

Florida Department of Education



DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

| | |
|---|--|
| School Name: Keys Gate Charter School | District Name: Miami-Dade |
| Principal: Ken Haiko (Director), David McKnight | Superintendent: Alberto Carvalho |
| SAC Chair: Lorena Malave | Date of School Board Approval: Pending |

Student Achievement Data:

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](#)

Highly Effective Administrators

List your school's highly effective 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.

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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 | David McKnight | Degrees: BS Journalism, MS Guidance and Counseling, Ed.S. Education Leadership Certification: Educational Leadership (All Levels) | 1 | 11 | <table> <tr> <td></td> <td>'12</td> <td>'11</td> <td>'10</td> <td>'09</td> <td>'08</td> </tr> <tr> <td>School Grades</td> <td>B</td> <td>A</td> <td>A</td> <td>B</td> <td>B</td> </tr> <tr> <td>High Standards – Rdg</td> <td>56</td> <td>76</td> <td>79</td> <td>73</td> <td>79</td> </tr> <tr> <td>High Standards – Math</td> <td>53</td> <td>69</td> <td>76</td> <td>65</td> <td>74</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lrng Gains – Rdg</td> <td>63</td> <td>63</td> <td>69</td> <td>67</td> <td>72</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lrng Gains – Math</td> <td>70</td> <td>58</td> <td>73</td> <td>65</td> <td>57</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gains-R-25</td> <td>65</td> <td>66</td> <td>60</td> <td>52</td> <td>60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gains-M-25</td> <td>77</td> <td>68</td> <td>77</td> <td>69</td> <td>50</td> </tr> </table> | | '12 | '11 | '10 | '09 | '08 | School Grades | B | A | A | B | B | High Standards – Rdg | 56 | 76 | 79 | 73 | 79 | High Standards – Math | 53 | 69 | 76 | 65 | 74 | Lrng Gains – Rdg | 63 | 63 | 69 | 67 | 72 | Lrng Gains – Math | 70 | 58 | 73 | 65 | 57 | Gains-R-25 | 65 | 66 | 60 | 52 | 60 | Gains-M-25 | 77 | 68 | 77 | 69 | 50 |
| | '12 | '11 | '10 | '09 | '08 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| School Grades | B | A | A | B | B | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| High Standards – Rdg | 56 | 76 | 79 | 73 | 79 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| High Standards – Math | 53 | 69 | 76 | 65 | 74 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lrng Gains – Rdg | 63 | 63 | 69 | 67 | 72 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lrng Gains – Math | 70 | 58 | 73 | 65 | 57 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gains-R-25 | 65 | 66 | 60 | 52 | 60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gains-M-25 | 77 | 68 | 77 | 69 | 50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Assistant Principal | Witnery Garcia | Degrees: BS Early Childhood Education, MS Educational Leadership Certification: Early Childhood Education (PreK-3), Middle Grades Math (5-9), ESOL Endorsement, Educational Leadership (All Levels) | 7 | 1 | <table> <tr> <td></td> <td>'12</td> <td>'11</td> <td>'10</td> <td>'09</td> <td>'08</td> </tr> <tr> <td>School Grades</td> <td>B</td> <td>B</td> <td>A</td> <td>A</td> <td>A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>High Standards – Rdg</td> <td>56</td> <td>72</td> <td>78</td> <td>77</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>High Standards – Math</td> <td>53</td> <td>64</td> <td>76</td> <td>71</td> <td>64</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lrng Gains – Rdg</td> <td>63</td> <td>65</td> <td>74</td> <td>73</td> <td>72</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lrng Gains – Math</td> <td>70</td> <td>57</td> <td>71</td> <td>76</td> <td>67</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gains-R-25</td> <td>65</td> <td>63</td> <td>66</td> <td>75</td> <td>69</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gains-M-25</td> <td>77</td> <td>59</td> <td>71</td> <td>74</td> <td>67</td> </tr> </table> | | '12 | '11 | '10 | '09 | '08 | School Grades | B | B | A | A | A | High Standards – Rdg | 56 | 72 | 78 | 77 | 75 | High Standards – Math | 53 | 64 | 76 | 71 | 64 | Lrng Gains – Rdg | 63 | 65 | 74 | 73 | 72 | Lrng Gains – Math | 70 | 57 | 71 | 76 | 67 | Gains-R-25 | 65 | 63 | 66 | 75 | 69 | Gains-M-25 | 77 | 59 | 71 | 74 | 67 |
| | '12 | '11 | '10 | '09 | '08 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| School Grades | B | B | A | A | A | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| High Standards – Rdg | 56 | 72 | 78 | 77 | 75 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| High Standards – Math | 53 | 64 | 76 | 71 | 64 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lrng Gains – Rdg | 63 | 65 | 74 | 73 | 72 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lrng Gains – Math | 70 | 57 | 71 | 76 | 67 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gains-R-25 | 65 | 63 | 66 | 75 | 69 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gains-M-25 | 77 | 59 | 71 | 74 | 67 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Assistant Principal | Carmen Magarino | Degrees: BS Elementary Education, MS Reading Education, Ed.S. Educational Leadership Certification: Primary Education (K-3), ESOL Endorsement, Educational Leadership (All Levels) | 4 | 4 | <table> <tr> <td></td> <td>'12</td> <td>'11</td> <td>'10</td> <td>'09</td> <td>'08</td> </tr> <tr> <td>School Grades</td> <td>B</td> <td>B</td> <td>A</td> <td>A</td> <td>A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>High Standards – Rdg</td> <td>56</td> <td>72</td> <td>78</td> <td>77</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>High Standards – Math</td> <td>53</td> <td>64</td> <td>76</td> <td>71</td> <td>64</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lrng Gains – Rdg</td> <td>63</td> <td>65</td> <td>74</td> <td>73</td> <td>72</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lrng Gains – Math</td> <td>70</td> <td>57</td> <td>71</td> <td>76</td> <td>67</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gains-R-25</td> <td>65</td> <td>63</td> <td>66</td> <td>75</td> <td>69</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gains-M-25</td> <td>77</td> <td>59</td> <td>71</td> <td>74</td> <td>67</td> </tr> </table> | | '12 | '11 | '10 | '09 | '08 | School Grades | B | B | A | A | A | High Standards – Rdg | 56 | 72 | 78 | 77 | 75 | High Standards – Math | 53 | 64 | 76 | 71 | 64 | Lrng Gains – Rdg | 63 | 65 | 74 | 73 | 72 | Lrng Gains – Math | 70 | 57 | 71 | 76 | 67 | Gains-R-25 | 65 | 63 | 66 | 75 | 69 | Gains-M-25 | 77 | 59 | 71 | 74 | 67 |
| | '12 | '11 | '10 | '09 | '08 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| School Grades | B | B | A | A | A | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| High Standards – Rdg | 56 | 72 | 78 | 77 | 75 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| High Standards – Math | 53 | 64 | 76 | 71 | 64 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lrng Gains – Rdg | 63 | 65 | 74 | 73 | 72 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lrng Gains – Math | 70 | 57 | 71 | 76 | 67 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gains-R-25 | 65 | 63 | 66 | 75 | 69 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gains-M-25 | 77 | 59 | 71 | 74 | 67 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|--------------|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Assistant Principal | Corinne Baez | Degrees: BS Elementary Education, MS Educational Leadership Certification: Educational Leadership (All Levels), Elementary Education (Grades 1-6), ESOL Endorsement | 9 | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Highly Effective Instructional Coaches

List your school’s highly effective 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 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) | | | | | | | |
|---------------|-------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Primary (K-2) | Jennifer Gonzalez | Degrees: MS in Educational Leadership & BS in Elementary Education Certification: Elementary Education (K-6), Educational Leadership (All Levels), ESOL Endorsement, & Gifted Endorsement | 9 | 7 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|--|---|---|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Middle (3-8) | Jennifer Thermes | Degrees: MS Educational Leadership & BS Elementary Education Certification: Elementary Education (K-6), Primary Education (PreK-3), Middle Grades Integrated Curriculum (5-9), & Gifted Endorsement | 5 | 1 | School Grades High Standards – Rdg High Standards – Math Lrng Gains – Rdg Lrng Gains – Math Gains-R-25 Gains-M-25 | '12 | '11 | '10 | '09 | '08 |
| | | | | | | B | B | A | A | A |
| | | | | | | 56 | 72 | 78 | 77 | 75 |
| | | | | | | 53 | 64 | 76 | 71 | 64 |
| | | | | | | 63 | 65 | 74 | 73 | 72 |
| | | | | | | 70 | 57 | 71 | 76 | 67 |
| | | | | | | 65 | 63 | 66 | 75 | 69 |
| | | | | | | 77 | 59 | 71 | 74 | 67 |

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. An interview committee reviews the resumes of potential teacher candidates to determine the highest quality as defined by State policy. After interviews, the best candidates are chosen according to State and District requirements. In order to retain high-quality and highly qualified teachers, professional development opportunities as defined in the No Child Left Behind Act are provided. | Principal AP CSUSA Human Resources Department | June 2013 |
| 2. Charter School USA (CSUSA) our school's management company, is committed to ensuring a highly qualified pool of teachers. Presently, recruitment efforts include ongoing outreach to local and in and out-of-state colleges and universities. Electronic application procedures are streamlined to provide a more efficient method of processing applicants and to improve communication with prospective candidates. Additionally, the CSUSA office of Teacher Recruitment participates in year-round local, district, state, and national teacher recruitment fairs. | Principal AP CSUSA Human Resources Department | June 2013 |
| 3. Professional Development initiatives target researched based-instructional strategies aligned to the needs the school's population. | Principal AP CSUSA Education Team | June 2013 |

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

| | | |
|---|---|-----------|
| 4. Implement the Teacher Learning Community Leader Program, in which the Curriculum Resource Teacher offers school site support, professional development, and mentoring to the teachers. | Principal CSUSA Education Team TLC Leader (CRT) | June 2013 |
|---|---|-----------|

