FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Maitland Middle School	District Name: Orange County Public Schools
Principal: Ronald Maxwell	Superintendent: Dr. Barbara Jenkins
SAC Chair: Anne Albright	Date of School Board Approval: January 29,2013

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

School Grades Trend Data (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)

High School Feedback Report

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

Administrators

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

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Ronald Maxwell	Bachelor of Science in History/Secondary Education Master of Science in Educational Leadership Principal Certification for All Grades Educational Leadership Certification for All Grades Social Science Certification for Grades 5-9	5 years	8 years	Based on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Maitland Middle School made the following learning gains: • 10% point increase in Reading learning gains (55% to 66%) • 28% point increase in Reading learning gains of the lowest 25% (30% to 58%) • 13% point increase in Math learning gains (58% to 71%) • 38% point increase in Math learning gains of the lowest 25% (22% to 60%) Maitland Middle School earned "A" school grade
Assistant Principal	Paul Wilhite	Bachelor of Arts- University of Florida Masters-Business Administration-Florida State University Specialist Degree – Educational Leadership- University of Central Florida Certified in History 6-12 Leadership K-12	1	1	School Grade for 2011-12 designated "A". Reading learning gains, 68%, Math learning gains, 74%, Reading learning gains, lowest 25%, 63%, Math learning gains, lowest 25%, 66%.
Assistant Principal	Tamara Baker-Drayton	Masters in Educational Leadership/ Biology Grades 6-12	0	0	Before Accepting the Assistant Principal's Postion at Maitland Middle School, Mrs. Baker-Drayton was the 8th Grade Adminstrative Dean at Freedom Middle School. As the 8th Grade Adminisatrative Dean at Freedom Middle School, Mrs. Baker-Drayton supervised over 360 8th grade students. Out of the 360 students, 103 eigth graders were in the lowest 25% which accounted for 33% of the

					students. Of the 103 students, 21% students were Black, 49% were Hispanic, and 16% were White. In addition, to the 33%, 75% of the 8th graders were eligible for free/reduced lunch. The 8th grade students in the lowest quartile also accounted for 48% of the discipline referrals and suspensions. Mrs. Baker-Drayotn was able to decrease the number of discipline referrals by 5% due to creating a Discipline matirx that exhibited school wide consistency. Under Mrs. Drayton's supervision, 40% of the targeted group made learning gains on the FCAT as measured by the scale score; due to 50% of the targeted group participating in mentoring sessions at least four times a month for the 2011-2012 school year with a focus in personal and social skills.

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

Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading Coach	Diane Smith	Bachelor of Science in Secondary English Ed. Master of Reading Ed. ELA Middles Grades 5-9 Reading K-12	18	0 (first year)	Based on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Maitland Middle School made the following learning gains: • 10% point increase in Reading learning gains (55% to 66%) • 28% point increase in Reading learning gains of the lowest 25% (30% to 58%)
Learning Resource Specialist	Margaret Frey	Elementary Education Secondary English Educational Leadership Bachelor of Arts Master of Science	10	14	Based on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Maitland Middle School made the following learning gains: • 10% point increase in Reading learning gains (55% to 66%) • 28% point increase in Reading learning gains of the lowest 25% (30% to 58%)

Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Use and interview panel consisting of teachers and administrators to select highly effective teachers.	Principal and Assistant Principals	August 2012
2. Provide professional development training focused on building teacher capacity as it relates to research based best practices.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Learning Resource Specialist and Reading Coach	June 2013
3. Coaching and support as it relates to teaching and learning.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Deans, Learning Resource Specialist, Staffing Specialist,	June 2013

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

	Media Specialist and Reading Coach	
4. Mentor program for new teachers to Maitland Middle School.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Learning Resource Specialist and Reading Coach	June 2013

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

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
2% (2) of instructional staff are teaching out-of-field	Teachers that are teaching out-of-field are currently taking classes to meet all certification requirements
1% (1) of the instructional staff was rated less than effective last year	Professional Improvement Plan will be implemented with this staff member. Professional development will be provided to build teacher capacity. Instructional resource staff and the evaluating administrator will provide one on one coaching.

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
62	0	19.3% (12)	48.3% (30)	32.2% (20)	28.5% (18)	98% (62)	9.5% (6)	12.6% (8)	15.8% (10)

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.

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Cheri Rauls	Randy Singer	Mr. Singer was the previous AVID instructor prior to becoming a guidance counselor this current school year. Ms. Rauls+ is the new AVID teacher at Maitland Middle School.	Bi-weekly meetings to discuss the following: lesson planning, instructional strategies, formative/ summative assessments, classroom management strategies and other topics as needed.
Franz Honeygan	Robert Privitera	Mr. Privitera and Mr. Honeygan both teach 8th grade American history.	Bi-weekly meetings to discuss the following: lesson planning, instructional strategies, formative/ summative assessments, classroom management strategies and other topics as needed.

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

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

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

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. Christine Wallace (Staffing Specialist), Diane Smith (Reading Coach), Ronald Maxwell (Principal), Paul Wilhite (Assistant Principal), Tamara Drayton (Assistant Principal), Diane Willson (Guidance Counselor), Randy Bishop (Guidance Counselor), Sandy Bishop (Guidance Counselor), Diane Smith (Reading Coach), Nancy Nielson (Media Specialist), Meg Frey (Learning Resource Specialist) and Professional Learning Community Leaders.
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? We will coordinate meetings with teachers based on the instructional cycle to discuss benchmarks and student mastery of the benchmarks. Data reviewed will include teacher common assessments, min-benchmark assessments and district benchmark assessments. The RtI Leadership Council will meet once month as a group.
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 RtI problem-solving process was used in developing professional development opportunities to aid teachers in meeting the needs of all students.
MTSS Implementation
Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior. The data sources and management systems that will be used to summarize data are the following: Information Management System (IMS), Educational Data Warehouse (EDW), and other sources such as Edusoft, FAIR, Reading Plus, System 44, Read 180 and Compass Learning.
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. Key staff member that are RtI trained will continue to build staff capacity during staff meetings, PLC meetings and grade level meetings.
Describe the plan to support MTSS. Administrators will support MTSS by planning and facilitating data chats with core area teachers.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Diane Smith (Reading Coach), Nancy Nielson (Media Specialist), Meg Frey (Learning Resource Specialist), Ronald Maxwell (Principal), Paul Wilhite (Assistant Principal), Tamara Drayton (Assistant Principal), Department Chairs and Literacy teachers.
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The literacy team will meet monthly to discuss activities that will be done throughout the school year and in Hawks' Nest. The team will determine ways to increase the use of reading strategies in all content areas.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? The major initiative of the LLT this year is to increase the use of reading strategies in all content areas.

Public School Choice
- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**

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

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

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

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

Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

N/A

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

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

Benchmark and FAIR data will be reviewed with all teachers to aid them in meeting the needs of their students. The Reading Coach will provide professional development to promote researched based reading strategies, in an effort to promote reading in all content areas. Monitoring will take place through informal observations and learning plans.

