide healthy alternatives when using snacks as rewards.

Housing Programs N/A
Head Start N/A
Adult Education N/A
Career and Technical Education A career and technical education component will be integrated into the 7th grade electives as part of the standard curriculum. Eighth grade students will be provided the opportunity to complete a needs assessment focusing on a choice of career focus post middle and high school.
Job Training N/A
Other

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

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. Theresa Hammond – Science Teacher, Sandra Mead – Guidance Counselor, Lisa Herndon – Teacher, Tracy Turner – Teacher, Josh Borders - Tech Specialist, Holly Mickler – Teacher, Jane Tynes – Math Teacher, Jeff Wolff – Assistant Principal, Kimberly Anderson – Principal, Other teachers and staff members as needed.
Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts? The team will meet on a bi-monthly basis to analyze and problem-solve school-wide data. The team commits to build faculty/staff consensus on the MTSS plan and increase communication with faculty, staff, and families as to the MTSS status of the school. SIP goals will be supported through the use of MTSS.
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 reviewed previous year data, the goals and strategies in the SIP, and provided recommendations for the plan. The team helped write goals and action plans toward meeting those goals.
MTSS Implementation
Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior. TERMS is our district wide data system. It will be used to house all discipline data according to our policies and procedures. We will also track interventions other than office referrals using a summary of intervention form, which will be collected from all staff and analyzed quarterly. Academic data is housed in TERMS, Star, and Core K-12. Formative data and FAIR data are also available.
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. All staff were trained in the MTSS method of intervention for academics and behavior during the first week of teacher planning. The staff were trained at a faculty meeting and follow up coaching will occur on an as needed basis using our school based mentors and coaches.
Describe the plan to support MTSS. Formal and informal observations and coaching will be used throughout the year by administrators, coaches and peers. Common planning and assessment will help to ensure a solid common core for all academics.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Lisa McCabe, Linda Beebe, Jenny Borders, Dee Hampton, Karen Harris, Ellen Lindow, Susan McHugh, Holly Mickler, Jeff Wolff, and DR. Jill Mink
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). This committee serves in conjunction with the MTSS Committee to identify target areas for school improvement. It serves as the vehicle for academic initiatives such as Parent Nights, Quarterly Academic focus areas, and data analysis. The committee members also complete monthly walk through schedules to gather school-wide data on the use of best teaching/learning practices. The committee analyzes this data to make recommendations to the leadership team for future training and/or recognition of excellence.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? The LLT will continue to work with the MTSS Committee in determining Tier two and three interventions for students not making progress in reading. The committee will continue the practice of walk-throughs, giving important feedback on instructional practices in our classrooms. From this data, the LLT will suggest training opportunities and coaching strategies for teacher improvement. The LLT will model best practices in reading instruction. The committee will also focus on the implementation of Common Core Standards.

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.

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

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

All teachers incorporate reading and writing into their daily lessons by using best strategies for comprehension checks and vocabulary development. The Lead Literacy Committee will work with departments to monitor the implementation of all SIP goals pertaining to reading. A collaboration of meetings will be held for horizontal and vertical planning. In accordance with the K12 Literacy Plan, our teachers will meet four times per month to collaborate on Best Practice, data analysis, creation of common assessments, and discussion of students in need of additional assistance. This continuous cycle of collaboration and action planning will support the expectation that literacy is the responsibility of all teachers.

**High Schools Only*

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.	1A.1. Time constraints impact teachers' opportunities to meet collaboratively in professional learning communities.	1A.1. Teachers will meet by department on a regular basis to collaborate and discuss the implementation of Best Practices, data analysis, and common assessments.	1A.1. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	1A.1. PLC Collaboration meetings, PLC Data meetings, Common Assessment data analysis.	1A.1. FAIR, CORE K-12, Summative Assessment, Observations, Formative Assessments		

Reading Goal #1A: The percentage of students scoring proficient in reading will increase by 10%, as measured by the FCAT 2.0.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	388 students out of 829 or 46%	*56% of students will score at least a level 3.*					
		1A.2. Teachers have not received adequate professional development to support the implementation of blended instruction with the use of technology	1A.2. Teachers will participate in focused staff development centered around the use of instructional technology.	1A.2. Literacy Coach, Administration, Technology Specialist	1A.2. Observation of PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common assessments, walk through data, lesson plans, equipment check out logs	1A.2 PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common assessments, walk through data, lesson plans, equipment check out logs .	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.**	1B.1. Time constraints impact teachers' opportunities to meet collaboratively in professional learning communities.	1B.1. Teachers will meet by department on a regular basis to collaborate and discuss the implementation of Best Practices, data analysis, and common assessments.	1B.1. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	1B.1. PLC Collaboration meetings, PLC Data meetings, Common Assessment data analysis	1B.1. FAIR, CORE K-12, Summative Assessment, Observations, Formative Assessments		