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 |
|--|--|
| 24 | Keys Gate provides teacher mentoring by our Leadership team, which includes administration and Curriculum Resource Teachers. These teachers are provided with guidance in completing requirements to achieve proper certification. |

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 |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 112 | 11% (12) | 49% (55) | 31% (35) | 8% (9) | 21% (23) | 79% (88) | 5% (6) | 0% (0) | 54% (60) |

Teacher Mentoring Program

Please describe the school’s teacher mentoring program by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

| Mentor Name | Mentee Assigned | Rationale for Pairing | Planned Mentoring Activities |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|
|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|

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

| | | | |
|-------------------|---|---|---|
| Jennifer Gonzalez | Nila Castro-Headley, Celena Garcia, & Monique Roldan | Teacher's with Statement of Eligibility | Keys Gate provides teacher mentoring by our Leadership team, which includes administration and Curriculum Resource Teachers. In addition, new teachers to our school are provided support from Teacher Learning Community Leaders in areas of curriculum, instruction, and classroom management with the goals of improved student achievement. |
| Jennifer Thermes | Deborah Dowling, Cynthia Griffith Quintana, Judith Bello, Pamela Amador, Juan Hernandez, Nicole Yassa, & Steven Petit | Teacher's with Statement of Eligibility | Keys Gate provides teacher mentoring by our Leadership team, which includes administration and Curriculum Resource Teachers. In addition, new teachers to our school are provided support from Teacher Learning Community Leaders in areas of curriculum, instruction, and classroom management with the goals of improved student achievement. |

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

| |
|--------------------------|
| Title I, Part A |
| Title I, Part C- Migrant |
| Title I, Part D |
| Title II |

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

| |
|---|
| Title III |
| Title X- Homeless |
| Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) |
| Violence Prevention Programs |
| Nutrition Programs |
| Housing Programs |
| Head Start |
| Adult Education |
| Career and Technical Education |
| Job Training |
| Other |

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

| School-Based MTSS/RtI Team |
|--|
| <p>Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.</p> <p>Principal: will ensure that the MTSS team is implementing MTSS; provides professional development to support the appropriate implementation of MTSS; monitors assessment and documentation of MTSS skills; ensure ample resources are provided for the implementation of MTSS and communicates with all stakeholders about the implementation of MTSS.</p> <p>Elementary and Middle School Teachers: Share common goal of improving instruction for all students and provides information and support to colleagues about core, supplemental and intensive instruction.</p> <p>ESE Teachers: Provides support and collaborates with general education teachers.</p> <p>Student Services Specialist: Provides support and expertise with teachers, staff and families in the areas of academic, emotional, behavioral and social success.</p> |

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

| |
|--|
| <p>Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?</p> <p>The team will meet twice a month to discuss how the MTSS process can be used to enhance data collection, data analysis, problem solving, differentiated assistance and progress monitoring. The ongoing goals will be to increase student achievement, provide a safe and secure environment, promote a more positive school culture, enhance student social/emotional well-being and minimize student failure with early intervention programs.</p> <p>The team will meet with the general education teachers to discuss student progress and needs while in the regular education classroom.</p> |
| <p>Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?</p> <p>The MTSS team will monitor and adjust the school's academic goals through the use of data as needed. They will monitor the instructional and intervention programs and will provide the support and interventions to students as needed from data results.</p> |
| MTSS Implementation |
| <p>Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.</p> <p>Data will be used to guide instructional programs. The managed data will include FCAT, SAT, quarterly benchmark assessments, CELLA, PMRN, and student grades for academic areas and SCMS, ISIS, suspension rate, detention rate, referral rate, and parent/staff surveys for behavioral data.</p> |
| <p>Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.</p> <p>CSUSA Professional Development and Student Services Professional Development with MTSS-principles, procedures, implementation, and ongoing support throughout the year (faculty meetings, teacher planning days, planning time)</p> |
| <p>Describe plan to support MTSS.</p> <p>Implement reading and mathematics intervention classes for the lowest 25%. Provide support and resources for teachers that have students in the MTSS program.</p> |

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

| |
|--|
| School-Based Literacy Leadership Team |
|--|

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

| |
|--|
| Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). David McKnight-Principal Carmen Magarino-Assistant Principal K-2 Corinne Baez-Assistant Principal 3-7 Witnery Garcia-Assistant Principal 8 Jennifer Gonzalez-Mentor Teacher K-2 Jennifer Thermes – Mentor Teacher 3-8 Carey Smith – Intervention Teacher K-2 Kimberly VanDemark – Intervention Teacher 3-7 Carlee Sutton – Reading Specialist 8 Lorena Malave – Student Services Specialist K-2 Barbara Perez-Fernandez – Guidance Counselor 3-7 Monica Bunsen – Student Services Specialist 8 |
| Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). Administration meets with the mentor teachers, intervention teachers and student services specialist on a regular basis to monitor that the following is occurring: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Analysis of data is reported and drives reading instruction2. Professional development for teachers is provided based on school goals3. Measureable student goals are established4. Research-based instructional programs, materials and strategies are being implemented5. Instruction is differentiated based on student strengths and weaknesses6. Intensive intervention is provided7. Reading is being integrated in all content areas8. Reading instruction is provided in an uninterrupted block of time daily to all students The above is monitored using classroom walk-throughs, lesson planning reviews, data binder reviews, grade/subject level planning meetings, and professional development sessions. |
| What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Increased use of small group reading instruction2. Increased use of research based strategies3. Increased use of data analysis to differentiate instruction |

Public School Choice

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

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

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

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

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

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

For schools with Grades 6-12, describe the plan to ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility of every teacher.

| |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Mentor teachers will model effective instructional strategies for all teachers2. Lesson plans will be reviewed to ensure reading strategies are included in all subject areas3. Walk-throughs will be implemented on a regular basis to monitor the use of reading strategies in all subject areas4. Evidence of use of curriculum maps will be monitored5. Teachers of all subject areas will participate in planning meetings with reading teachers |
|--|

****High Schools Only***

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

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

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

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

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

| Reading | Problem- | | | | | | |
|---------|----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|---------|----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

| Goals | Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. | 1a.1. These students have not mastered the knowledge of advanced word/phrase relationships and their meanings. | 1a.1. Higher order questioning and use of FCAT Task cards will be used to increase the deficient barrier. Students will be given tasks to analyze words in a given text. Instruction will be given in different levels of content-specific words and the shades of their meaning. | 1a.1. MTSS Team Literacy Leadership Team Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT) | 1a.1. Monitor effectiveness using lesson plan reviews. Review formative assessment data and adjust instruction and/or strategies as appropriate. Create instructional focus calendars to target specific deficiencies needing improvement. | 1a.1. Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment FCAT Explorer Benchmark Testing Strand Analysis FAIR Developmental Reading Assessment Achieve 3000 Cambridge Evaluation Tools Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| <p>Reading Goal #1a: The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading indicates that 28% (357) of students achieved proficiency with a level 3. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 3 student proficiency by 8 percentage points to 36% (459).</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u>*</p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u>*</p> | | | | | |
| | 28% (357) | 36% (459) | | | | | |
| | | 1a.2. | 1a.2. | 1a.2. | 1a.2. | 1a.2. | |
| | | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | |
| <p>1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.</p> | 1b.1. | 1b.1. | 1b.1. | 1b.1. | 1b.1. | | |
| <p>Reading Goal #1b: N/A</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u>*</p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u>*</p> | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

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

| | | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|-------|--|
| | | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in reading. | 2a.1. The students have not mastered comparing and contrasting elements in multiple texts. | 2a.1. Higher order questioning and use of FCAT Task cards will be used to increase the deficient barrier. Students will be encouraged to read from a wide variety of texts. Enrichment opportunities will be given in the arts, sports teams, and student clubs to further students' exponential learning. Students will participate in the Cambridge Advanced Studies program to increase the rigor within the curriculum. | 2a.1. MTSS Team Literacy Leadership Team Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT) | 2a.1. Monitor effectiveness using lesson plan reviews. Review formative assessment data and adjust instruction and/or strategies as appropriate. | 2a.1. Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment FCAT Explorer Benchmark Testing Strand Analysis FAIR Developmental Reading Assessment Achieve 3000 Cambridge Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 | | |

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

| Reading Goal #2a: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|--|---|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading indicates that 27% (343) of students achieved proficiency with a level 4 or 5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 4 and 5 student proficiency by 3 percentage points to 30% (382). | | | | | | | |
| | 27% (343) | 30% (382) | | | | | |
| | | 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 reading. | 2b.1. | 2b.1. | 2b.1. | 2b.1. | 2b.1. | | |
| Reading Goal #2b: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 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 | |