High Schools Only

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

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

N/A

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

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

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

N/A

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1A: By June 2013, 33% of the students at Maitland Middle School will score at achievement level 3 in reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 28% (272)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 33% (322)	1A.1. Limited teacher knowledge of standards and item specifications.	1A.1. Use professional learning community meetings to deconstruct standards, set learning goals, develop complex scales, identify instructional strategies and monitor data.	1A.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist.	1A.1. Learning plans, classroom observations, PLC notes and progress monitoring data	1A.1. Benchmark Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments, FAIR, Read 180 and FCAT
			1A.2. Lack of differentiated instruction.	1A.2. Analyze reading progress through the use of formative and summative assessments, data from FCAT, Edusoft, SRI and Reading Plus to monitor student progress, predict growth and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students.	1A.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist	1A.2. Learning plans, student assessments, professional development and PLC notes	1A.2. Benchmark Assessments , Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT
			1A.3. Lack of positive relationships between staff members and students.	1A.3. Bridge Mentor Program and Hawk Watch Program	1A.3. Principal, Assistant Principals, Deans, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, Media Specialist, Learning Resource Specialist and Guidance Counselors	1A.3. Progress Reports, Report Cards and Formative/Summative Assessments	1A.3. Benchmark Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
			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 in reading.			2A.1. Limited teacher knowledge of standards and item specifications.	2A.1. Use professional learning community meetings to deconstruct standards, set learning goals, develop complex scales, identify instructional strategies and monitor data.	2A.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist	2A.1. Learning plans, classroom observations, PLC notes and progress monitoring data	2A.1. Benchmark Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT
Reading Goal #2A: By June 2013, 49% (478) of the students at Maitland Middle School will score at or above achievement level 4 in reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 44% (428)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 49% (478)					
			2A.2. Lack of differentiated instruction.	2A.2. Analyze reading progress through the use of formative and summative assessment data from FCAT, Edusoft, SRI and common assessments to monitor student progress, predict growth and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students.	2A.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist	2A.2. Learning plans, student assessments, professional development and PLC notes	2A.2. Benchmark Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Reading Goal #2B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3A.1. Limited teacher knowledge of standards and item specifications.	3A.1. Use professional learning community meetings to deconstruct standards, set learning goals, develop complex scales, identify instructional strategies and monitor data.	3A.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist	3A.1. Learning plans, classroom observations, PLC notes and progress monitoring data	3A.1. Benchmark Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments, FAIR, Read 180, SRI, CELLA, System 44 and FCAT
Reading Goal #3A: By June 2013, 70% (683) of the students at Maitland Middle School will make learning gains in reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 65% (632)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 70% (683)					
			3A.2. Lack of differentiated instruction.	3A.2. Analyze reading progress through the use of formative and summative assessments, data from FCAT, Edusoft, FAIR, CELLA, SRI, Reading Plus, System 44 and Read 180common assessments to monitor student progress, predict growth and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students.	3A.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist	3A.2. Learning plans, student assessments, professional development and PLC notes	3A.2. Benchmark Assessments , Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Reading Goal #3B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4A.1. Limited teacher knowledge of standards and item specifications.	4A.1. Use professional learning community meetings to deconstruct standards, set learning goals, develop complex scales, identify instructional strategies and monitor data.	4A.1. Assistant Principals and Reading Coach	4A.1. Learning plans, classroom observations, PLC notes and progress monitoring data	4A.1. Benchmark Exams, Mini-Benchmark Exams, FAIR, Read 180 and FCAT
Reading Goal #4A: By June 2013, 70% (683) of the students at Maitland Middle School will make learning gains in reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 58% (539)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 70% (683)					
			4A.2. Lack of differentiated instruction.	4A.2. Analyze reading progress through the use of formative and summative assessments, data from FCAT, Edusoft, SRI, CELLA, FAIR, Read 180, System 44 and Reading Plus to monitor student progress, predict growth and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students.	4A.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist	4A.2. Learning plans, student assessments, professional development and PLC notes	4A.2. Benchmark Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT
			4A.3. Lack of positive relationships between staff members and students.	4A.3. Bridge Mentor Program and Hawk Watch Program	4A.3. Principal, Assistant Principals, Deans, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, Media Specialist, Learning Resource Specialist and Guidance Counselors	4A.3. Progress Reports, Report Cards and Formative/Summative Assessments	4A.3. Benchmark Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.
Reading Goal #4B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.
			4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**	Asian=85% Black=43% English Language Learners (ELL)=41%	Asian=89% Black=49% English Language Learners (ELL)=48%	Asian=90% Black=54% English Language Learners (ELL)=54%	Asian=91% Black=59% English Language Learners (ELL)=59%	Asian=92% Black=64% English Language Learners (ELL)=64%	Asian=94% Black=70% English Language Learners (ELL)=69%
Reading Goal #5A: By June 2013 the percentage of students achieving Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) in the following student subgroups will be: Asian=89% Black=49% English Language Learners (ELL)=48%							

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. Limited teacher knowledge of standards and item specifications.	5B.1. Use professional learning community meetings to deconstruct standards, set learning goals, develop complex scales, identify instructional strategies and monitor data.	5B.1. Assistant Principals and Reading Coach	5B.1. Learning plans, classroom observations, PLC notes and progress monitoring data	5B.1. Benchmark Exams, Mini-Benchmark Exams and FCAT	
Reading Goal #5B: By June 2013 the percentage of students not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease by 3% in the following student subgroups by ethnicity: White 11% (71) Black 54% (142) Hispanic 39% (43)	**2012 Current Level of Performance:*** White: 14% (84) Black: 57% 153) Hispanic: 42% (50)	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:*** White: 11% (71) Black: 54% (142) Hispanic: 39% (43)					
		5B.2. Lack of differentiated instruction.	5B.2. Analyze reading progress through the use of formative and summative assessments, data from FCAT, Edusoft, FAIR, System 44, Reading Plus, Read 180, CELLA and SRI to monitor student progress, predict growth and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students.	5B.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist	5B.2. Learning plans, student assessments, professional development and PLC notes	5B.2. Benchmark Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT	
		5C.3. Lack of positive relationships between staff members and students.	5C.3. Bridge Mentor Program and Hawk Watch Program	5C.3. Principal, Assistant Principals, Deans, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, Media Specialist,	5C.3. Progress Reports, Report Cards and Formative/Summative Assessments	5C.3. Benchmark Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and	