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

Reading Goal #1B: *All students will score higher than a 6 on the FAAR reading test.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	9% (1) of students were level 4,5, or 6.	*0% will be 4,5,or 6.*					
		1B.2. Teachers have not received adequate professional development to support the implementation of blended instruction with the use of technology	1B.2. Teachers will participate in focused staff development centered around the use of instructional technology.	1B.2. Literacy Coach, Administration, Technology Specialist	1B.2. Observation of PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common assessments, walk through data, lesson plans, equipment check out logs	1B.2. PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common assessments, walk through data, lesson plans, equipment check out logs	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.	2A.1. It is challenging for teachers to meet the diverse needs of students in their classroom using conventional processes.	2A.1. Classroom activities will be structured to incorporate cooperative learning and gradual release strategies to improve educational outcomes and meet the diverse needs of learners	2A.1. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	2A.1. PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common formative assessments	2A.1. Summative assessments, Observations		
Reading Goal #2A: The percentage of students scoring at levels 4 or 5 will increase by 10%, as measured by the FCAT 2.0. ***Enter narrative for the goal in this box.***	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	176 students out of 829 or 21% are at a level 4 or 5.	*The number of students at level 4 or 5 will increase by 10%*					

		2A.2. Time constraints impact teachers' opportunities to meet collaboratively in professional learning communities.	2A.2. Teachers will meet by department on a regular basis to collaborate and discuss the implementation of Best Practices, data analysis, and common assessments.	2A.2. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	2A.2. PLC Collaboration meetings, PLC Data meetings, Common Assessment data analysis	2A.2. FAIR, CORE K-12, Summative Assessment, Observations, Formative Assessments	
		2A.3. In the past, students have been heterogeneously grouped for academics classes.	2A.3. Honors classes will be offered for the first time in 8th grade. This is a pilot program.	2A.3 Administrators and teachers	2A.3. Observations, FCAT scores, formative assessments, summative assessments	2A.3. Observations, FCAT scores, formative assessments, summative assessments	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.	2B.1. It is challenging for teachers to meet the diverse needs of students in their classroom using conventional processes.	2B.1. Classroom activities will be structured to incorporate cooperative learning and gradual release strategies to improve educational outcomes and meet the diverse needs of learners	2B.1. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	2B.1. PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common formative assessments	2B.1. Summative assessments, Observations		

Reading Goal #2B: The percentage of students scoring at a level 7 or above will increase by 9%, as measured by the FAAR.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	91% (10) students were scoring at level 7 or above.	*100% of students will score at level 7 or above.*					
		2B.2. Time constraints impact teachers' opportunities to meet collaboratively in professional learning communities	2B.2. Teachers will meet by department on a regular basis to collaborate and discuss the implementation of Best Practices, data analysis, and common assessments.	2B.2. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	2B.2. PLC Collaboration meetings, PLC Data meetings, Common Assessment data analysis	2B.2. FAIR, CORE K-12, Summative Assessment, Observations, Formative Assessments	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	3A.1. It is challenging for teachers to meet the diverse needs of students in their classroom using conventional processes.	3A.1. Classroom activities will be structured to incorporate cooperative learning and gradual release strategies to improve educational outcomes and meet the diverse needs of learners	3A.1. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	3A.1. PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common formative assessments	3A.1. FAIR, CORE K-12, Summative Assessment, Observations, Formative Assessments		
Reading Goal #3A: The percentage of students making a learning gain will increase by 10%, as measured by the FCAT 2.0.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	485 out of 829 or 58% students made a learning gain of type 1,2, or 3 as measured by FCAT 2.0	***The number of students making a learning gain will increase to 68%.***					

		3A.2. Time constraints impact teachers' opportunities to meet collaboratively in professional learning communities.	3A.2. Teachers will meet by department on a regular basis to collaborate and discuss the implementation of Best Practices, data analysis, and common assessments.	3A.2. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	3A.2. PLC Collaboration meetings, PLC Data meetings, Common Assessment data analysis	3A.2. FAIR, CORE K-12, Summative Assessment, Observations, Formative Assessments	
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	3B.1. It is challenging for teachers to meet the diverse needs of students in their classroom using conventional processes.	3B.1. Classroom activities will be structured to incorporate cooperative learning and gradual release strategies to improve educational outcomes and meet the diverse needs of learners	3B.1. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	3B.1. PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common formative assessments	3B.1. FAIR, CORE K-12, Summative Assessment, Observations, Formative Assessments		
Reading Goal #3B: *Data unavailable.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					

		3B.2. Time constraints impact teachers' opportunities to meet collaboratively in professional learning communities.	3B.2. Teachers will meet by department on a regular basis to collaborate and discuss the implementation of Best Practices, data analysis, and common assessments.	3B.2. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	3B.2. PLC Collaboration meetings, PLC Data meetings, Common Assessment data analysis	3B.2. FAIR, CORE K-12, Summative Assessment, Observations, Formative Assessments	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4A.1. A balanced support system needs to be established to support the diverse needs of students with disabilities in mainstream courses.	4A.1. A dual certification model will be adopted for ESE students. Ensuring fewer students per class with the supports needed to help all students succeed.	4A.1. Teachers and Administrators	4A.1. Balancing of classes, Scheduling process	4A.1. FCAT data, Formative Assessments, Summative Assessments, FAIR data, Core K-12 data.		
Reading Goal #4: The percentage of students in the lowest quartile making a learning gain will increase by 10%, as measured by the FCAT 2.0.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	30% of the lowest quartile students made a learning gain in reading.	*40% of the lowest quartile students will make a learning gain in reading. .*					
		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	
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** *54% of students are not proficient in reading.*	49%	**44%**	**39%**	**34%%**	**29%**	**27% or less**
Reading Goal #5A: The percentage of non-proficient students in reading is currently 54%. We will reduce the number of students non-proficient in Reading to 27% as measured by the FCAT.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: It is challenging for teachers to meet the diverse needs of students in their classroom using conventional processes.	5B.1. Classroom activities will be structured to incorporate cooperative learning and gradual release strategies to improve educational outcomes and meet the diverse needs of learners	5B.1. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	5B.1. PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common formative assessments	5B.1. Summative assessments, Observations		