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. These students have not mastered how to analyze the text features needed to understand the text. | 3a.1. Ensure all students read a wide variety of texts. Emphasize implicit meanings. Use text features to locate, interpret, and organize information | 3a.1. MTSS Team Literacy Leadership Team Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT) | 3a.1. Monitor effectiveness using lesson plan reviews. Review formative assessment data and adjust instruction and/or strategies as appropriate. | 3a.1. Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment FCAT Explorer Benchmark Testing Strand Analysis FAIR Developmental Reading Assessment Achieve 3000 Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 | | |
| Reading Goal #3a: The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading indicates that 63% (664) of students made learning gains in reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase learning gains by 5 percentage points to 68% (717). | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | 63% (664) | 68% (717) | | | | | |
| | | 3a.2. | 3a.2. | 3a.2. | 3a.2. | 3a.2. | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|-----------------|-------|--|
| | | 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: | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 3b.2. | 3b.2. | 3b.2. | 3b.2. | 3b.2. | |
| | | 3b.3. | 3b.3. | 3b.3. | 3b.3. | 3b.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| <p>4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</p> | <p>4a.1. These students have not mastered how to analyze a variety of text structures and explain their impact meaning in text.</p> | <p>4a.1. Higher order questioning and use of FCAT Task cards will be used to increase the student gains. Students will be given problem solving tasks to increase their ability to compare/contrast a piece of literature. Instructional Focus Programs will be implemented on a biweekly basis to target the deficient area.</p> | <p>4a.1. MTSS Team Literacy Leadership Team Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT)</p> | <p>4a.1. Monitor effectiveness using lesson plan reviews. Review formative assessment data and adjust instruction and/or strategies as appropriate.</p> | <p>4a.1. Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment FCAT Explorer Benchmark Testing Strand Analysis FAIR Developmental Reading Assessment Achieve 3000 Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0</p> | | |
| <p><u>Reading Goal #4a:</u> The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading indicates that 65% (183) of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the learning gains of students in the lowest 25% by 5 percentage points to 70% (197).</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|--|
| | 65% (183) | 70% (197) | | | | | |
| | | 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 reading. | 4b.1. | 4b.1. | 4b.1. | 4b.1. | 4b.1. | | |
| Reading Goal #4b: | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 4b.2. | 4b.2. | 4b.2. | 4b.2. | 4b.2. | |
| | | 4b.3 | 4b.3. | 4b.3. | 4b.3. | 4b.3. | |
| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | |

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

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|------------------------|-------------|-------------|--|
| <p>5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</p> | <p>Baseline data 2010-2011</p> | <p>The AMO-2 Target for the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading administration is 63% proficiency. In 2012, the proficiency rate decreased by 18 percentage points to 56%.</p> | <p>67%.</p> | <p>70%.</p> | <p>73%.</p> | <p>77%.</p> | <p>80%.</p> | |
| <p><u>Reading Goal #5A:</u> Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.</p> | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:</p> | <p>Anticipated Barrier</p> | <p>Strategy</p> | <p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p> | <p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p> | <p>Evaluation Tool</p> | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p> | <p>5B.1. Students have not mastered how to relate vocabulary or texts to real life.</p> | <p>5B.1. Increased use of visuals and the use of culturally sensitive texts. Implement skill-based tutoring during and after school. Students will use personal dictionaries, word walls, and word maps to relate newly acquired words to their schema.</p> | <p>5B.1. MTSS Team Literacy Leadership Team Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT)</p> | <p>5B.1. Monitor effectiveness using lesson plan reviews. Review formative assessment data and adjust instruction and/or strategies as appropriate.</p> | <p>5B.1. Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment FCAT Explorer Benchmark Testing Strand Analysis FAIR Developmental Reading Assessment Achieve 3000 Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0</p> | | |
| <p><u>Reading Goal #5B:</u> The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading indicates that 36% of the students the white, black, and Hispanic subgroups did not make satisfactory progress in reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase their progress by 3 percentage point to 67% (820).</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u>*</p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u>*</p> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|-------|-------|
| | White: 78% (212) Black: 56% (72) Hispanic: 58% (406) | White: 80% (242) Black: 60% (94) Hispanic: 62% (484) | | | | | |
| | | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. |
| | | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. | 5C.1. Students have not mastered how to relate vocabulary or texts to real life. | 5C.1. Increased use of visuals and the use of culturally sensitive texts. Implement skill-based tutoring during and after school. Students will use personal dictionaries, word walls, and word maps to relate newly acquired words to their schema. | 5C.1. MTSS Team Literacy Leadership Team Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT) | 5C.1. Monitor effectiveness using lesson plan reviews. Review formative assessment data and adjust instruction and/or strategies as appropriate. | 5C.1. Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment FCAT Explorer Benchmark Testing Strand Analysis FAIR Developmental Reading Assessment Achieve 3000 Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 | | |

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

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|-----------------|-------|--|--|
| <u>Reading Goal</u> <u>#5C:</u> | <u>2012 Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u> | | | | | | |
| The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading indicates that 60% of the English Language Learners did not make satisfactory progress in reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase their progress by 5 percentage points to 45% (49). | | | | | | | | |
| | 40% (32) | 45% (49) | | | | | | |
| | | 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 | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|--------------|--|
| <p>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p> | <p>5D.1. Students have not mastered how to relate vocabulary or texts to real life.</p> | <p>5D.1. Implement skill-based tutoring during and after school. Increased use of visuals and the use of culturally sensitive texts. Students will use personal dictionaries, word walls, and word maps to relate newly acquired words to their schema.</p> | <p>5D.1. MTSS Team Literacy Leadership Team Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT)</p> | <p>5D.1. Monitor effectiveness using lesson plan reviews. Review formative assessment data and adjust instruction and/or strategies as appropriate.</p> | <p>5D.1. Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment FCAT Explorer Benchmark Testing Strand Analysis FAIR Developmental Reading Assessment Achieve 3000 Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0</p> | | |
| <p><u>Reading Goal #5D:</u> The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading indicates that 74% of the Students with Disabilities did not make satisfactory progress in reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase their progress by 7 percentage points to 33% (34).</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u>*</p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u>*</p> | | | | | |
| | <p>26% (26)</p> | <p>33% (34)</p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>5D.2.</p> | <p>5D.2.</p> | <p>5D.2.</p> | <p>5D.2.</p> | <p>5D.2.</p> | |

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

| | | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|-------|--|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. | 5E.1. Students have not mastered how to relate vocabulary or texts to real life. | 5E.1. Implement skill-based tutoring during and after school. Increased use of visuals and the use of culturally sensitive texts. Students will use personal dictionaries, word walls, and word maps to relate newly acquired words to their schema. | 5E.1. MTSS Team Literacy Leadership Team Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT) | 5E.1. Monitor effectiveness using lesson plan reviews. Review formative assessment data and adjust instruction and/or strategies as appropriate. | 5E.1. Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment FCAT Explorer Benchmark Testing Strand Analysis FAIR Developmental Reading Assessment Achieve 3000 Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 | | |

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

| Reading Goal #5E: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|---|--|------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading indicates that 43% of the Economically Disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase their progress by 4 percentage points to 61% (517). | | | | | | | |
| | 57% (415) | 61% (517) | | | | | |
| | | 5E.2. | 5E.2 | 5E.2. | 5E.2. | 5E.2. | |
| | | 5E.3 | 5E.3 | 5E.3 | 5E.3 | 5E.3 | |

Reading Professional Development

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</p> <p>Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.</p> | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g. , frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|--|----------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| Cambridge Training | Cambridge 4-8 | Cambridge Personnel | Reading/LA Cambridge Teachers | August 18, 2012 | Walkthroughs | CRT and AP |
| Higher Order Questioning | Reading/LA K-8 | CRT | Reading/LA Teachers | September 26, 2012 | Walkthroughs | CRT and AP |
| Using FCAT Task Cards in the Reading Classroom | Reading/LA K-8 | CRT | Reading/LA Teachers | September 26, 2012 | Walkthroughs | CRT and AP |
| Text Features and Text Structures | Reading/LA K-8 | CRT | Reading/LA Teachers | September 26, 2012 | Walkthroughs | CRT and AP |
| Using Visual Aids in the Classroom | Reading/LA K-8 | CRT | Reading/LA Teachers | September 26, 2012 | Walkthroughs | CRT and AP |

Reading 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 |
| Wide variety of texts | Library Books/Videos | Operating | \$5,000 |
| Wide variety of texts | Time for Kids | Operating | \$2,000 |
| Wide variety of texts | Reading Through Social Studies | Operating | \$500 |
| Practice context clues, meanings of words and phrases, and prefixes, suffixes, affixes, and roots. | Wordly Wise | Operating | \$1,000 |
| Practice context clues, meanings of words and phrases, and prefixes, suffixes, affixes, and roots. | Vocabulary Workshop | Operating | \$400 |
| Skill-Based Tutoring | FCAT Coach | Operating | \$300 |
| Skill-Based Tutoring | Test Ready | Operating | \$1,000 |
| Subtotal: \$10,200 | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |

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

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|----------------|------------|
| Implement Reading Goals | Study Island | Operating | \$1,500 |
| Subtotal: \$1,500 | | | |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Skill Based Tutoring | Test Item Specifications, Study Island, Discovery Education Assessments and Probes | Operating | \$50.00 |
| Study Island | Web-Based Product | Operating | \$50.00 |
| Vocabulary | Seven Levels of Vocabulary | Operating | \$50.00 |
| Subtotal: \$150.00 | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Implement Reading Goals | FCAT Tutoring | Operating | \$7,000.00 |
| Subtotal: \$7,000.00 | | | |
| Total: \$18,850 | | | |