			Learning Resource Specialist and Guidance Counselors		FCAT

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. Limited teacher knowledge of standards and item specifications	5C.1. Use professional learning community meetings to deconstruct standards, set learning goals, develop complex scales, identify instructional strategies and monitor data.	5C.1. Assistant Principals and Reading Coach	5C.1. Learning plans, classroom observations, PLC notes and progress monitoring data	5C.1. Benchmark Exams, Mini-Benchmark Exams and FCAT
Reading Goal #5C: By June 2013 we will increase the percentage of English Language Learners making satisfactory progress to 42% (19) in reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 61% (39)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 58% (26)					
			5C.2. Lack of differentiated instruction.	5C.2. Analyze reading progress through the use of formative and summative assessments, data from FCAT, Edusoft, FAIR, System 44, Reading Plus, Read 180, CELLA and SRI to monitor student progress, predict growth and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students.	5C.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist and Learning Resource Specialist	5C.2. Learning plans, student assessments, professional development and PLC notes	5C.2. Benchmark Assessments , Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT
			5C.3. Lack of positive relationships between staff members and students.	5C.3. Bridge Mentor Program and Hawk Watch Program	5C.3. Principal, Assistant Principals, Deans, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, Media Specialist, Learning Resource Specialist and Guidance Counselors	5C.3. Progress Reports, Report Cards and Formative/Summative Assessments	5C.3. Benchmark Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and 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 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. Limited teacher knowledge of standards and item specifications	5D.1. Use professional learning community meetings to deconstruct standards, set learning goals, develop complex scales, identify instructional strategies and monitor data.	5D.1. Assistant Principals and Staffing Specialist.	5D.1. Learning plans, classroom observations, PLC notes and progress monitoring data	5D.1. Benchmark Exams, Mini-Benchmark Exams and FCAT
Reading Goal #5D: By June 2013 we will increase the percentage of Students with Disabilities (SWD) making satisfactory progress to 42% (40) in reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 61% (73)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 58% (55)					
			5D.2. Lack of differentiated instruction.	5D.2. Analyze reading progress through the use of formative and summative assessments, data from FCAT, Edusoft, FAIR, System 44, Reading Plus, Read 180, CELLA and SRI to monitor student progress, predict growth and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students.	5D.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, ESE teachers and Learning Resource Specialist	5D.2. Learning plans, student assessments, professional development and PLC notes	5D.2. Benchmark Assessments , Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT

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

		5D.3. Lack of positive relationships between staff members and students.	5D.3. Bridge Mentor Program and Hawk Watch Program	5D.3. Principal, Assistant Principals, Deans, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, Media Specialist, Learning Resource Specialist and Guidance Counselors	5D.3. Progress Reports, Report Cards and Formative/Summative Assessments	5D.3. Benchmark Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT

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. Limited teacher knowledge of standards and item specifications	5E.1. Use professional learning community meetings to deconstruct standards, set learning goals, develop complex scales, identify instructional strategies and monitor data.	5E.1. Assistant Principals and Reading Coach	5E.1. Learning plans, classroom observations, PLC notes and progress monitoring data	5E.1. Benchmark Exams, Mini-Benchmark Exams and FCAT
Reading Goal #5E: By June 2013 will increase the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students making satisfactory progress to 53% (191) in reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 50% (203)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 47% (169)					
			5E.2. Lack of differentiated instruction.	5E.2. Analyze reading progress through the use of formative and summative assessments, data from FCAT, Edusoft, FAIR, System 44, Reading Plus, Read 180, CELLA and SRI to monitor student progress, predict growth and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students.	5E.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, ESE teachers and Learning Resource Specialist	5E.2. Learning plans, student assessments, professional development and PLC notes	5E.2. Benchmark Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT
			5E.3. Lack of positive relationships between staff members and students.	5E.3. Bridge Mentor Program and Hawk Watch Program	5E.3. Principal, Assistant Principals, Deans, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, Media Specialist, Learning Resource Specialist and Guidance Counselors	5E.3. Progress Reports, Report Cards and Formative/Summative Assessments	5E.3. Benchmark Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT

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
Marzano Design Questions (1, 2, 5, 7, and 8)	All Grades	Principal, Assistant Principals and Learning Resource Specialist	All	Faculty Meetings and Planning Periods (October, November and January)	Learning plans, classroom observations and PLC notes	Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist
Common Core Implementation	All Grades	Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist	Core Subject Areas and Literacy	Core area planning days, which are offered each nine weeks	Reflection, classroom observations and learning plans	Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist
Data Chats	All Grades	Assistant Principals, Reading Coach and PLC Leaders	Core Subject Areas and Literacy	Scheduled every 2 to 3 weeks based on the instructional cycle	Benchmark Exams, mini-benchmark exams, focus calendars and common assessments	Principal, Assistant Principals and Reading Coach

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

Differentiated Instruction	All Grades	PD 360	Core Subject Areas	Common planning time	Learning plans, classroom observations and PLC notes	Principal and Assistant Principals
SpringBoard	All Grade/Language Arts	District SpringBoard Representative	Language Arts	Half day trainings per nine weeks during common planning time	Learning Plans, classroom observations, focus calendars and PLC notes	Principal, Assistant Principals and Reading Coach

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

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Common Core Implementation of Reading Standards	Substitutes for full day professional development training for core teachers each nine weeks.	Title II Funds	$5600.00
		School Based Budget	$2532.00
			Subtotal: $8,132.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: $8,132.00

End of Reading Goals

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

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1: By June 2013 we will increase the percentage of students scoring proficient in listening/speaking to 77% (21).	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: 74% (20)	1.1. Limited teacher knowledge of standards and item specifications.	1.1. Use professional learning community meetings to deconstruct standards, set learning goals, develop complex scales, identify instructional strategies and monitor data	5E.1. Assistant Principals and Reading Coach	5E.1. Learning plans, classroom observations, PLC notes and progress monitoring data	5E.1. Benchmark Exams, Mini-Benchmark Exams and FCAT
		1.2. Lack of differentiated instruction.	1.2. Analyze reading progress through the use of formative and summative assessments, data from FCAT, Edusoft, FAIR, System 44, Reading Plus, Read 180, CELLA and SRI to monitor student progress, predict growth and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students.	1.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, ESE teachers and Learning Resource Specialist	1.2. Learning plans, student assessments, professional development and PLC notes	1.2. Benchmark Assessments , Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2: By June 2013 we will increase the percentage of students scoring proficient in reading to 44% (12).	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: 41% (11)	2.1. Limited teacher knowledge of standards and item specifications.	2.1. Use professional learning community meetings to deconstruct standards, set learning goals, develop complex scales, identify instructional strategies and monitor data	2.1. Assistant Principals and Reading Coach	2.1. Learning plans, classroom observations, PLC notes and progress monitoring data	2.1. Benchmark Exams, Mini-Benchmark Exams and FCAT
		2.2. Lack of differentiated instruction.	2.2. Analyze reading progress through the use of formative and summative assessments, data from FCAT, Edusoft, FAIR, System 44, Reading Plus, Read 180, CELLA and SRI to	2.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, ESE teachers and Learning Resource Specialist	2.2. Learning plans, student assessments, professional development and PLC notes	2.2. Benchmark Assessments , Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT

			monitor student progress, predict growth and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students.			
		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. CELLA Goal #3: By June 2013 we will increase the percentage of students scoring proficient in writing to 35% (10).	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : 32% (9)	2.1. Lack of teacher knowledge as relates to the new FCAT 2.0 rubric and requirements.	2.1. Use department planning days, PLC meetings and department meetings to create a focus calendar that details how writing will explicitly be taught in language arts by grade level.	2.1. Principal, Assistant Principal and Reading Coach	2.1. Learning plans, department /PLC notes and focus calendars	2.1. FCAT Writing and school based writing prompts
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CELLA Goals