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

Reading Goal #5B: The percentage of students, in the various sub-groups, scoring not proficient in reading will decrease by 10%, as measured by the FCAT 2.0.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: 39% Black: 61% Hispanic: 63% Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: 29% Black: 51% Hispanic: 53% Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A					
		5B.2. Teachers have not received adequate professional development to support the implementation of blended instruction with the use of technology	5B.2. Teachers will participate in focused staff development centered around the use of instructional technology.	5B.2. Literacy Coach, Administration, Technology Specialist	5B.2. Observation of PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common assessments, walk through data, lesson plans, equipment check out logs	5B.2. PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common assessments, walk through data, lesson plans, equipment check out logs	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5C.1. It is challenging for teachers to meet the diverse needs of students in their classroom using conventional processes.	5C.1. Classroom activities will be structured to incorporate cooperative learning and gradual release strategies to improve educational outcomes and meet the diverse needs of learners	5C.1. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	5C.1. PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common formative assessments	5C.1. Summative assessments, Observations		
Reading Goal #5C: The percentage of ELL students scoring not proficient will decrease by 10%, as measured by the FCAT 2.0.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	30 out of 37 or 81% of ELL students are not proficient in reading as measured by the FCAT.	***71% or less of ELL students will not be proficient in reading as measured by the FCAT.***					

		5C.2. Teachers have not received adequate professional development to support the implementation of blended instruction with the use of technology	5C.2. Teachers will participate in focused staff development centered around the use of instructional technology.	5C.2. Literacy Coach, Administration, Technology Specialist	5C.2. Observation of PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common assessments, walk through data, lesson plans, equipment check out logs	5C.2. PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common assessments, walk through data, lesson plans, equipment check out logs	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5D.1. It is challenging for teachers to meet the diverse needs of students in their classroom using conventional processes.	5D.1. Classroom activities will be structured to incorporate cooperative learning and gradual release strategies to improve educational outcomes and meet the diverse needs of learners	5D.1. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	5D.1. PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common formative assessments	5D.1. Summative assessments, Observations		

Reading Goal #5D: The percentage of SWD students scoring not proficient in reading will decrease by 10%, as measured by the FCAT 2.0.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	83% of all SWD were not proficient in reading as measured by the FCAT.	*73% or less of all SWD will not be proficient in reading as measured by the FCAT.*					
		5D.2. Teachers have not received adequate professional development to support the implementation of blended instruction with the use of technology	5D.2. Teachers will participate in focused staff development centered around the use of instructional technology.	5D.2. Literacy Coach, Administration, Technology Specialist	5D.2. Observation of PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common assessments, walk through data, lesson plans, equipment check out logs	5D.2. PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common assessments, walk through data, lesson plans, equipment check out logs	
		5D.3. A balanced support system needs to be established to support the diverse needs of students with disabilities in mainstream courses.	5D.3. . A dual certification model will be adopted for ESE students. Ensuring fewer students per class with the supports needed to help all students succeed.	5D.3. Teachers and Administrators	5D.3. Balancing of classes, Scheduling process	5D.3. FCAT data, Formative Assessments, Summative Assessments, FAIR data, Core K-12 data.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5E.1. It is challenging for teachers to meet the diverse needs of students in their classroom using conventional processes.	5E.1. Classroom activities will be structured to incorporate cooperative learning and gradual release strategies to improve educational outcomes and meet the diverse needs of learners	5E.1. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	5E.1. PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common formative assessments	5E.1. Summative assessments, Observations		
Reading Goal #5E: The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring not proficient in reading will decrease by 10%, as measured by the FCAT 2.0.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	406 students out of 637 or 63% are not making satisfactory progress in reading.	*A decrease to 53% is expected.*					

		5E.2. Teachers have not received adequate professional development to support the implementation of blended instruction with the use of technology	5E.2. Teachers will participate in focused staff development centered around the use of instructional technology.	5E.2. Literacy Coach, Administration, Technology Specialist	5E.2. Observation of PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common assessments, walk through data, lesson plans, equipment check out logs	5E.2. PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common assessments, walk through data, lesson plans, equipment check out logs	
		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	

Reading Professional Development

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

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/ materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Use of Technology in the classroom to engage students	iPads - 50	Title 1	15,160.00
Flowcabulary	Online subscription for the increase of vocabulary	Title 1	1,200.00
Subtotal: 16,360.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Training for teachers in the use of technology	Teacher Stipends	Title 1	4,426.00
Training for teachers in the use of technology	Substitute Teachers	Title1	5,200.00
Subtotal: 9626.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total: 25,986			