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

| 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 | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|-------------|
| <p>1. Students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking.</p> | <p>1.1. Many students have parents/guardians and family that do not speak English; therefore they only practice while at school.</p> | <p>1.1. The teacher will use modeling with illustrations and diagrams along with visuals to build background knowledge and develop language skills. Focus on key vocabulary (including multiple meaning words and cognates) with the use of word banks and vocabulary notebooks. Use of a heritage language dictionary in all classes/disciplines.</p> | <p>1.1. ESOL Coordinator CRT Administration</p> | <p>1.1. Monitor effectiveness using lesson plan reviews. Review formative assessment data and adjust instruction and/or strategies as appropriate.</p> | <p>1.1. Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment FCAT Explorer Benchmark Testing Strand Analysis FAIR Developmental Reading Assessment Achieve 3000 Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0</p> | |
| <p><u>CELLA Goal #1:</u> The results of the 2012 CELLA Listening/Speaking indicates that 54% (142) of the English Language Learners were proficient. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase their progress by 5 percentage points to 59% (151 students).</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>54% (142)</p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>1.2.</p> | <p>1.2.</p> | <p>1.2.</p> | <p>1.2.</p> | <p>1.2.</p> |
| | | <p>1.3.</p> | <p>1.3.</p> | <p>1.3.</p> | <p>1.3.</p> | <p>1.3.</p> |
| <p>Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.</p> | <p>Anticipated Barrier</p> | <p>Strategy</p> | <p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p> | <p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p> | <p>Evaluation Tool</p> | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|-------------|
| <p>2. Students scoring proficient in Reading.</p> | <p>2.1. Students lack phonemic awareness upon entering third grade and have difficulty grasping the English grammar and idiom usage.</p> | <p>2.1. Assignment complexity needs to be varied in order to effectively differentiate instruction. Use multisensory approaches such as visual aids, books on tape, etc. Students will participate in role playing activities and buddy/partner readings.</p> | <p>2.1. ESOL Coordinator CRT Administration</p> | <p>2.1. Monitor effectiveness using lesson plan reviews. Review formative assessment data and adjust instruction and/or strategies as appropriate.</p> | <p>2.1. Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment FCAT Explorer Benchmark Testing Strand Analysis FAIR Developmental Reading Assessment Achieve 3000 Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0</p> | |
| <p><u>CELLA Goal #2:</u> The results of the 2012 CELLA Reading indicates that 33% (88) of the English Language Learners were proficient. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase their progress by 2 percentage points to 35% (92).</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>33% (88)</p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>2.2.</p> | <p>2.2.</p> | <p>2.2.</p> | <p>2.2.</p> | <p>2.2.</p> |
| | | <p>2.3</p> | <p>2.3</p> | <p>2.3</p> | <p>2.3</p> | <p>2.3</p> |
| <p>Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.</p> | <p>Anticipated Barrier</p> | <p>Strategy</p> | <p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p> | <p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p> | <p>Evaluation Tool</p> | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|---|------|
| 3. Students scoring proficient in Writing. | 3.1. Students struggle with English grammar and spelling patterns. | 3.1. Students will work cooperatively to complete reports and projects. Students will read for a specific purpose such as to highlight key information, create graphic organizers with the information, take notes and outline information, or summarizing the text. | 3.1. ESOL Coordinator CRT Administration | 3.1. Monitor effectiveness using lesson plan reviews. Review formative assessment data and adjust instruction and/or strategies as appropriate. | 3.1. Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment FCAT Explorer Benchmark Testing Strand Analysis FAIR Developmental Reading Assessment Achieve 3000 Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 | |
| CELLA Goal #3: The results of the 2012 CELLA Writing indicates that 28% (76) of the English Language Learners were proficient. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase their progress by 2 percentage point to 30% (79). | <u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u> | | | | | |
| | 28% (76) | | | | | |
| | | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. |
| | | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 |

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--------|
| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Students will participate in role playing activities and buddy/partner readings. | Culturally and language appropriate library books | Operating | \$500 |

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

| | | | |
|--------------------------|---|----------------|--------|
| Subtotal: \$500 | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| All strategies | A variety of resources to assist teachers in planning lessons that will accommodate ELL students. | Operating | \$100 |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: \$100 | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Total: \$600 | | | |

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Elementary Mathematics Goals | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p>1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.</p> | <p>1a.1. These students struggle to read and answer multi-step problems following directions.</p> | <p>1a.1. Identifying key words and providing opportunities to follow steps. Use of problem solving organizers.</p> | <p>1a.1. Administration (Curriculum Resource Teacher)</p> | <p>1a.1. Monitor Instructional Focus Program results</p> | <p>1a.1. Summative: Discovery Education Benchmarks Instructional Focus Program Interim Assessments Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment 2013 FCAT 2.0</p> | | |

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

| <u>Mathematics Goal #1a:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | |
|--|--|---|------|-------|-------|-------|
| The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math indicates that 31% (396) of students achieved proficiency with a level 3. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 3 student proficiency by 4 percentage points to 35% (446). | | | | | | |
| | 31% (396) | 35% (446) | | | | |
| | | 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. | |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #1b:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | |
| 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 | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| <p>2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.</p> | <p>2a.1. Students are not provided with sufficient enrichment opportunities.</p> | <p>2a.1. Include enrichment opportunities. Curriculum Department Resource through fifth grade. Differentiate Instructional focus Program and classroom instruction. Professional development</p> | <p>2a.1. Administration</p> | <p>2a.1. Monitor Instructional Focus Program results.</p> | <p>2a.1. Summative: Discovery Education Benchmarks Instructional Focus Program Interim Assessments Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment 2013 FCAT 2.0</p> | | |

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

| <u>Mathematics Goal #2a:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | |
|---|--|---|------|-------|-------|-------|
| The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math indicates that 21% (268) of students achieved proficiency with a level 4 or 5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 4 and 5 student proficiency by 2 percentage points to 23% (293). | | | | | | |
| | 21% (268) | 23% (293) | | | | |
| | | 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. | | |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #2b:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | | |
| | | 2b.2. | 2b.2 | 2b.2. | 2b.2. | 2b.2. |

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

| | | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | |
|--|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|------|--|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| <p>3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.</p> | <p>3a.1. These students have not had the opportunity to master understanding of basic math concepts.</p> | <p>3a.1. Departmentalize third through fifth grade Differentiate Instructional focus programs and classroom instruction Provide grade level appropriate activities and manipulatives Use of Math Centers Engaging opportunities for practice</p> | <p>3a.1. Analyze Benchmark strands Monitor Instructional Focus Program results. Instructional binder reviews</p> | <p>2a.1. Summative: Discovery Education Benchmarks Instructional Focus Program Interim Assessment Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment 2013 FCAT 2.0</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | through the use of technology and increase subscriptions for interactive websites | | | | |
| | | Implement Math Intervention | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #3a: | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | |
| The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math indicates that 70% (739) of students made learning gains in math. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase learning gains by 5 percentage points to 75% (791). | | | | | | |
| | 70% (739) | 75% (791) | | | | |
| | | 3a.2. | 3a.2 | 3a.2. | 3a.2. | 3a.2. |
| | | 3a.3. | 3a.3 | 3a.3. | 3a.3. | 3a.3. |

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

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

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|-------------|---|--|--|--|
| <p>of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</p> | <p>4a.1. These students have not had the opportunity to master understanding of basic math concepts.</p> | <p>4a.1. Use of Math Centers</p> <p>Engaging opportunities for practice through the use of technology and</p> <p>Start Instructional Focus Program</p> | <p>4a.1</p> | <p>4a.1. Analyze Benchmark strands</p> <p>Monitor Instructional Focus Program results.</p> <p>Instructional binder reviews to include small group instruction</p> | <p>4a.1. Summative: Discovery Education Benchmarks Instructional Focus Program Interim Assessments</p> <p>Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment 2013 FCAT 2.0</p> | | |
|--|--|--|-------------|---|--|--|--|

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

| | | earlier Implement Math Intervention | | | | |
|---|--|---|------|-------|-------|-------|
| <u>Mathematics Goal #4a:</u> The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math indicates that 77% (212) of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the learning gains of students in the lowest 25% by 5 percentage points to 82% (226). | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | |
| | 77% (212) | 82% (226) | | | | |
| | | 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. | |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #4b:</u> N/A | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------|
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 4b.2. | 4b.2 | 4b.2. | 4b.2. | 4b.2. | |
| | | 4b.3 | 4b.3 | 4b.3. | 4b.3. | 4b.3. | |
| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | |
| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Baseline data 2010-2011 | The AMO-2 Target for the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math administration is 58% proficiency. In 2012, the proficiency rate decreased by 14 percentage points to 53%. | 58% | 62%. | 66%. | 70%. | 75%. |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u> Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%. | | | | | | | |

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 | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|
| <p>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p> | <p>5B.1. These students have not had the opportunity to master understanding of basic math concepts.</p> | <p>5B.1. Engage students by using centers and manipulatives. Use the instructional focus program from the start of the school year.</p> | <p>5B.1. Administration Curriculum Resources Teachers</p> | <p>5B.1. Analyze Benchmark strands Monitor Instructional Focus Program results. Instructional binder reviews to include small group instruction</p> | <p>5B.1. Summative: Discovery Education Benchmarks Instructional Focus Program Interim Assessment Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment 2013 FCAT 2.0</p> | | |

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

| Mathematics Goal #5B: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|-----------------|-------|--|
| The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math indicates that 48% of the students the white, black, and Hispanic subgroups did not make satisfactory progress in math. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase their progress by 5 percentage points to 57%. | | | | | | | |
| | White: 64% (197) Black: 43% (68) Hispanic: 50% (383) | White: 68% (206) Black: 48% (75) Hispanic: 54% (422) | | | | | |
| | | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | |
| | | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--------------|---|--|--------------|--|
| <p>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p> | <p>5C.1. Students do not have sufficient command and understanding of the English language.</p> | <p>5C.1. Increase vocabulary through the use of picture cards Use of semantic webs in Math Hands on learning activities</p> | <p>5C.1.</p> | <p>1. Monitor Instructional Focus Program results. Analyze Benchmark results. Curriculum Resources Teachers</p> | <p>5C.1. Summative: Discovery Education Benchmarks Instructional Focus Program Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment</p> | | |
| <p><u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u> The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math indicates that 58% of the English Language Learners did not make satisfactory progress in math. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase their progress by 6 percentage point to 48% (52).</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>42% (42)</p> | <p>48% (52)</p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>5C.2.</p> | <p>5C.2.</p> | <p>5C.2.</p> | <p>5C.2.</p> | <p>5C.2.</p> | |
| | | <p>5C.3.</p> | <p>5C.3.</p> | <p>5C.3.</p> | <p>5C.3.</p> | <p>5C.3.</p> | |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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. These students have not had the opportunity to master understanding of basic math concepts. | 5D.1. Differentiate instruction Small group instruction Skills based tutoring Practicing repetition of basic Math skills | 5D.1. Teachers Curriculum Resources Teachers | 5D.1. Tracking progress in class and through benchmark assessments | 5D.1. Summative: Discovery Education Benchmarks Instructional Focus Program Interim Assessment Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment 2013 FCAT 2.0 | | |