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**						
Mathematics Goal #5A: 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	
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: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* N/A						
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

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

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

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

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1A.1. Limited teacher knowledge of standards and item specifications.	1A.1. Use professional learning community meetings to deconstruct standards, set learning goals, develop complex scales, identify instructional strategies and monitor data	1A.1. Principal , Assistant Principals, Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist	1A.1. Learning plans, classroom observations, PLC notes and progress monitoring data	1A.1. Benchmark Exams, Mini-Benchmark Exams and FCAT
Mathematics Goal #1A: By June 2013 we will increase the percentage of students scoring at achievement level 3 in mathematics to 30% (293).	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 25% (243)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 30% (293)					
			1A.2. Lack of differentiated instruction.	1A.2. Analyze reading progress through the use of formative and summative assessments, data from FCAT, Edusoft, to monitor student progress, predict growth and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students.	1A.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, ESE teachers and Learning Resource Specialist	1A.2. Learning plans, student assessments, professional development and PLC notes	1A.2. Benchmark Assessments , Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT
			1A.3. Lack of positive relationships between staff members and students.	1A.3. Bridge Mentor Program and Hawk Watch Program	1A.3. Principal, Assistant Principals, Deans, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, Media Specialist, Learning Resource Specialist and Guidance Counselors	1A.3. Progress Reports, Report Cards and Formative/Summative Assessments	1A.3. Benchmark Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT
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: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* N/A					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1. Limited teacher knowledge of standards and item specifications.	2A.1. Use professional learning community meetings to deconstruct standards, set learning goals, develop complex scales, identify instructional strategies and monitor data.	2A.1. Principal , Assistant Principals, Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist	2A.1. Learning plans, classroom observations, PLC notes and progress monitoring data	2A.1. Benchmark Exams, Mini-Benchmark Exams and FCAT
Mathematics Goal #2A: By June 2013 we will increase the percentage of students scoring at or above achievement levels 4 and 5 in mathematics to 46% (449).	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 41% (398)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 46% (449)					
			2A.2. Lack of differentiated instruction.	2A.2. Analyze reading progress through the use of formative and summative assessments, data from FCAT, Edusoft, to monitor student progress, predict growth and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students.	2A.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, ESE teachers and Learning Resource Specialist	2A.2. Learning plans, student assessments, professional development and PLC notes	2A.2. Benchmark Assessments , Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT
			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: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* N/A					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3A.1. Limited teacher knowledge of standards and item specifications.	3A.1. Use professional learning community meetings to deconstruct standards, set learning goals, develop complex scales, identify instructional strategies and monitor data.	3A.1. Principal , Assistant Principals, Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist	3A.1. Learning plans, classroom observations, PLC notes and progress monitoring data	3A.1. Benchmark Exams, Mini-Benchmark Exams and FCAT
Mathematics Goal #3A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
By June 2013 we will increase the percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics to 85% (830).	75% (729)	85% (830)					
			1A.2. Lack of differentiated instruction.	1A.2. Analyze reading progress through the use of formative and summative assessments, data from FCAT, Edusoft, to monitor student progress, predict growth and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students.	1A.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, ESE teachers and Learning Resource Specialist	1A.2. Learning plans, student assessments, professional development and PLC notes	1A.2. Benchmark Assessments , Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT
			1A.3. Lack of positive relationships between staff members and students.	1A.3. Bridge Mentor Program and Hawk Watch Program	1A.3. Principal, Assistant Principals, Deans, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, Media Specialist, Learning Resource Specialist and Guidance Counselors	1A.3. Progress Reports, Report Cards and Formative/Summative Assessments	1A.3. Benchmark Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Mathematics Goal #3B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A	N/A	N/A					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1. Limited teacher knowledge of standards and item specifications.	4A.1. Use professional learning community meetings to deconstruct standards, set learning goals, develop complex scales, identify instructional strategies and monitor data.	4A.1. Principal , Assistant Principals, Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist	4A.1. Learning plans, classroom observations, PLC notes and progress monitoring data	4A.1. Benchmark Exams, Mini-Benchmark Exams and FCAT
Mathematics Goal #4A: By June 2013 we will increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics to 76% (100).	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 66% (160)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 76% (100)					
			4A.2. Lack of differentiated instruction.	4A.2. Analyze reading progress through the use of formative and summative assessments, data from FCAT, Edusoft, to monitor student progress, predict growth and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students.	4A.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, ESE teachers and Learning Resource Specialist	4A.2. Learning plans, student assessments, professional development and PLC notes	4A.2. Benchmark Assessments , Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT
			4A.3. Lack of positive relationships between staff members and students.	4A.3. Bridge Mentor Program and Hawk Watch Program	4A.3. Principal, Assistant Principals, Deans, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, Media Specialist, Learning Resource Specialist and Guidance Counselors	4A.3. Progress Reports, Report Cards and Formative/Summative Assessments	4A.3. Benchmark Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.
Mathematics Goal #4B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* N/A					
			4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.
			4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**	All Students=73% Asian=96% Black=49% Students With Disabilities (SWD) =45%	All Students=75% Asian=97% Black=53% Students With Disabilities (SWD) =50%	All Students=78% Asian=97% Black=58% Students With Disabilities (SWD) =55%	All Students=80% Asian=97% Black=63% Students With Disabilities (SWD) =60%%	All Students=83% Asian=98% Black=67% Students With Disabilities (SWD) =65%	All Students=85% Asian=98% Black=72% Students With Disabilities (SWD) =70%
Mathematics Goal #5A: By June 2013 the percentage of students achieving Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) in the following student subgroups will be: All Students=75% Asian=97% Black=53% Students With Disabilities=50%							

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**		5B.1. Limited teacher knowledge of standards and item specifications.	5B.1. Use professional learning community meetings to deconstruct standards, set learning goals, develop complex scales, identify instructional strategies and monitor data.	5B.1. Principal , Assistant Principals, Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist	5B.1. Learning plans, classroom observations, PLC notes and progress monitoring data	5B.1. Benchmark Exams, Mini-Benchmark Exams and FCAT	

Mathematics Goal #5B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*
By June 2013 we will increase the percentage of students making satisfactory progress on mathematics 3% in the following student subgroups by ethnicity:	White: 15% (84) Black: 53% (135) Hispanic: 36% (39)	White: 12% (78) Black: 43% (118) Hispanic: 26% (29)
White: 88% (568) Black: 50% (132) Hispanic: 67% (75)		

| | | 5B.2.
Lack of differentiated instruction. | 5B.2.
Analyze reading progress through the use of formative and summative assessments, data from FCAT, Edusoft, to monitor student progress, predict growth and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students. | 5B.2.
Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, ESE teachers and Learning Resource Specialist | 5B.2.
Learning plans, student assessments, professional development and PLC notes | 5B.2.
Benchmark Assessments , Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT |