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition**					
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.	1.1. ELL students often lack vocabulary development.	1.1. All teachers will develop vocabulary through content area reading and writing.	1.1. All teachers and administrators	1.1. Grade level PLCs and planning	1.1. Common assessments, FAIR, FCAT, Core K-12	
CELLA Goal #1: The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient in Listening and Speaking will increase by 10%, as measured by the CELLA.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: ***60% (14) of ELL students are proficient in Listening and Speaking.***					
		1.2 It is challenging for teachers to meet the diverse needs of students in their classroom using conventional processes.	1.2. Classroom activities will be structured to incorporate cooperative learning and gradual release strategies to improve educational outcomes and meet the diverse needs of learners	1.2 Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	1.2 PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common formative assessments	1.2 Summative assessments, Observations
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.	2.1. ELL students often lack vocabulary development.	2.1. All teachers will develop vocabulary through content area reading and writing.	2.1. All teachers and administrators	2.1. Grade level PLCs and planning	2.1. Common assessments, FAIR, FCAT, Core K-12	
CELLA Goal #2: The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient in Reading will increase by 10%, as measured by the CELLA	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: ***13% (3) of ELL students were proficient in reading.***					
		2.2 It is challenging for teachers to meet the diverse needs of students in their classroom using conventional processes.	2.2. Classroom activities will be structured to incorporate cooperative learning and gradual release strategies to improve educational outcomes and meet the diverse needs of learners	2.2 Teachers, Literacy Coach, All Teachers, Administration	2.2 PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common formative assessments	2.2 Summative assessments, Observations
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.	3.1. ELL students often lack vocabulary development.	3.1. All teachers will develop vocabulary through content area reading and writing.	3.1. All teachers and administrators	3.1. Grade level PLCs and planning	3.1. Common assessments, FAIR, FCAT, Core K-12	
CELLA Goal #3: The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient in Writing will increase by 10%, as measured by the CELLA	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : *21% (5) of ELL students were proficient in writing.*					
		3.2 It is challenging for teachers to meet the diverse needs of students in their classroom using conventional processes.	3.2. Classroom activities will be structured to incorporate cooperative learning and gradual release strategies to improve educational outcomes and meet the diverse needs of learners	3.2 Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	3.2 PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common formative assessments	3.2 Summative assessments, Observations
		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #1B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**						
Mathematics Goal #5A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		

Mathematics Goal #5B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5D: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	

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

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goal

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

ddle School Mathema	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.	1A.1. It is challenging for teachers to meet the diverse needs of students in their classroom using conventional processes.	21A.1. Classroom activities will be structured to incorporate cooperative learning and gradual release strategies to improve educational outcomes and meet the diverse needs of learners	1A.1. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	1A.1. PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common formative assessments	1A.1. Summative assessments, Observations		

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

Mathematics Goal #1A: The percentage of students scoring proficient in math will increase by 10%, as measured by the FCAT 2.0.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	41% (351) of students scored proficient in math as measured by the FCAT.	***51% of students will be proficient in math, as measured by the FCAT.***					
		1A.2. Time constraints impact teachers' opportunities to meet collaboratively in professional learning communities.	1A.2. Teachers will meet by department on a regular basis to collaborate and discuss the implementation of Best Practices, data analysis, and common assessments.	1A.2. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	1A.2. PLC Collaboration meetings, PLC Data meetings, Common Assessment data analysis	1A.2. FAIR, CORE K-12, Summative Assessment, Observations, Formative Assessments	
		1A.3 Teachers have not received adequate professional development to support the implementation of blended instruction with the use of technology	1A.3. Teachers will participate in focused staff development centered around the use of instructional technology.	1A.3 Literacy Coach, Administration, Technology Specialist	1A.3. Observation of PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common assessments, walk through data, lesson plans, equipment check out logs	1A.3 PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common assessments, walk through data, lesson plans, equipment check out logs	

1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	1B.1. It is challenging for teachers to meet the diverse needs of students in their classroom using conventional processes.	1B1. Classroom activities will be structured to incorporate cooperative learning and gradual release strategies to improve educational outcomes and meet the diverse needs of learners	1B.1. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	1B.1. PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common formative assessments	1B.1. Summative assessments, Observations		
Mathematics Goal #1B: The percentage of students scoring not proficient in math will decrease by 27%%, as measured by the FAAR.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	27% (3) of FAAR students were a level 4, 5 or 6.	*0% of students taking the FAAR will be at a level 4, 5, or 6.*					
		1B.2. Time constraints impact teachers' opportunities to meet collaboratively in professional learning communities.	1B2. Teachers will meet by department on a regular basis to collaborate and discuss the implementation of Best Practices, data analysis, and common assessments.	1B.2. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	1B.2. PLC Collaboration meetings, PLC Data meetings, Common Assessment data analysis	1B.2. FAIR, CORE K-12, Summative Assessment, Observations, Formative Assessments	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.	2A.1. It is challenging for teachers to meet the diverse needs of students in their classroom using conventional processes.	2A.1. Classroom activities will be structured to incorporate cooperative learning and gradual release strategies to improve educational outcomes and meet the diverse needs of learners	2A.1. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	2A.1. PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common formative assessments	2A.1. Summative assessments, Observations		
Mathematics Goal #2A: The percentage of students scoring level 4 or 5 in math will increase by 10%, as measured by the FCAT 2.0.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	15% (130) of students scored a 4 or 5 on the FCAT math.	*25% or more of students taking the FCAT will score a level 4 or 5.*					