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

| Mathematics Goal #5D: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|-----------------|-------|--|
| The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math indicates that 77% of the Students with Disabilities did not make satisfactory progress in math. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase their progress by 7 percentage points to 30% (38). | | | | | | | |
| | 23% (31) | 30% (38) | | | | | |
| | | 5D.2. | SD. 2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | |
| | | 5D.3. | SD. 3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|--------------|--|
| <p>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p> | <p>5E.1. These students have not had the opportunity to master understanding of basic math concepts.</p> | <p>5E.1. Hands on practice using manipulatives Differentiate instruction Use of technology</p> | <p>5E.1. 1. Monitor effectiveness using lesson plans reviews Tracking progress though Benchmark Assessments</p> <p>Curriculum Resource Teachers</p> | <p>5E.1. Summative: Discovery Education Benchmarks Instructional Focus Program Interim Assessment</p> <p>Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment 2013 FCAT 2.0</p> | | |
| <p><u>Mathematics Goal #5E:</u> The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math indicates that 54% of the Economically Disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in math. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase their progress by 5 percentage point to 51% (432).</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | |
| | <p>46% (407)</p> | <p>51% (432)</p> | | | | |
| | | <p>5E.2.</p> | <p>5E.2. 2</p> | <p>5E.2.</p> | <p>5E.2.</p> | |
| | | <p>5E.3</p> | <p>5E.3 3</p> | <p>5E.3</p> | <p>5E.3</p> | |

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

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

| Middle School Math ematics Goals | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem ent | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 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. These students have not had the opportunity to master basic operations using fractions. | 1a.1. Develop understanding and fluency with the addition and subtraction of fractions Provide opportunities and activities for students to generate equivalent fractions and simplify fractions | 1a.1. MTSS Team Leadership Team Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT) | 1a.1. Monitor effectiveness using lesson plan reviews. Review formative assessment data and adjust instruction and/or strategies as appropriate. | 1a.1. Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment FCAT Explorer Benchmark Testing Strand Analysis Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 | | |

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

| <u>Mathematics Goal #1a:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
|--|--|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math indicates that 31% (396) of students achieved proficiency with a level 3. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 3 student proficiency by 4 percentage points to 35% (446). | | | | | | | |
| | 31% (396) | 35% (446) | | | | | |
| | | 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. | | |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #1b:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| 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 | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| <p>2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.</p> | <p>2a.1. These students have not had sufficient exposure to probability activities to master statistics.</p> | <p>2a.1. Enrich learning by providing students with hands-on experiences involving the use of manipulatives to solve for probability. Provide opportunities to practice interpreting and data to solve problems and make predictions.</p> | <p>2a.1. MTSS Team Leadership Team Curriculum Resource</p> | <p>2a.1. Monitor effectiveness using lesson plan reviews. Review formative assessment data and adjust instruction and/or strategies as appropriate.</p> | <p>2a.1. Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment FCAT Explorer Benchmark Testing Strand Analysis Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0</p> | | |
| <p><u>Mathematics Goal #2a:</u> The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math indicates that 21% (268) of students achieved proficiency with a level 4 or 5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 4 and 5 student proficiency by 2 percentage points to 23% (293).</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|-----------------|-------|--|
| | 21% (268) | 23% (293) | | | | | |
| | | 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. | | |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #2b:</u> N/A | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 2b.2. | 2b.2. | 2b.2. | 2b.2. | 2b.2. | |
| | | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|---|--------------|--|
| <p>3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.</p> | <p>3a.1. These students have not to mastered the understanding of geometry and measurement concepts</p> | <p>3a.1. Support the use of hands-on and interactive manipulatives and engaging opportunities for practice. Provide grade level appropriate activities that promote the use of geometric knowledge and spatial reasoning.</p> | <p>3a.1. MTSS Team Leadership Team Curriculum Resource Teacher</p> | <p>3a.1. Monitor effectiveness using lesson plan reviews. Review formative assessment data and adjust instruction and/or strategies as appropriate.</p> | <p>3a.1. Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment FCAT Explorer Benchmark Testing Strand Analysis Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0</p> | | |
| <p><u>Mathematics Goal #3a:</u> The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math indicates that 70% (739) of students made learning gains in math. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase learning gains by 5 percentage points to 75% (791).</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>70% (739)</p> | <p>75% (791)</p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>3a.2.</p> | <p>3a.2.</p> | <p>3a.2.</p> | <p>3a.2.</p> | <p>3a.2.</p> | |
| | | <p>3a.3.</p> | <p>3a.3.</p> | <p>3a.3.</p> | <p>3a.3.</p> | <p>3a.3.</p> | |

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

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

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|--------------|--|
| <p>4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</p> | <p>4a.1. These students have not mastered math fluency and fact families therefore making it difficult for them to calculate simple items quickly and efficiently.</p> | <p>4a.1. Use flash cards to develop recall. Provide opportunities for students to verify the reasonableness of number operations results including problem situations. Skills-Based tutoring.</p> | <p>4a.1. MTSS Team Leadership Team Curriculum Resource</p> | <p>4a.1. Monitor effectiveness using lesson plan reviews. Review formative assessment data and adjust instruction and/or strategies as appropriate.</p> | <p>4a.1. Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment FCAT Explorer Benchmark Testing Strand Analysis Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0</p> | | |
| <p><u>Mathematics Goal #4a:</u> The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math indicates that 77% (212) of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the learning gains of students in the lowest 25% by 5 percentage points to 82% (226).</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>77% (212)</p> | <p>82% (226)</p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>4a.2.</p> | <p>4a.2.</p> | <p>4a.2.</p> | <p>4a.2.</p> | <p>4a.2.</p> | |
| | | <p>4a.3</p> | <p>4a.3.</p> | <p>4a.3.</p> | <p>4a.3.</p> | <p>4a.3.</p> | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|--|
| 4b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. | 4b.1. | 4b.1. | 4b.1. | 4b.1. | 4b.1. | | |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #4b:</u> N/A | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance.*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance.*</u> | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 4b.2. | 4b.2. | 4b.2. | 4b.2. | 4b.2. | |
| | | 4b.3 | 4b.3. | 4b.3. | 4b.3. | 4b.3. | |
| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|------------------------|------------|------------|
| <p>5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</p> | <p>Baseline data 2010-2011</p> | <p>The AMO-2 Target for the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math administration is 53% proficiency. In 2012, the proficiency rate decreased by 14 percentage points to 53%.</p> | <p>58%</p> | <p>62%</p> | <p>66%</p> | <p>70%</p> | <p>75%</p> |
| <p><u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u> Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.</p> | | | | | | | |
| <p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:</p> | <p>Anticipated Barrier</p> | <p>Strategy</p> | <p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p> | <p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p> | <p>Evaluation Tool</p> | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|--------------|--|
| <p>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p> | <p>5B.1. These students have not had the opportunity to master understanding of geometry and measurement concepts</p> | <p>5B.1. Support the use of hands-on and interactive manipulatives and engaging opportunities for practice. Provide grade level appropriate activities that promote the use of geometric knowledge and spatial reasoning.</p> | <p>5B.1. MTSS Team Leadership Team Curriculum Resource</p> | <p>5B.1. Monitor effectiveness using lesson plan reviews. Review formative assessment data and adjust instruction and/or strategies as appropriate.</p> | <p>5B.1. Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment FCAT Explorer Benchmark Testing Strand Analysis Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0</p> | | |
| <p><u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u> The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math indicates that 48% of the students the white, black, and Hispanic subgroups did not make satisfactory progress in math. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase their progress by 5 percentage points to 57% (703).</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>White: 64% (194) Black: 43% (68) Hispanic: 49% (383)</p> | <p>White: 68% (206) Black: 48% (75) Hispanic: 54% (422)</p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>5B.2.</p> | <p>5B.2.</p> | <p>5B.2.</p> | <p>5B.2.</p> | <p>5B.2.</p> | |

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

| | | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|-------|--|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. | 5C.1. These students have not had the opportunity to master understanding of geometry and measurement concepts. | 5C.1. Support the use of hands-on and interactive manipulatives and engaging opportunities for practice. Provide grade level appropriate activities that promote the use of geometric knowledge and spatial reasoning. | 5C.1. MTSS Team Leadership Team Curriculum Resource | 5C.1. Monitor effectiveness using lesson plan reviews. Review formative assessment data and adjust instruction and/or strategies as appropriate. | 5C.1. Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment FCAT Explorer Benchmark Testing Strand Analysis Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 | | |

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

| Mathematics Goal #5C: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|-----------------|-------|--|
| The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math indicates that 58% of the English Language Learners did not make satisfactory progress in math. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase their progress by 6 percentage points to 48% (52). | | | | | | | |
| | 39% (42) | 48% (52) | | | | | |
| | | 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 | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|--------------|--|
| <p>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p> | <p>5D.1. These students have not mastered math fluency and fact families therefore making it difficult for them to calculate simple items quickly and efficiently.</p> | <p>5D.1. Use flash cards to develop recall. Provide opportunities for students to verify the reasonableness of number operations results including problem situations. Skills-Based tutoring.</p> | <p>5D.1. MTSS Team Leadership Team Curriculum Resource</p> | <p>5D.1. Monitor effectiveness using lesson plan reviews. Review formative assessment data and adjust instruction and/or strategies as appropriate.</p> | <p>5D.1. Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment FCAT Explorer Benchmark Testing Strand Analysis Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0</p> | | |
| <p><u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u> The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math indicates that 77% of the Students with Disabilities did not make satisfactory progress in math. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase their progress by 1 percentage point to 30% (38).</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>23% (31)</p> | <p>30% (38)</p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>5D.2.</p> | <p>5D.2.</p> | <p>5D.2.</p> | <p>5D.2.</p> | <p>5D.2.</p> | |
| | | <p>5D.3.</p> | <p>5D.3.</p> | <p>5D.3.</p> | <p>5D.3.</p> | <p>5D.3.</p> | |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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. These students have not had the opportunity to master understanding of geometry and measurement concepts. | 5E.1. Support the use of hands-on and interactive manipulatives and engaging opportunities for practice. Provide grade level appropriate activities that promote the use of geometric knowledge and spatial reasoning. | 5E.1. MTSS Team Leadership Team Curriculum Resource | 5E.1. Monitor effectiveness lesson plan reviews. Review formative assessment data and adjust instruction and/or strategies as appropriate. | 5E.1. Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment FCAT Explorer Benchmark Testing Strand Analysis Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 | | |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #5E:</u> The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math indicates that 54% of the Economically Disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in math. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase their progress by 5 percentage points to 51% (432) | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| | 46% (407) | 51% (432) | | | | | |
| | | 5E.2. | 5E.2 | 5E.2. | 5E.2. | 5E.2. | |
| | | 5E.3 | 5E.3 | 5E.3 | 5E.3 | 5E.3 | |