		5B.3. Lack of positive relationships between staff members and students.	5B.3. Bridge Mentor Program and Hawk Watch Program	5B.3. Principal, Assistant Principals, Deans, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, Media Specialist, Learning Resource Specialist and Guidance Counselors	5B.3. Progress Reports, Report Cards and Formative/Summative Assessments	4A.3. Benchmark Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1. Limited teacher knowledge of standards and item specifications.	5C.1. Use professional learning community meetings to deconstruct standards, set learning goals, develop complex scales, identify instructional strategies and monitor data.	5C.1. Principal , Assistant Principals, Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist	5C.1. Learning plans, classroom observations, PLC notes and progress monitoring data	5C.1. Benchmark Exams, Mini-Benchmark Exams and FCAT
Mathematics Goal #5C: By June 2013 we will increase the percentage of English Language Learners making satisfactory progress in mathematics to 54% (24).	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 49% (26)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 46% (21)					
			5C.2. Lack of differentiated instruction.	5C.2. Analyze reading progress through the use of formative and summative assessments, data from FCAT, Edusoft, to monitor student progress, predict growth and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students.	5C.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, ESE teachers and Learning Resource Specialist	5C.2. Learning plans, student assessments, professional development and PLC notes	5C.2. Benchmark Assessments , Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT
			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. Limited teacher knowledge of standards and item specifications.	5D.1. Use professional learning community meetings to deconstruct standards, set learning goals, develop complex scales, identify instructional strategies and monitor data.	5D.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist	5D.1. Learning plans, classroom observations, PLC notes and progress monitoring data	5D.1. Benchmark Exams, Mini-Benchmark Exams and FCAT
Mathematics Goal #5D: By June 2013 we will increase the percentage of Students with Disabilities making satisfactory progress in mathematics to 47% (48).	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 56% (57)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 53% (54)					
			5D.2. Lack of differentiated instruction.	5D.2. Analyze reading progress through the use of formative and summative assessments, data from FCAT, Edusoft, to monitor student progress, predict growth and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students.	5D.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, ESE teachers and Learning Resource Specialist	5D.2. Learning plans, student assessments, professional development and PLC notes	5D.2. Benchmark Assessments , Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT
			5D.3. Lack of positive relationships between staff members and students.	5D.3. Bridge Mentor Program and Hawk Watch Program	5D.3. Principal, Assistant Principals, Deans, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, Media Specialist, Learning Resource Specialist	5D.3. Progress Reports, Report Cards and Formative/Summative Assessments	5D.3. Benchmark Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT

				and Guidance Counselors		

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. Limited teacher knowledge of standards and item specifications.	5E.1. Use professional learning community meetings to deconstruct standards, set learning goals, develop complex scales, identify instructional strategies and monitor data.	5E.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist	5E.1. Learning plans, classroom observations, PLC notes and progress monitoring data	5E.1. Benchmark Exams, Mini-Benchmark Exams and FCAT
Mathematics Goal #5E: By June 2013 we will increase the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students making satisfactory progress in mathematics to 61% (220).	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 42% (193)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 39% (141)					
			5E.2. Lack of differentiated instruction.	5E.2. Analyze reading progress through the use of formative and summative assessments, data from FCAT, Edusoft, to monitor student progress, predict growth and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students.	5E.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, ESE teachers and Learning Resource Specialist	5E.2. Learning plans, student assessments, professional development and PLC notes	5E.2. Benchmark Assessments , Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT
			5E.3. Lack of positive relationships between staff members and students.	5E.3. Bridge Mentor Program and Hawk Watch Program	5E.3. Principal, Assistant Principals, Deans, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, Media Specialist, Learning Resource Specialist and Guidance Counselors	5E.3. Progress Reports, Report Cards and Formative/Summative Assessments	5E.3. Benchmark Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

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

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

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

<u>Algebra 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals</u> *(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. Limited teacher knowledge of standards and item specifications.	1.1. Use professional learning community meetings to deconstruct standards, set learning goals, develop complex scales, identify instructional strategies and monitor data.	1.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist	1.1. Learning plans, classroom observations, PLC notes and progress monitoring data	1.1. Benchmark Exams, Mini-Benchmark Exams and EOC
Algebra 1 Goal #1: By June 2013 we will increase the percentage of students scoring at achievement level 3 in Algebra I to 46% (139).	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 41% (72)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 46% (129)					
			1.2. Lack of differentiated instruction.	1.2. Analyze reading progress through the use of formative and summative assessments, data from FCAT, Edusoft, to monitor student progress, predict growth and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students.	1.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, ESE teachers and Learning Resource Specialist	1.2. Learning plans, student assessments, professional development and PLC notes	1.2. Benchmark Assessments , Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT
			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. Limited teacher knowledge of standards and item specifications.	2.1. Use professional learning community meetings to deconstruct standards, set learning goals, develop complex scales, identify instructional strategies and monitor data.	2.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist	2.1. Learning plans, classroom observations, PLC notes and progress monitoring data	2.1. Benchmark Exams, Mini-Benchmark Exams and EOC
Algebra Goal #2: By June 2013 we will increase the percentage of students scoring at or above achievement level 4 and 5 in Algebra to 59% (178).	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 54% (95)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 54% (151)					
			2.2. Lack of differentiated instruction.	2.2. Analyze reading progress through the use of formative and summative assessments, data from FCAT, Edusoft, to monitor student progress, predict growth and differentiate instruction to meet the	2.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, ESE teachers and Learning Resource Specialist	2.2. Learning plans, student assessments, professional development and PLC notes	2.2. Benchmark Assessments , Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT

			needs of all students.			
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		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: Waiting for data from the state.							

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. Limited teacher knowledge of standards and item specifications.	3B.1. Use professional learning community meetings to deconstruct standards, set learning goals, develop complex scales, identify instructional strategies and monitor data.	3B.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist	3B.1. Learning plans, classroom observations, PLC notes and progress monitoring data	3B.1. Benchmark Exams, Mini-Benchmark Exams and EOC	
Algebra 1 Goal #3B: By June 2013 we will increase the percentage student subgroups by ethnicity making satisfactory progress in Algebra I to the following: White 100% Black 98% (56) Hispanic 91% (25)	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White: 3% (129) Black: 5% (1) Hispanic: 12% (1)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White: 0% Black: 2% (1) Hispanic: 9% (2)						
			3B.2. Lack of differentiated instruction.	3B.2. Analyze reading progress through the use of formative and summative assessments, data from FCAT, Edusoft, to monitor student progress, predict growth and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students.	3B.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, ESE teachers and Learning Resource Specialist	3B.2. Learning plans, student assessments, professional development and PLC notes	3B.2. Benchmark Assessments , Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT	
			3B.3. Lack of positive relationships between staff members and	3B.3. Bridge Mentor Program and Hawk Watch Program	3B.3. Principal, Assistant Principals, Deans, Reading Coach, Staffing	3B.3. Progress Reports, Report Cards and Formative/Summative	3B.3. Benchmark Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Assessments,	

		students.		Specialist, Media Specialist, Learning Resource Specialist and Guidance Counselors	Assessments	Common Assessments and FCAT