		2A.2. Time constraints impact teachers' opportunities to meet collaboratively in professional learning communities.	2A.2. Teachers will meet by department on a regular basis to collaborate and discuss the implementation of Best Practices, data analysis, and common assessments.	2A.2. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	2A.2. PLC Collaboration meetings, PLC Data meetings, Common Assessment data analysis	2A.2. FAIR, CORE K-12, Summative Assessment, Observations, Formative Assessments	
		2A.3. In the past, students have been heterogeneously grouped for academics classes.	2A.3. Honors classes will be offered for the first time in 8th grade. This is a pilot program.	2A.3 Administrators and teachers	2A.3. Observations, FCAT scores, formative assessments, summative assessments	2A.3. Observations, FCAT scores, formative assessments, summative assessments	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	2B.1. It is challenging for teachers to meet the diverse needs of students in their classroom using conventional processes.	2B.1. Classroom activities will be structured to incorporate cooperative learning and gradual release strategies to improve educational outcomes and meet the diverse needs of learners	2B.1. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	2B.1. PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common formative assessments	2B.1. Summative assessments, Observations		

Mathematics Goal #2B: The percentage of students scoring 7 or higher in math will increase by 27%, as measured by the FAAR.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	72% of students taking the FAAR scored a level 7 or higher.	*100% of students taking the FAAR will score a level 7 or higher.*					
		2B.2. Time constraints impact teachers opportunities to meet collaboratively in professional learning communities	2B.2. Teachers will meet by department on a regular basis to collaborate and discuss the implementation of Best Practices, data analysis, and common assessments.	2B.2. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	2B.2. PLC Collaboration meetings, PLC Data meetings, Common Assessment data analysis	2B.2. FAIR, CORE K-12, Summative Assessment, Observations, Formative Assessments	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3A.1. It is challenging for teachers to meet the diverse needs of students in their classroom using conventional processes.	3A.1. Classroom activities will be structured to incorporate cooperative learning and gradual release strategies to improve educational outcomes and meet the diverse needs of learners	3A.1. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	3A.1. PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common formative assessments	3A.1. FAIR, CORE K-12, Summative Assessment, Observations, Formative Assessments		
Mathematics Goal #3A: The percentage of students making learning gains in math will increase by 10%, as measured by the FCAT 2.0.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	48% of students taking the math FCAT showed a learning gain.	*58% of all students taking the math FCAT will show a learning gain.*					

		3A.2. Time constraints impact teachers' opportunities to meet collaboratively in professional learning communities.	3A.2. Teachers will meet by department on a regular basis to collaborate and discuss the implementation of Best Practices, data analysis, and common assessments.	3A.2. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	3A.2. PLC Collaboration meetings, PLC Data meetings, Common Assessment data analysis	3A.2. FAIR, CORE K-12, Summative Assessment, Observations, Formative Assessments	
		3A.3 Teachers have not received adequate professional development to support the implementation of blended instruction with the use of technology	3A.3. Teachers will participate in focused staff development centered around the use of instructional technology.	3A.3 Literacy Coach, Administration, Technology Specialist	3A.3. Observation of PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common assessments, walk through data, lesson plans, equipment check out logs	3A.3 PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common assessments, walk through data, lesson plans, equipment check out logs	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3B.1. It is challenging for teachers to meet the diverse needs of students in their classroom using conventional processes.	3B.1. Classroom activities will be structured to incorporate cooperative learning and gradual release strategies to improve educational outcomes and meet the diverse needs of learners	3B.1. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Math Teachers, Administration	3B.1. PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common formative assessments	3B.1. FAIR, CORE K-12, Summative Assessment, Observations, Formative Assessments		

Mathematics Goal #3B: *Data Unavailable*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	*N/A*					
		3B.2. Time constraints impact teachers' opportunities to meet collaboratively in professional learning communities.	3B.2. Teachers will meet by department on a regular basis to collaborate and discuss the implementation of Best Practices, data analysis, and common assessments.	3B.2. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	3B.2. PLC Collaboration meetings, PLC Data meetings, Common Assessment data analysis	3B.2. FAIR, CORE K-12, Summative Assessment, Observations, Formative Assessments	
		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		
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4A.1. A balanced support system needs to be established to support the diverse needs of students with disabilities in mainstream courses.	4A.1. A dual certification model will be adopted for ESE students. Ensuring fewer students per class with the supports needed to help all students succeed.	4A.1. Teachers and Administrators	4A.1. Balancing of classes, Scheduling process	4A.1. FCAT data, Formative Assessments, Summative Assessments, FAIR data, Core K-12 data.		
Mathematics Goal #4: The percentage of students in the lowest quartile making learning gains in math will increase by 10%, as measured by the FCAT 2.0.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *30% of students in the lowest quartile made learning gains.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *40% of students in the lowest quartile will make learning gains.*					
		4A.2. Students have difficulty grasping concepts.	4A.2. Students would benefit from an additional teacher pushing into classrooms to assist with instruction.	4A.2. SSAP Teacher	4A.2. Observations and teacher logs	4A.2. Formative and summative assessments, FCAT, Core K-12 test scores.	
		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	
5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** 60% of students are not proficient as measured by the FCAT.	**55%**	**50%**	**45%**	**40%**	**35%**	**30% or less**
Mathematics Goal #5A: The percentage of non-proficient students in math is currently 60%. We will reduce the number of students non-proficient in math to 30% as measured by the FCAT.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**	5B.1. It is challenging for teachers to meet the diverse needs of students in their classroom using conventional processes.	5B.1. Classroom activities will be structured to incorporate cooperative learning and gradual release strategies to improve educational outcomes and meet the diverse needs of learners	5B.1. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	5B.1. PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common formative assessments	5B.1. FAIR, CORE K-12, Summative Assessment, Observations, Formative Assessments		