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

| Algebra 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. These students are working towards mastery of how to solve multi-step algebraic expressions where functions are involved. | 1.1. Practice solving real world problems. Provide inductive reasoning strategies to solve functions. Practice with hands-on instruction and interactive technology. | 1.1. MTSS Team Leadership Team Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT) | 1.1. Monitor effectiveness using lesson plan reviews. Review formative assessment data and adjust instruction and/or strategies as appropriate. | 1.1. Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment FCAT Explorer Benchmark Testing Strand Analysis Summative: 2013 Algebra 1 EOC | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|-------------|--|
| <p><u>Algebra Goal #1:</u> The results of the 2012 Algebra EOC indicates that 52% (33) of students achieved proficiency with a level 3. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 3 student proficiency by 4 percentage points to 56% (35).</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>52% (33)</p> | <p>56% (35)</p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>1.2.</p> | <p>1.2.</p> | <p>1.2.</p> | <p>1.2.</p> | <p>1.2.</p> | |
| | | <p>1.3.</p> | <p>1.3.</p> | <p>1.3.</p> | <p>1.3.</p> | <p>1.3.</p> | |
| <p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:</p> | <p>Anticipated Barrier</p> | <p>Strategy</p> | <p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p> | <p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p> | <p>Evaluation Tool</p> | | |
| <p>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra.</p> | <p>2.1. These students are working towards mastery of how to solve multi-step algebraic expressions where functions are involved.</p> | <p>2.1. Practice solving real world problems. Provide enrichment to solve functions by using inductive reasoning strategies. Practice with hands-on instruction and interactive technology.</p> | <p>2.1. MTSS Team Leadership Team Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT)</p> | <p>2.1. Monitor effectiveness using lesson plan reviews. Review formative assessment data and adjust instruction and/or strategies as appropriate.</p> | <p>2.1. Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment FCAT Explorer Benchmark Testing Strand Analysis Summative: 2013 Algebra 1 EOC</p> | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------|
| <p><u>Algebra Goal #2:</u> The results of the 2012 Algebra EOC indicates that 29% (18) of students achieved proficiency with a level 4 or 5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 4 and 5 student proficiency by 2 percentage points to 31% (20).</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>29% (18)</p> | <p>31% (20)</p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>2.2.</p> | <p>2.2.</p> | <p>2.2.</p> | <p>2.2.</p> | <p>2.2.</p> | |
| | | <p>2.3</p> | <p>2.3</p> | <p>2.3</p> | <p>2.3</p> | <p>2.3</p> | |
| <p>Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target</p> | <p>2011-2012</p> | <p>2012-2013</p> | <p>2013-2014</p> | <p>2014-2015</p> | <p>2015-2016</p> | <p>2016-2017</p> | |
| <p>3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</p> | <p>Baseline data 2010-2011</p> | <p>The AMO-2 Target for the 2012 Algebra EOC administration is 65% proficiency. In 2012, the proficiency rate decreased by 11 percentage points to 54%.</p> | <p>68%.</p> | <p>72%.</p> | <p>75%.</p> | <p>78%.</p> | <p>81%.</p> |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p><u>Algebra Goal #3A:</u></p> <p>Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.</p> | | | | | | | |
| <p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:</p> | <p>Anticipated Barrier</p> | <p>Strategy</p> | <p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p> | <p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p> | <p>Evaluation Tool</p> | | |
| <p>3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.</p> | <p>3B.1 These students have not mastered how to solve multi-step algebraic expressions where functions are involved.</p> | <p>3B.1 Practice solving real world problems. Provide enrichment to solve functions by using inductive reasoning strategies. Practice with hands-on instruction and interactive technology.</p> | <p>3B.1 MTSS Team Leadership Team Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT)</p> | <p>3B.1 Monitor effectiveness using lesson plan reviews. Review formative assessment data and adjust instruction and/or strategies as appropriate.</p> | <p>3B.1 Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment FCAT Explorer Benchmark Testing Strand Analysis Summative: 2013 Algebra 1 EOC</p> | | |
| <p><u>Algebra Goal #3B:</u></p> <p>The results of the 2012 Algebra EOC indicates that 29% of the students the white, black, and Hispanic subgroups did not make satisfactory progress in algebra. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase their progress by 1 percentage point to 30%.</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>White: Black: Hispanic:</p> | <p>White: Black: Hispanic:</p> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|-----------------|-------|--|
| | | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | |
| | | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. | 3C.1 | 3C.1 | 3C.1 | 3C.1 | 3C.1 | | |
| <u>Algebra Goal #3C:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance.*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance.*</u> | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 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 | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|-------|--|
| 3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. | 3D.1 | 3D.1 | 3D.1 | 3D.1 | 3D.1 | | |
| <u>Algebra Goal #3D:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | NA | NA | | | | | |
| | | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | |
| | | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. | 3E.1 These students have not mastered how to solve multi-step algebraic expressions where functions are involved. | 3E.1 Practice solving real world problems. Provide enrichment to solve functions by using inductive reasoning strategies. Practice with hands-on instruction and interactive technology. | 3E.1 MTSS Team Leadership Team Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT) | 3E.1 Monitor effectiveness using lesson plan reviews. Review formative assessment data and adjust instruction and/or strategies as appropriate. | 3E.1 Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment FCAT Explorer Benchmark Testing Strand Analysis Summative: 2013 Algebra 1 EOC | | |

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

| Algebra Goal #3E: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| The results of the 2012 Algebra EOC indicates that 52% of the Economically Disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in algebra. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase their progress by 3 percentage points to 51% (16). | | | | | | | |
| | 48% (15) | 51% (16) | | | | | |
| | | 3E.2. | 3E.2 | 3E.2. | 3E.2. | 3E.2. | |
| | | 3E.3 | 3E.3 | 3E.3 | 3E.3 | 3E.3 | |

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</p> <p>Please note that each Strategy does not require a</p> | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| 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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Math Technology | Math K-8 | CRT | K-8 Math Teachers | September 17, 2012 | Classroom Walkthroughs | CRT and AP |
| Problem Solving Organizers | Math K-8 | CRT | K-8 Math Teachers | September 26, 2012 | Classroom Walkthroughs | CRT and AP |
| Enrichment in the Math Classroom | Math K-8 | CRT | K-8 Math Teachers | September 26, 2012 | Classroom Walkthroughs | CRT and AP |
| Math Centers and Manipulatives | Math K-8 | CRT | K-8 Math Teachers | September 26, 2012 | Classroom Walkthroughs | CRT and AP |

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 |
| Skill Based tutoring | AMSCO Test Preparation | Operating | \$1,000 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: \$1,000 | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Implement Math Goals | Study Island | Operating | \$1,500 |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: \$1,500 | | | |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Use of manipulatives, games and interactive technology | Manipulatives, Promethean Boards, SMART Boards, and research-based strategies | Operating | \$1,000.00 |
| Study Island | Web-Based Program | Operating | Refer to Reading Budget |

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|------------|
| Subtotal: \$1,000.00 | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Implement Math Goals | FCAT Tutoring | Operating | \$7,000.00 |
| Subtotal:\$7,000.00 | | | |
| Total: \$10,500 | | | |

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

| Elementary and Middle Science Goals | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. | 1a.1. Students do not have sufficient command over basic science concepts. | 1a.1. Use vocabulary concept maps. Modeling scientific thinking. Hands on Inquiry Prompts. | 1a.1. CRT Administration | 1a.1. Unit and Benchmark Assessments Instructional Focus Program (change biweekly using data from Benchmark assessments) Pre/Post Tests | 1a.1. Summative: Discovery Education Benchmarks Instructional Focus Program Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment 2013 FCAT 2.0 | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|------------------------|--------------|--|
| <p><u>Science Goal #1a:</u> The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science indicates that 37% (153) of students achieved proficiency with a level 3. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 3 student proficiency by 4 percentage points to 41% (168).</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>37% (153)</p> | <p>41% (168)</p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>1a.2.</p> | <p>1a.2.</p> | <p>1a.2.</p> | <p>1a.2.</p> | <p>1a.2.</p> | |
| | | <p>1a.3.</p> | <p>1a.3.</p> | <p>1a.3.</p> | <p>1a.3.</p> | <p>1a.3.</p> | |
| <p>1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Level 4, 5, and 6 in science.</p> | <p>1b.1.</p> | <p>1b.1.</p> | <p>1b.1.</p> | <p>1b.1.</p> | <p>1b.1.</p> | | |
| <p><u>Science Goal #1b:</u> N/A</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>1b.2.</p> | <p>1b.2.</p> | <p>1b.2.</p> | <p>1b.2.</p> | <p>1b.2.</p> | |
| | | <p>1b.3.</p> | <p>1b.3.</p> | <p>1b.3.</p> | <p>1b.3.</p> | <p>1b.3.</p> | |
| <p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:</p> | <p>Anticipated Barrier</p> | <p>Strategy</p> | <p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p> | <p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p> | <p>Evaluation Tool</p> | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|--------------|--|
| <p>2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.</p> | <p>2a.1. Students do not have sufficient command over basic science concepts.</p> | <p>2a.1. Provide enrichment by using Problem-Based Learning and student led instruction. Hands on Inquiry Differentiate Instruction by providing enrichment</p> | <p>2a.1. CRT Administration</p> | <p>2a.1. Unit and Benchmark Assessments Instructional Focus Program Pre/Post Tests Open-Ended Questions</p> | <p>2a.1. Summative: Discovery Education Benchmarks Instructional Focus Program Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment 2013 FCAT 2.0</p> | | |
| <p><u>Science Goal #2a:</u> The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science indicates that 11% (46) of students achieved proficiency with a level 4 or 5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 4 and 5 student proficiency by 2 percentage points to 13% (52).</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>11% (46)</p> | <p>13% (52)</p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>2a.2.</p> | <p>2a.2.</p> | <p>2a.2.</p> | <p>2a.2.</p> | <p>2a.2.</p> | |
| | | <p>2a.3</p> | <p>2a.3</p> | <p>2a.3</p> | <p>2a.3</p> | <p>2a.3</p> | |
| <p>2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.</p> | <p>2b.1.</p> | <p>2b.1.</p> | <p>2.1.</p> | <p>2b.1.</p> | <p>2b.1.</p> | | |
| <p><u>Science Goal #2b:</u> N/A</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 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