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3C: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* N/A					
			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. Limited teacher knowledge of standards and item specifications.	3D.1. Use professional learning community meetings to deconstruct standards, set learning goals, develop complex scales, identify instructional strategies and monitor data.	3D.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist	3D.1. Learning plans, classroom observations, PLC notes and progress monitoring data	3D.1. Benchmark Exams, Mini-Benchmark Exams and EOC
Algebra 1 Goal #3D: By June 2013 we will increase the percentage for Students with Disabilities making satisfactory progress in Algebra I to 70% (10).	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 33% (1)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 30% (4)					
			3D.2. Lack of differentiated instruction.	3D.2. Analyze reading progress through the use of formative and summative assessments, data from FCAT, Edusoft, to monitor student progress, predict growth and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students.	3D.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, ESE teachers and Learning Resource Specialist	3D.2. Learning plans, student assessments, professional development and PLC notes	3D.2. Benchmark Assessments , Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT
			3D.3. Lack of positive relationships between staff members and students.	3D.3. Bridge Mentor Program and Hawk Watch Program	3D.3. Principal, Assistant Principals, Deans, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, Media Specialist, Learning Resource Specialist and Guidance Counselors	3D.3. Progress Reports, Report Cards and Formative/Summative Assessments	3D.3. Benchmark Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3E.1. Limited teacher knowledge of standards and item specifications.	3E.1. Use professional learning community meetings to deconstruct standards, set learning goals, develop complex scales, identify instructional strategies and monitor data.	3E.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist	3E.1. Learning plans, classroom observations, PLC notes and progress monitoring data	3E.1. Benchmark Exams, Mini-Benchmark Exams and EOC
Algebra 1 Goal #3E: By June 2013 we will increase the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students making satisfactory progress in Algebra I to 99% (94).	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 4% (1)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 1% (1)					
			3E.2. Lack of differentiated instruction.	3E.2. Analyze reading progress through the use of formative and summative assessments, data from FCAT, Edusoft, to monitor student progress, predict growth and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students.	3E.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, ESE teachers and Learning Resource Specialist	3E.2. Learning plans, student assessments, professional development and PLC notes	3E.2. Benchmark Assessments , Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT
			3E.3. Lack of positive relationships between staff members and students.	3E.3. Bridge Mentor Program and Hawk Watch Program	3E.3. Principal, Assistant Principals, Deans, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, Media Specialist, Learning Resource Specialist and Guidance Counselors	3E.3. Progress Reports, Report Cards and Formative/Summative Assessments	3E.3. Benchmark Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

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

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

Geometry EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.			1.1. Limited teacher knowledge of standards and item specifications.	1.1. Use professional learning community meetings to deconstruct standards, set learning goals, develop complex scales, identify instructional strategies and monitor data.	1.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist	1.1. Learning plans, classroom observations, PLC notes and progress monitoring data	1.1. Benchmark Exams, Mini-Benchmark Exams and EOC
Geometry Goal #1: By June 2013 we will increase the percentage of students scoring at achievement levels 4 and 5 in Geometry to 99% (45).	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	2% (2)	1% (1)					
			1.2. Lack of differentiated instruction.	1.2. Analyze reading progress through the use of formative and summative assessments, data from FCAT, Edusoft, to monitor student progress, predict growth and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students.	1.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, ESE teachers and Learning Resource Specialist	1.2. Learning plans, student assessments, professional development and PLC notes	1.2. Benchmark Assessments , Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT
			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. Limited teacher knowledge of standards and item specifications.	2.1. Use professional learning community meetings to deconstruct standards, set learning goals, develop complex scales, identify instructional strategies and monitor data.	2.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist	2.1. Learning plans, classroom observations, PLC notes and progress monitoring data	2.1. Benchmark Exams, Mini-Benchmark Exams and EOC
Geometry Goal #2: By June 2013 we will increase the percentage of students scoring at or above achievement levels 4 and 5 in Geometry to 99% (44).	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	98% (49)	99% (44)					
			2.2. Lack of differentiated instruction.	2.2. Analyze reading progress through the use of formative and summative assessments, data from FCAT, Edusoft, to monitor student progress, predict growth and differentiate instruction to meet the	2.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, ESE teachers and Learning Resource Specialist	2.2. Learning plans, student assessments, professional development and PLC notes	2.2. Benchmark Assessments , Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT

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

			needs of all students.			
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

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

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. Limited teacher knowledge of standards and item specifications.	3B.1. Use professional learning community meetings to deconstruct standards, set learning goals, develop complex scales, identify instructional strategies and monitor data.	3B.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist	3B.1. Learning plans, classroom observations, PLC notes and progress monitoring data	3B.1. Benchmark Exams, Mini-Benchmark Exams and EOC
Geometry Goal #3B: By June 2013 we will increase the percentage of students making satisfactory progress in Geometry in student subgroups by ethnicity to the following: White 100% (39) Black 100% (1) Hispanic 100% (2)	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White: 11% (4) Black: 0% Hispanic: 0% / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White: 0% Black: 0% Hispanic: 0%					
		3B.2. Lack of differentiated instruction.	3B.2. Analyze reading progress through the use of formative and summative assessments, data from FCAT, Edusoft, to monitor student progress, predict growth and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students.	3B.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, ESE teachers and Learning Resource Specialist	3B.2. Learning plans, student assessments, professional development and PLC notes	3B.2. Benchmark Assessments , Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT
		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: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* N/A					
			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: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* N/A					
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E: By June 2013 we increase the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students making satisfactory progress in Geometry to 100% (1). <table><tr><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td></tr><tr><td>13% (2)</td><td>0%</td></tr></table>	3E.1. Limited teacher knowledge of standards and item specifications.	3E.1. Use professional learning community meetings to deconstruct standards, set learning goals, develop complex scales, identify instructional strategies and monitor data.	3E.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist	3E.1. Learning plans, classroom observations, PLC notes and progress monitoring data	3E.1. Benchmark Exams, Mini-Benchmark Exams and EOC
	3E.2. Lack of differentiated instruction.	3E.2. Analyze reading progress through the use of formative and summative assessments, data from FCAT, Edusoft, to monitor student progress, predict growth and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students.	3E.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, ESE teachers and Learning Resource Specialist	3E.2. Learning plans, student assessments, professional development and PLC notes	3E.2. Benchmark Assessments , Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT
	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
Marzano Design Questions (1, 2, 5, 7, and 8)	All Grades	Principal, Assistant Principals and Learning Resource Specialist	All	Faculty Meetings and Planning Periods (October, November and January)	Learning Plans, classroom observations and PLC notes	Principal and Assistant Principals
Common Core Implementation	All Grades	Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist	Core Subject Areas	Core area planning days, which are offered each nine weeks	Reflection and learning plans	Principal, Assistant Principals and Learning Resource Specialist
Data Chats	All Grades	Assistant Principals, and PLC Leaders	Core Subject Areas	Every 2 to 3 weeks scheduled based on the instructional cycle	Benchmark Exams, Mini-Benchmark Exams, Focus Calendars and Common Assessments	Assistant Principal