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

Mathematics Goal #5B: The percentage of students, in the various sub-groups, scoring not proficient will decrease by 10%, as measured by the FCAT 2.0	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: 52% Black: 74% Hispanic: 64% Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: 42% Black: 64% Hispanic: 54% Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A					
		5.B.2. Teachers have not received adequate professional development to support the implementation of blended instruction with the use of technology	5.B.2. Teachers will participate in focused staff development centered around the use of instructional technology.	5.B.2. Literacy Coach, Administration, Technology Specialist	5.B.2. Observation of PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common assessments, walk through data, lesson plans, equipment check out logs	5.B.2. PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common assessments, walk through data, lesson plans, equipment check out logs	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.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		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5C.1. It is challenging for teachers to meet the diverse needs of students in their classroom using conventional processes.	5C.1. Classroom activities will be structured to incorporate cooperative learning and gradual release strategies to improve educational outcomes and meet the diverse needs of learners	5C.1. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	5C.1. PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common formative assessments	5C.1. FAIR, CORE K-12, Summative Assessment, Observations, Formative Assessments		
Mathematics Goal #5C: The percentage of ELL students scoring not proficient in math will decrease by 10%, as measured by the FCAT 2.0.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	81% (30) of ELL students did not score proficient on the math FCAT	*71% of ELL students will not score proficient on the math FCAT.*					

		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5D.1. A balanced support system needs to be established to support the diverse needs of students with disabilities in mainstream courses.	5D.1. A dual certification model will be adopted for ESE students. Ensuring fewer students per class with the supports needed to help all students succeed.	5D.1. Teachers and Administrators	5D.1. Balancing of classes, Scheduling process	5D.1. FCAT data, Formative Assessments, Summative Assessments, FAIR data, Core K-12 data.		
Mathematics Goal #5D: The percentage of SWD students scoring not proficient in math will decrease by 10%, as measured by the FCAT 2.0.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	83% of SWD did not score proficient on the Math FCAT	*73% or less of students will score not proficient on the math FCAT.*					

		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5E.1. It is challenging for teachers to meet the diverse needs of students in their classroom using conventional processes.	5E.1. Classroom activities will be structured to incorporate cooperative learning and gradual release strategies to improve educational outcomes and meet the diverse needs of learners	5E.1. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	5E.1. PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common formative assessments	5E.1. FAIR, CORE K-12, Summative Assessment, Observations, Formative Assessments		
Mathematics Goal #5E: The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring not proficient in math will decrease by 10%, as measured by the FCAT 2.0.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *66% (424) of ED students scored a not proficient on the FCAT Math*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *56% or less of ED students will score not proficient on the math FCAT.*					

		5.E.2. Teachers have not received adequate professional development to support the implementation of blended instruction with the use of technology	5.E.2. Teachers will participate in focused staff development centered around the use of instructional technology.	5.E.2. Literacy Coach, Administration, Technology Specialist	5.E.2. Observation of PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common assessments, walk through data, lesson plans, equipment check out logs	5.E.2. PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common assessments, walk through data, lesson plans, equipment check out logs	
		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

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

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.	1.1. No Barrier for pass rate. Students have not been identified at the 5th grade level to take advanced math.	1.1. Evaluate students for advanced math in 6th grade early and place students who could be successful in advanced math.	1.1. Admin and math teachers	1.1. Watch the numbers in the Advanced math class and watch the students' completion rate advanced math classes.	1.1. EOC for Algebra, FCAT for math.		
Algebra 1 Goal #1: ***Continue with 100% pass rate for the Algebra EOC and increase the number of students taking Algebra at Pasco Middle School.***	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	100% of all students received a 3 or better on the EOC.	*100% of all students taking the EOC for Algebra will receive a 3 or better.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Algebra Goal #2: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**						
Algebra 1 Goal #3A: *N/A*							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.**	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		

Algebra 1 Goal #3B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	*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.	