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

| Biology 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 | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|-------------|--|
| <p>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology.</p> | <p>1.1. Students have not mastered the basics of life science needed in order to begin with the biology standards.</p> | <p>1.1. Vocabulary note books Cornell note taking format Science videos aligning both curriculum map and pacing guide. Provide visual representations and labs and hands on activities Study Jams</p> | <p>1.1. Administration Curriculum Resource Teacher</p> | <p>1.1. Monitor effectiveness using lesson plan reviews. Review formative assessment data and adjust instruction and/or strategies as appropriate.</p> | <p>1.1. Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment FCAT Explorer Quizzes and or Unit Exams Testing Strand Analysis Summative: 2013 Biology EOC</p> | | |
| <p>Biology Goal #1: Our goal for the 2012-2013 Biology EOC is to have 30% of students achieve level 3 proficiency. The results of the 2012 Biology Baseline Assessment indicates that 11% (46) of students achieved a level 3 in Biology. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the number of students achieving a level 3 by 2 percentage points to 13% (52).</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>11% (46)</p> | <p>13% (52)</p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>1.2.</p> | <p>1.2.</p> | <p>1.2.</p> | <p>1.2.</p> | <p>1.2.</p> | |
| | | <p>1.3.</p> | <p>1.3.</p> | <p>1.3.</p> | <p>1.3.</p> | <p>1.3.</p> | |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| <p>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology.</p> | <p>2.1. Students have not mastered the basics of life science needed in order to begin with the biology standards.</p> | <p>2.1. Vocabulary note books Cornell note taking format Science videos aligning both curriculum map and pacing guide. Provide visual representations and labs and hands on activities Study Jams</p> | <p>2.1. Administration Curriculum Resource Teacher</p> | <p>2.1. Monitor effectiveness using classroom walkthroughs and lesson plan reviews. Review formative assessment data and adjust instruction and/or strategies as appropriate.</p> | <p>2.1. Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment FCAT Explorer Quizzes and or Unit Exams Testing Strand Analysis Summative: 2013 Biology EOC</p> | | |
| <p><u>Biology Goal #2:</u> Our goal for the 2012-2013 Biology EOC is to have 30% of students achieve level 4 or 5 proficiency. The results of the 2012 Biology Baseline Assessment indicates that 11% (46) of students achieved a level 4 or 5 in Biology. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the number of students achieving a level 4 or 5 by 2 percentage points to 13% (52).</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | 11% (46) | 13% (52) | | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | |
| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | |

End of Biology EOC Goals

Science Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|---|
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Cornell Note-taking | Science K-8 | CRT | K-8 Science Teachers | September 26, 2012 | Observations and Data Reports | CRT and AP |
| Problem Based Learning | Science K-8 | CRT | K-8 Science Teachers | October 25, 2012 | Walkthroughs | CRT and AP |
| Effective Hands-on Labs and videos | Science K-8 | CRT | K-8 Science Teachers | October 25, 2012 | Classroom Visits & Lesson Plan Review | CRT and AP |

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials. | | | |
|---|--|--|--|

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

| | | | |
|--|---------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: \$ | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Implement Science Goals | Study Island | Operating | \$1,500 |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: \$1,500 | | | |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Study Island | Web-Based Program | Operating | Refer to Reading Budget |
| Effective hands-on labs | Research-based strategies | Operating | \$1,000 |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: \$1,000 | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Implement Science Goals | FCAT Tutoring | Operating | \$7,000.00 |
| | | | |
| Subtotal:\$7,000 | | | |
| Total: \$9,500 | | | |

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Writing Goals | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| | Achievement | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|---|-------|--|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 1a. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. | 1a.1. Students do not have command over the writing process. | 1a.1. Writing Workshops Develop and maintain writing notebook Create a plan for writing and follow the steps in the writing process | 1a.1. CRT Administration | 1a.1. Monitor effectiveness using classroom walkthroughs and lesson plan reviews. Review formative assessment data and adjust instruction and/or strategies as appropriate. | 1a.1. Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment Monthly writing prompts Summative: 2013 FCAT Writes | | |
| <u>Writing Goal #1a:</u> The results of the 2012 FCAT Writing indicates that 81% (292) of students achieved a score of 3.0 and higher. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the number of students scoring a 3.0 and higher by 2 percentage points to 83% (299). | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | 81% (292) | 83% (299) | | | | | |
| | | 1a.2. | 1a.2. | 1a.2. | 1a.2. | 1a.2. | |
| | | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. | 1b.1. | 1b.1. | 1b.1. | 1b.1. | 1b.1. | | |
| <u>Writing Goal #1b:</u> N/A | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | |
| | | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | |

Writing Professional Development

| | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Writing Workshops | Writing K-8 | CRT | K-8 Writing Teachers | August 15, 2012 | Classroom Walkthroughs | CRT and AP |

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

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-----|----------------------|-----------------|------------------------|------------|
| Keeping a writer's notebook | Writing K-8 | CRT | K-8 Writing Teachers | August 15, 2012 | Classroom Walkthroughs | CRT and AP |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-----|----------------------|-----------------|------------------------|------------|

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| | | | |
|---|---|----------------|------------|
| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: \$ | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Implement Writing Goals | Study Island | Operating | \$1,500 |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: \$1,500 | | | |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Writing Workshops and developing and maintaining a writing notebook | Writer's notebooks and workshop materials | Operating | \$300 |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: \$300 | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Implement Writing Goals | FCAT Tutoring | Operating | \$7,000.00 |
| Subtotal: \$7,000.00 | | | |
| Total: \$8,800 | | | |

End of Writing Goals

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

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

* 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. Students do not have command over the content specific vocabulary or the history behind democracy in America. | 1.1. Use vocabulary notebook. Practice reading and interpreting visual representations of text (charts, graphs, etc.). Read and interpret primary and secondary sources of information while also examining varying points of view. | 1.1. Administration Curriculum Resource Teacher | 1.1. Monitor effectiveness using lesson plan reviews. Review formative assessment data and adjust instruction and/or strategies as appropriate. | 1.1. Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment Summative: District Spring Assessment | | |
| <u>Civics Goal #1:</u> Our goal for the 2012-2013 Civics EOC is to have 30% of students achieve level 3 proficiency. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|--|------|--|
| | 0% (0) | 30% (76) | | | | | |
| | | 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. Students have not mastered understanding and taking a position on various issues. | 2.1. Provide students with opportunities to discuss the values, complexities, and dilemmas involved in social, political, and economic issues. Assist students in developing well-reasoned positions on issues. Provide opportunities for students to write to inform and to persuade. Provide opportunities for students to participate in project-based learning activities. | 2.1. Administration Curriculum Resource Teacher | 2.1. Monitor effectiveness using lesson plan reviews. Review formative assessment data and adjust instruction and/or strategies as appropriate. | 2.1. Formative: Study Island Weekly Skills Assessment Summative: District Spring Assessment | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|------|------|------|------|--|
| Civics Goal #2: Our goal for the 2012-2013 Biology EOC is to have 30% of students achieve level 4 or 5 proficiency. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | |
| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | |

Civics Professional Development

| | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| | PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring |
| Primary and Secondary Sources | 5-8 Social Science | CRT | 5-8 Social Science Teachers | October 26, 2012 | Classroom walkthroughs | CRT and AP |

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

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|-----|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------------|------------|
| Persuasive Writing | 5-8 Social Science | CRT | 5-8 Social Science Teachers | October 26, 2012 | Classroom walkthroughs | CRT and AP |
|--------------------|--------------------|-----|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------------|------------|

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Read and interpret primary and secondary sources of information while also examining varying points of view. | Primary and Secondary Sources | Operating | \$100 |
| Provide opportunities for students to write to inform and to persuade. | Writing Traits | Operating | \$50 |
| Subtotal: \$150 | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Total: \$150 | | | |