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

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Common Core Implementation of Math Standards	Substitutes for full day professional development training for math teachers each nine weeks.	School Based Budget	$3,852.00
			Subtotal: $3,852.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: $3,852.00

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">Elementary and Middle Science Goals</th><th colspan="5">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="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:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="3">1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.</td>
<td>1A.1.
Limited teacher knowledge of standards and item specifications.</td>
<td>1A.1.
Use professional learning community meetings to deconstruct standards, set learning goals, develop complex scales, identify instructional strategies and monitor data.</td>
<td>1A.1.
Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist</td>
<td>1A.1.
Learning plans, classroom observations, PLC notes and progress monitoring data</td>
<td>1A.1.
Benchmark Exams, Mini-Benchmark Exams and FCAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td rowspan="2">Science Goal #1A:

By June 2013 we will increase the percentage of students scoring at achievement level 3 in science to 45% (154).</td>
<td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*

40% (129)</td>
<td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*

45% (154)</td>
<td rowspan="2"></td>
<td rowspan="2"></td>
<td rowspan="2"></td>
<td rowspan="2"></td>
<td rowspan="2"></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="2"></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="3" rowspan="2"></td>
<td>1A.2.
Lack of differentiated instruction.</td>
<td>1A.2.
Analyze reading progress through the use of formative and summative assessments, data from FCAT, Edusoft, to monitor student progress, predict growth and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students.</td>
<td>1A.2.
Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, ESE teachers and Learning Resource Specialist</td>
<td>1A.2.
Learning plans, student assessments, professional development and PLC notes</td>
<td>1A.2.
Benchmark Assessments , Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A.3.
Lack of positive relationships between staff members and students.</td>
<td>1A.3.
Bridge Mentor Program and Hawk Watch Program</td>
<td>1A.3.
Principal, Assistant Principals, Deans, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, Media Specialist, Learning Resource Specialist and Guidance Counselors</td>
<td>1A.3.
Progress Reports, Report Cards and Formative/Summative Assessments</td>
<td>1A.3.
Benchmark Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="3">1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.</td>
<td>1B.1.</td>
<td>1B.1.</td>
<td>1B.1.</td>
<td>1B.1.</td>
<td>1B.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td rowspan="2">Science Goal #1B:

N/A</td>
<td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*

N/A</td>
<td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*

N/A</td>
<td rowspan="2"></td>
<td rowspan="2"></td>
<td rowspan="2"></td>
<td rowspan="2"></td>
<td rowspan="2"></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="2"></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="3" rowspan="2"></td>
<td>1B.2.</td>
<td>1B.2.</td>
<td>1B.2.</td>
<td>1B.2.</td>
<td>1B.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B.3.</td>
<td>1B.3.</td>
<td>1B.3.</td>
<td>1B.3.</td>
<td>1B.3.</td>
</tr>
</table>

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.			2A.1. Limited teacher knowledge of standards and item specifications.	2A.1. Use professional learning community meetings to deconstruct standards, set learning goals, develop complex scales, identify instructional strategies and monitor data.	2A.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist	2A.1. Learning plans, classroom observations, PLC notes and progress monitoring data	2A.1. Benchmark Exams, Mini-Benchmark Exams and FCAT
Science Goal #2A: By June 2013 will increase the percentage of students scoring at or above achievement levels 4 and 5 in science to 26% (89).	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 21% (67)	2013Expected Level of Performance:* 26% (89)					
			2A.2. Lack of differentiated instruction.	2A.2. Analyze reading progress through the use of formative and summative assessments, data from FCAT, Edusoft, to monitor student progress, predict growth and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students.	2A.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, ESE teachers and Learning Resource Specialist	2A.2. Learning plans, student assessments, professional development and PLC notes	2A.2. Benchmark Assessments , Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Science Goal #2B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* N/A	2013Expected Level of Performance:* N/A					
			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

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

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

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

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

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

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

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

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Marzano Design Questions (1, 2, 5, 7, and 8)	All Grades	Principal, Assistant Principals and Learning Resource Specialist	All	Faculty Meetings and Planning Periods (October, November and January)	Learning Plans, classroom observations and PLC notes	Principal and Assistant Principals
Common Core Implementation	All Grade s	Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist	Core Subject Areas	Core area planning days, which are offered each nine weeks	Reflections and learning plans	Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist
Data Chats	All Grades	Assistant Principals, and PLC Leaders	Core Subject Areas	Every 2 to 3 weeks scheduled based on the instructional cycle	Benchmark Exams, Mini-Benchmark Exams, Focus Calendars and Common Assessments	Assistant Principal

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
FCAT Science	FCAT ScAT (Hands on activity book which consists of labs based on the FCAT Science test).	School Based Budget	$1750.00
			Subtotal: $1750.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Common Core Implementation of Reading Standards	Substitutes for full day professional development training for core teachers each nine weeks.	School Based Budget	$3424.00

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

			Subtotal: $3242.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: $4,992.00

End of Science Goals

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

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.			1A.1. Limited teacher knowledge of the FCAT 2.0 Writing Calibration Scoring.	1A.1. Use professional learning community and staff development days to build teacher capacity.	1A.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach and Learning Resource Specialist	1A.1. Learning plans, classroom observations, PLC notes and progress monitoring data	1A.1. Writing Prompts FCAT
Writing Goal #1A: By June 2013 will increase the percentage of students scoring at achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing to 83% (284)	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 78% (199)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 83% (284)					
			2A.2. Lack of differentiated instruction.	2A.2. Analyze writing progress through the use of formative and summative assessments, use writing prompts to monitor student progress, predict growth and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students.	2A.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach, and Learning Resource Specialist	2A.2. Learning plans, student assessments, professional development and PLC notes	2A.2. Benchmark Assessments , Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments and FCAT
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Writing Goal #1B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* N/A					
			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

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
Review 2012 Writing Results	All	Reading Coach	Language Arts Department	October	Develop a focus calendar to identify explicit writing strategies that will be taught in 8th grade	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach and PLC leaders

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

End of Writing Goals

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

<u>Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals</u> <u>*(required in year 2014-2015)*</u>

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

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

Civics Professional Development

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

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
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Civics Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

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
N/A						

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
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of U.S. History Goals

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

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

<table>
<tr><th colspan="2">Attendance Goal(s)</th><th colspan="5">Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">**1. Attendance**</td><td>1.1.
Lack of student motivation to attend school or be on time to class.</td><td>1.1.
Implement a two minute warning bell during transition times.

Implement the Hawk Talon program. Through this program kids are acknowledged for doing something positive. Each time a student is recognized he/she will receive a reward and their name is placed in a box for a nine week raffle to win an iPod.</td><td>1.1.
Nine week attendance results</td><td>1.1.