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

Algebra 1 Goal #3D: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	

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

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

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

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Geometry Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017		
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2011-2012**						
Geometry Goal #3A: ***Enter narrative for the goal in this box.***							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.**	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		

Geometry Goal #3B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.		
Geometry Goal #3D: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional						

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

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
iPad Charging cart to support the iPad purchase	This cart will allow the iPads to charge and sync for easier use.	Title 1	2,599.95
Subtotal: 2,599.95			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Big Ideas Math	Teacher Training on the text series	Free with the purchase of the text	0
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
SSAP Teacher	SSAP Teacher salary. This teacher will push into math (and other teachers') classrooms to assist struggling students.	Title 1	35,000.00
Subtotal:			
Total: 37,599.95			

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.	1A.1. It is challenging for teachers to meet the diverse needs of students in their classroom using conventional processes.	1A.1. Classroom activities will be structured to incorporate cooperative learning and gradual release strategies to improve educational outcomes and meet the diverse needs of learners	1A.1. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	1A.1. PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common formative assessments	1A.1. FAIR, CORE K-12, Summative Assessment, Observations, Formative Assessments		

Science Goal #1A: The percentage of 8th grade students scoring proficient in science will increase by 10%, as measured by the FCAT 2.0.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	30% of 8th grade students were proficient as measured by the FCAT.	*40% of 8th grade students will be proficient as measured by the FCAT*					
		1A.2. Teachers have not received adequate professional development to support the implementation of blended instruction with the use of technology	1A.2. Teachers will participate in focused staff development centered around the use of instructional technology.	1A.2. Literacy Coach, Administration, Technology Specialist	1A.2. Observation of PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common assessments, walk through data, lesson plans, equipment check out logs	1A.2. PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common assessments, walk through data, lesson plans, equipment check out logs	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.	1B.1. No barrier	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		

Science Goal #1B: *100% of students will be proficient on the FAAR science test.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	0% of students scored a 4,5,6 on the science FAAR. 100% were proficient at higher levels.	*100% of students will be at least a 4,5,6 on the FAAR science test.*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.	2A.1. It is challenging for teachers to meet the diverse needs of students in their classroom using conventional processes.	2A.1. Classroom activities will be structured to incorporate cooperative learning and gradual release strategies to improve educational outcomes and meet the diverse needs of learners	2A1 Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	2A.1. PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common formative assessments	2A.1. FAIR, CORE K-12, Summative Assessment, Observations, Formative Assessments		
Science Goal #2A: The percentage of 8th grade students scoring a level 4 or 5 in science will increase by 10%, as measured by the FCAT 2.0.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	3% (8) of students scored a 4 or 5 in the science FCAT.	*13% or more of students will score a 4 or 5 on the science FCAT.*					

		2A.2. Teachers have not received adequate professional development to support the implementation of blended instruction with the use of technology	2A.2. Teachers will participate in focused staff development centered around the use of instructional technology.	2A.2. Literacy Coach, Administration, Technology Specialist	2A.2. Observation of PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common assessments, walk through data, lesson plans, equipment check out logs	2A2. PLC collaboration meetings, PLC data meetings, common assessments, walk through data, lesson plans, equipment check out logs	
		2A.3. In the past, students have been heterogeneously grouped for academics classes.	2A.3. Honors classes will be offered for the first time in 8th grade. This is a pilot program.	2A.3 Administrators and teachers	2A.3. Observations, FCAT scores, formative assessments, summative assessments	2A.3. Observations, FCAT scores, formative assessments, summative assessments	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.	2B.1. No barrier	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Science Goal #2B: *100% of students will be proficient at a level 7 or higher on the FAAR science test.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	100% of students scored a 7 or higher on the FAAR.	*100% of students will score a 7 or higher on the FAAR.*					
		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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Science Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

Biology 1 EOC Goals	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**						

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

Biology 1 Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

Science Professional Development

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

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Brain Pop	Online resource to assist with student engagement	Tile 1	1,495.00

Study Island	Online resource to assist with student engagement and assessment of understanding	Title 1	3,254.00
Subtotal: 4749.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total: 4749.00			

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.	1A.1. Students do not get the opportunity to practice writing in all curricular areas.	1A.1. Writing portfolios will be kept by language arts teachers for every student, which include 6 writing assessments each quarter. These writing assessments will be written in all curricular areas and assessed by the teacher who assigns it.	1A.1. All teachers	1A.1. Monthly data chats	1A.1. Writing portfolio, formative and summative assessments, Florida Writes.		

Writing Goal #1A: The percentage of students scoring proficient in writing will increase by 10%, as measured by the Florida Writes.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	63% of students scored proficient on the Florida Writes.	*73% of students will score proficient on the Florida Writes.*					
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.	1B.1. No barrier	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Writing Goal #1B: *100% of students will score a 4 or higher on the FAAR writing test.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	100% of students scored a 4 or higher on the FAAR writing test.	*100% of students will score a 4 or higher on the FAAR writing test.*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

Writing Professional Development

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

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Writing Portfolios	Folders and materials needed for organization	School Fees	200.00
Subtotal: 200.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total: 200.00			

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

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

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

Civics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Project Based Learning	All	Social Studies Dept. Head	Social Studies and other teachers	Fall 2012	Watch for use in Lesson Plans	Admin

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
PBL Training	PBL Training	Title 1	4150.00
Subtotal: 4150.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total: 4150.00			

End of Civics Goals

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

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

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

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

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

U.S. History Professional Development

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

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

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

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

End of U.S. History Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)	**Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance**						
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Attendance	1.1. Many students are not engaged in school. Many parents do not see the importance of regular attendance at school.	1.1. On track status will be used for entrance into all school incentive activities.	1.1. Administration and teachers	1.1. Examine quarterly on track status and attendance data.	1.1. TERMS attendance data, SDS data tracking of student attendance and on track status.		
Attendance Goal #1: *The number of students with 10 or more absences will decrease by 10%.*	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
	93.5%	*94%*					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					

	39% (340) of students at Pasco Middle School have excessive absences.	*29% or less of students at PMS will have excessive absences.*					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	13% of students at PMS have excessive tardies.	*8% or less of students will have excessive tardies.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Attendance Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Use of the SDS system	All	Tech Specialist	All teachers	Fall 2012	Continued monitoring of system at data chats	All admin

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
Activities for student incentives	Dances, snacks, movies, etc	PTO	1500.00
Subtotal: 1500.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total: 1500.00			

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)	**Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension**						
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Suspension	1.1. Many students are not engaged in school.	1.1. On track status will be used for entrance into all school incentive activities.	1.1. Administration and teachers	1.1. Examine quarterly on track status and discipline data.	1.1. TERMS discipline data, SDS data tracking of student discipline and on track status.		
Suspension Goal #1: ***The total number of discipline incidents will decrease by 10%.***	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions					
	623 day of ISS were reported for 2012.	***561 days or fewer of ISS will be assigned in 2013.***					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					
	388 incidents were assigned ISS in 2012.	***350 or fewer incidents will be assigned ISS in 2013.***					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					

	1079 days of OSS were assigned in 2012.	*972 or fewer days of OSS will be assigned in 2013.*					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	175 incidents were assigned OSS in 2012.	*158 or fewer incidents will be assigned OSS in 2013.*					
		1.2. Many parents are unaware of their child's behavior at school	1.2. Teachers are required to contact parents as an intervention prior to writing a level 1 or select level 2 discipline referrals.	1.2. Teachers and administration	1.2. Examine quarterly on track status and discipline data.	1.2. TERMS discipline data, SDS data tracking of student discipline and on track status.	
		1.3. Teachers lack the time to track student behavior in the classroom.	1.3. Teachers will use the SDS system to electronically track student behavior for themselves and all other teachers at the school.	1.3. Teachers and administrators	1.3. Examine quarterly on track status and discipline data.	1.3. TERMS discipline data, SDS data tracking of student discipline and on track status.	

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Use of the SDS system	All	Tech Specialist	All teachers	Fall 2012	Continued monitoring of system at data chats	All admin

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
Activities for student incentives	Dances, snacks, movies, etc	PTO	1500.00
Subtotal: 1500.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
SDS system	System used to monitor all student data	District Office Funding	0

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Training in the use of the SDS system	Snacks for training	Principal's Account	100.00
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total: 1500.00			

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

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

	Enter numerical data for graduation rate in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected graduation rate in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)	**Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement**						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Parent Involvement	1.1. Parents are not involved in school activities unless they are coming to celebrate their child's success.	1.1. Celebrate students' success through 4 Parent Nights coordinated by the Parent Involvement Assistant and Department Heads.	1.1. Parent Involvement Coordinator, Teachers, Children, Admin	1.1. Increased numbers of parents attending school events.	1.1. Sign in sheets for events at school.		
Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.* **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*					

	Enter numerical data for current level of parent involvement in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of parent involvement in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

Parent Involvement Budget

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Parent Involvement Coordinator	Hire a Parent Involvement Coordinator	Title 1	25, 356.78
Subtotal: 25,356.78			
Total: 25,356.78			

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
CTE Goal #1: *Increase the student interest for the CCTE programs.*	1.1. Students do not select some of the CCTE programs as much as others.	1.1. Introduce a new CCTE program called Robotics	1.1. Robotics Teacher Michael Bradley	1.1. Assess the selection of the robotics course for the 2013-2014 school year as compared to the selections for the Technology course in the previous year. Interview students during and after the initial implementation of the course	1.1. Course selections Student Interviews
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

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

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
Robotics Training	Robotics	District Facilitator	Michael Bradley	Fall 2012	Throughout the year with Robotics focus group.	Administration at the district and at the school.

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

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

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

Additional Goals Professional Development

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

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.
Reading Budget
Total: 25,986.00
CELLA Budget
Total: 0
Mathematics Budget
Total: 37,599.95
Science Budget
Total: 4749.00
Writing Budget
Total: 200.00
Civics Budget
Total: 4150.00
U.S. History Budget
Total: 0
Attendance Budget
Total: 1500.00
Suspension Budget
Total: 1500.00
Dropout Prevention Budget
Total: 0
Parent Involvement Budget
Total: 25,356.78
STEM Budget
Total: 0
CTE Budget
Total: 0
Additional Goals
Total: 0

Grand Total: 101,041.73

Differentiated Accountability

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
▫Priority	▫Focus	▫Prevent

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.
Monitor the use of Title 1 funding for the initial year, investigate the honors curriculum and its implementation at Pasco Middle School.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount

To increase the use of technology at Pasco Middle School through he use of blended instruction. Training and hardware purchases will be needed.	Total amount of SAC funding