End of Civics Goals

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

| Attendance Goal(s) | Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance | | | | | | |
|---|---|----------|---|---|-----------------|--|--|
| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---|--------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| <p>1. Attendance</p> | <p>1.1. There are still a number of absences, unexcused absences, and excessive tardies as a result of family vacations, no parent/medical notes, and parental lack of understanding the importance of school attendance.</p> | <p>1.1. Inform parents and students of the importance of attendance and punctuality via the Parent Link Phone Call System, notes home, Parent and Student workshops on school rules and procedures, and the use of the Student Information System. Ensure a clean school environment. Provide incentive parties and raffles for students that have 100% attendance quarterly.</p> | <p>1.1. Administration</p> | <p>1.1. Monthly Attendance Reports Notices to Parents</p> | <p>1.1. SIS Tracking ISIS Reports Monthly Attendance Reports</p> | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---|--------------------------------|---|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|------|------|------|------|--|
| <p><u>Attendance Goal #1:</u> Our goal for this year is to meet or improve our expected level of attendance of 95.26%, by minimizing absences due to illnesses. In addition, another goal for this year is to decrease the number of students with excessive absences and excessive tardiness by 5% by providing an incentive program.</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | 94.76% (1862) | 95.26% (1872) | | | | | |
| | <p><u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u></p> | | | | | |
| | 724 | 688 | | | | | |
| | <p><u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u></p> | | | | | |
| | 375 | 356 | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | | l.3. | l.3. | l.3. | l.3. | l.3. | |
|--|--|------|------|------|------|------|--|

| 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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring |
| Rules & Procedures | K-8 Grade | CRT & Admin | K-8 Grade Teachers | August 15, 2012 | Use of SIS/ISIS Registrar, teachers, and Principal will monitor monthly Attendance Reports | Principal |

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. | | | |
|--|--|--|--|

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

| | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--------|
| 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 |
| Rules and Procedures | Parent and Student Handbook | Operating | \$50 |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: \$50 | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Student Incentives | Gift cards and prizes | Operating | \$400 |
| Inform parents of the importance of attendance and punctuality via the Parent Link Phone Call System, notes home, workshops, and the use of the Student Information System. | Parent Workshops – Handouts, literature, refreshments | PTO | \$100 |
| Subtotal: \$500 | | | |
| Total: \$550 | | | |

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Suspension Goal(s) | Problem-solving | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| | 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. Some parents and students are unfamiliar with the parent student hand book. | 1.1. Utilize the STRIVE character education program to recognize positive student behavior and provide additional training on school behavior guidelines. Expectations for Behavior at Student Orientation. Wednesday detention (1 hour) and Saturday detention (2 hours). | 1.1. Administration | 1.1. Administration will analyze ISIS reports to monitor suspensions as well as reviewing the parent/teacher communication log on a monthly basis. | 1.1. ISIS Reports | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|------|------|------|------|--|
| Suspension Goal #1: Our goal is to meet or improve the districts expected level by decreasing the total number of suspensions by 5% . | <u>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u> | | | | | |
| | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | <u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u> | | | | | |
| | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | <u>2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u> | | | | | |
| | 137 | 123 | | | | | |
| | <u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u> | | | | | |
| | 93 | 84 | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

Suspension Professional Development

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| 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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring |
| Behavior Expectations | K-8 | CRT | Teachers and Support Staff | August 15, 2012 | Teacher Observation | Principal |

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Behavior Expectations | Parent and Student Handbook | Operating | \$200 |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: \$200 | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |

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

| | | | |
|------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | |
| Subtotal: \$200 | | | |
| Total: \$200 | | | |

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

| Dropout Prevention Goal(s) | Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention | | | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|--|--|
| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 1. Dropout Prevention <u>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</u> <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i> | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | | |
| | <u>2012 Current Dropout Rate:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*</u> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|------|------|------|------|--|
| | | | | | | | |
| | <u>2012 Current</u> Graduation Rate:* | <u>2013 Expected</u> Graduation Rate:* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Parent Involvement Goal(s) | Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| 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 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| <p>1. Parent Involvement <u>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</u> <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i></p> | <p>1.1. A large percentage of parents are not available to attend school functions during school hours and limited access and understanding of the Student Information System to monitor student progress.</p> | <p>1.1. Provide parent workshops of the use of the Student Information System and access to school computers. Notify parents of school events via the Parent Link Phone Call System, school website, notices, and the marquee.</p> | <p>1.1. Assistant Principal PTSO Board Members CRT</p> | <p>1.1. PTSO Attendance Sheets EESAC Attendance Sheets Count of Parents at other school events</p> | <p>1.1. Parent Survey PTSO Sign In Sheets SIS Volunteer Hours</p> | | |
| <p>According to 2011-2012 participation in the parent survey and PTSO sign in sheets, there was 32% (576) parent involvement. This year we plan to increase by 10 percentage points to 42% (756).</p> | <p><u>2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*</u></p> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | 32% (576) | 42% (756) | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

Parent Involvement Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| | PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring |
| Teacher and Parent Workshops and Meeting | K-8 | Leading Edge CRT PTSO President | K-8 Teachers and Parents | September 25, 2012 October 23, 2012 November 27, 2012 January 22, 2013 February 26, 2013 April 23, 2013 May 28, 2013 | Attendance Record Increase parent participation Parent Survey | Principal |

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 |

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

| | | | |
|---|--|----------------|----------|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 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 |
| Attendance Record Increase parent participation Parent Survey | Parent Workshops-Hand-outs, literature, refreshments | PTO | \$100.00 |
| Subtotal: \$100 | | | |
| Total: \$100 | | | |

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

| 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 |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| <p><u>STEM Goal #1:</u></p> <p>In the 2012-2013 school year, students will be engaged in more hands-on, project-based activities related to science and math incorporating technology.</p> | <p>1.1.</p> <p>Students are not accustomed to these types of activities.</p> | <p>1.1.</p> <p>Hands-on, project-based activities in the classroom.</p> <p>Encourage students to enroll in high level math and science courses when entering the middle school and for the transition to high school.</p> | <p>1.1.</p> <p>Administration</p> <p>Curriculum Resource Teacher</p> | <p>1.1.</p> <p>Monitor effectiveness using lesson plan reviews.</p> <p>Review formative assessment data and adjust instruction and/or strategies as appropriate.</p> <p>Review numbers of students enrolling in higher level mathematics and science courses.</p> | <p>1.1.</p> <p>Formative: Project completion (rubric)</p> <p>Summative: Advanced math and science course selection numbers for 2013-2014</p> |
| | <p>1.2.</p> | <p>1.2.</p> | <p>1.2.</p> | <p>1.2.</p> | <p>1.2.</p> |
| | <p>1.3.</p> | <p>1.3.</p> | <p>1.3.</p> | <p>1.3.</p> | <p>1.3.</p> |

STEM Professional Development

| <p>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</p> <p>Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.</p> | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| <p>PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus</p> | <p>Grade Level/ Subject</p> | <p>PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader</p> | <p>PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)</p> | <p>Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)</p> | <p>Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring</p> | <p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p> |
| <p>Incorporating technology instruction for student use</p> | <p>K-8</p> | <p>CRT</p> | <p>K-8 Teachers</p> | <p>September 17, 2012</p> | <p>Classroom Walkthroughs and observation</p> | <p>CRT and AP</p> |
| <p>Project-based learning</p> | <p>K-8</p> | <p>CRT</p> | <p>K-8 Teachers</p> | <p>October 26, 2012</p> | <p>Classroom Walkthroughs and observation</p> | <p>CRT and AP</p> |

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

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| | | | |
|--|---|----------------|----------|
| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Hands-on, project-based activities in the classroom using technology | Additional computers and computer carts | Operating | \$10,000 |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: \$10,000 | | | |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Hands-on, project-based activities in the classroom using technology | Project-based activity ideas | Operating | \$200 |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: \$200 | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Total: \$10,200 | | | |

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

| 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 |
| <p><u>CTE Goal #1:</u> In the 2012-2013 school year, the number of 7th grade students enrolled in CTE courses will increase to 100%.</p> | <p>1.1. CTE teacher is not certified with industry certification.</p> | <p>1.1. CTE Teachers implement CTE program state curriculum standards, program sequence of courses, including pacing of activities for industry certification as outlined within CTE professional development activities.</p> | <p>1.1. Administration Curriculum Resource Teacher</p> | <p>1.1. Administrators monitor the effective implementation of lessons and timely instruction in the CTE classrooms through common planning, review of test data including baseline, practice or readiness tests.</p> | <p>1.1. Teachers gain certification</p> |
| | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

CTE Professional Development

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>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.</p> | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| CTE | 6-8 Social Science | CRT | 6-8 Social Science Teachers | October 26, 2012 | Classroom Walkthroughs and review of certification requirements | CRT and AP |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| | | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| CTE | CTE information | Operating | \$50 |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: \$50 | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |

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

| | | | |
|--------------------|--|--|--|
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Total: \$50 | | | |

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

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

| Additional Goal(s) | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|-----------------|------|--|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 1. Additional Goal | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | | |
| Additional Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | <u>2012 Current Level :*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level :*</u> | | | | | |
| | <i>Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box.</i> | | | | | |
| | | 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 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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

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

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

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Please provide the total budget from each section. | |
| Reading Budget | Total: |
| | |
| CELLA Budget | Total: |
| | |
| Mathematics Budget | Total: |
| | |
| Science Budget | Total: |
| | |
| Writing Budget | Total: |
| | |
| Civics Budget | Total: |
| | |
| Attendance Budget | Total: |
| | |
| Suspension Budget | Total: |

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

| | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|
| | Total: |
| Parent Involvement Budget | |
| | Total: |
| STEM Budget | |
| | Total: |
| CTE Goals | |
| | Total: \$50 |
| | |
| | Grand Total: |

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

| | | |
|--|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| School Differentiated Accountability Status | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Priority | <input type="checkbox"/> Focus | <input type="checkbox"/> Prevent |

- *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. |

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

Monthly meetings, develop and monitor the School Improvement Plan, KGCS mission and vision, disperse EESAC funds, address parent and student concerns, focus on student achievement and school improvement.

| Describe the projected use of SAC funds. | Amount |
|---|----------|
| To purchase United Streaming (\$2,570) and Brain POP (\$1,650) school-wide. Additional projected usage for funds will be presented and voted on at the October Meeting. | \$10,040 |