Deans and Attendance Clerk</td><td>1.1.
End of year attendance results</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">

Attendance Goal #1:

By June 2013 we will increase attendance percentage rate to 98% (956).

2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*
95% (927)	98% (956)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
22	*10*
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
17	7

</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>1.2.</td><td>1.2.</td><td>1.2.</td><td>1.2.</td><td>1.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>1.3.</td><td>1.3.</td><td>1.3.</td><td>1.3.</td><td>1.3.</td></tr>
</table>

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

Attendance Professional Development

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

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Hawk Talons	PBS incentive program to promote positive student behaviors (incentives: pencils and iPods).	School Based Budget	$3000.00
			Subtotal:

	Total: $3000.00

End of Attendance Goals

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension			1.1. Lack of Interventions	1.1. Saturday School, Hawk Success Program and Administrative Detentions	1.1. Deans Assistant Principals	1.1. Quarterly suspension reports	1.1. End of the school year discipline results.
Suspension Goal #1: By June 2013 we will decrease our suspension rate by 25%.	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions					
	452	339					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					
	214	*160*					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	220	165					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	112	*84*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Suspension Professional Development

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
N/A						

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
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Discipline Interventions	After school detentions and Saturday School	School Based Budget	$4,000.00
N/A			Subtotal: $4,000.00
			Total: $4,000.00

End of Suspension Goals

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Dropout Prevention <u>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</u> N/A			1.1. Lack of interventions and support.	1.1. Implement the Hawk Watch Program, Bridge Mentor Program and Maitland Step Up Program.	1.1. Guidance Counselors Deans Assistant Principals	1.1. Progress Reports and Report Cards	1.1. Final Report Card and Retention List
	2012 Current Dropout Rate:*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*					
	N/A	N/A					
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

<table>
<tr>
<th colspan="3">Parent Involvement Goal(s)</th>
<th colspan="5">Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement</th>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="3">Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:</td>
<td>Anticipated Barrier</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td>
<td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td>
<td>Evaluation Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="3" rowspan="2">**1. Parent Involvement**

Parent Involvement Goal #1:

By June 2013 we will increase parental involvement to 75 % (732).</td>
<td>1.1.
Timely and clear communication to all parents.</td>
<td>1.1.
Bi-weekly Connect Orange messages

Weekly email update</td>
<td>1.1.
Principal and Assistant Principals</td>
<td>1.1.
Connect Orange and email reports</td>
<td>1.1.
End of the year Connect Orange and email reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="3">2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*
70% (668)

2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*
75% (732)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="3"></td>
<td>1.2.</td>
<td>1.2.</td>
<td>1.2.</td>
<td>1.2.</td>
<td>1.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="3"></td>
<td>1.3.</td>
<td>1.3.</td>
<td>1.3.</td>
<td>1.3.</td>
<td>1.3.</td>
</tr>
</table>

Parent Involvement Professional Development

<table>
<tr>
<th colspan="7">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.</th>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus</td>
<td>Grade Level/Subject</td>
<td>PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader</td>
<td>PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)</td>
<td>Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)</td>
<td>Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring</td>
<td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</table>

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

Parent Involvement Budget

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: By June 2012 we will increase the percentage of students participating in STEM Clubs and Challenges.	1.1. Lack of budget funds to compensate STEM club sponsors.	1.1. Have the YMCA After School Zone recruit a STEM club sponsor and compensate the sponsor for his/her time.	1.1. Assistant Principal	1.1. YMCA After School sign-in rosters.	1.1. Student participation in the YMCA and competitions.
	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
N/A					

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

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
CTE Goal #1: N/A	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.

CTE Professional Development

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

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

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Additional Goal			1.1. Lack of student applicants.	1.1. Visit all feeder elementary schools to conduct an AVID orientation.	1.1. AVID Coordinator	1.1. AVID class rosters	1.1. Enrollment Reports/Performance Data
Additional Goal #1: By June 2013 we will increase number of students enrolled in the AVID program by 5% (88).	2012 Current Level :* 63 Students Grade 6: 21 students Grade 7: 21 students Grade 8:	2013 Expected Level :* 88 students Grade 6: 44 students Grade 7: 22 students Grade 8:					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
Additional Goal #2: By June 2013 will increase the number of students enrolled high school credit courses by 5% (468).	2012 Current Level :* 43% (417)	2013 Expected Level :* *48% (468)*					
			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

Additional Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
Additional Goal #3: By June 2013 we will increase the number of college and career readiness course offered at Maitland Middle School.	1.1. Parent and student resistance to taking courses.	1.1. Provide online curriculum guide with a description of courses offered and offer more school tours.	1.1. Assistant Principal Guidance Counselors Deans	1.1. Enrollment Reports	1.1. Master Schedule

Additional Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
Additional Goal #4: By June 2013 we will increase our fine arts enrollment.	1.1. Parent and student resistance to taking courses.	1.1. Provide online curriculum guide with a description of courses offered. Perform at more events at feeder elementary schools.	1.1. Assistant Principal Guidance Counselors Fine Arts Teachers	1.1. Enrollment Reports	1.1. Master Schedule

Additional Goal(s)	Problem-Solving				

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

	Process to Increase Student Achievement					
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
Additional Goal #5: By June 2013 we will increase our fine arts enrollment.	1.1. Parent and student resistance to taking courses.	1.1. Provide online curriculum guide with a description of courses offered. Perform at more events at feeder elementary schools.	1.1. Assistant Principal Guidance Counselors Fine Arts Teachers	1.1. Enrollment Reports	1.1. Master Schedule	
Additional Goal(s)	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**					
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
Additional Goal #6: By June 2013 we will decrease disproportionate classification in Special Education.	1.1. Teacher and guidance counselor lacking of understanding as it relates to 504 Plans.	1.1. Provide professional develop on the purpose and use of a 504 Plan.	1.1. Assistant Principal Guidance Counselors	1.1. Enrollment Reports	1.1. Enrollment Reports Lesson Plans	

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

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
N/A						

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

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	
	Total: $8,132.00
CELLA Budget	
	Total: N/A
Mathematics Budget	
	Total: $3,852.00
Science Budget	
	Total: $4,992.00
Writing Budget	
	Total: N/A
Civics Budget	
	Total: N/A
U.S. History Budget	
	Total: N/A
Attendance Budget	
	Total: $1,500.00
Suspension Budget	
	Total: $4,000.00
Dropout Prevention Budget	
	Total: N/A
Parent Involvement Budget	
	Total: N/A
STEM Budget	
	Total: N/A
CTE Budget	
	Total: N/A
Additional Goals	
	Total: N/A
	Grand Total: $23,976.00

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

Differentiated Accountability

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
☐Priority	☐Focus	☐Prevent

- Upload a copy of the Differentiated Accountability Checklist in the designated upload link on the *Upload* page

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance
The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business and community members who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Please verify the statement above by selecting *Yes* or *No* below.

☒ Yes   ☐ No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount