FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Lake Como Elementary	District Name: Orange
Principal: Carmen S. Carrasco-Thompson	Superintendent: Dr. Jenkins
SAC Chair: Alan Ellis	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

High School Feedback Report

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

Administrators

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

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	Carmen Carrasco-Thompson	B.A. Elementary Ed. M.A. Administration & Supervision	6.6	15	**Lake Como Elementary** Yr. Grade LIII (R M) W Science LG(RM) 25% RM 11-12 B 52 58 74 49 66 79 59 75 10-11 A 68 69 78 48 69 75 53 77 09-10 A 77 73 67 64 77 75 63 67 08-09 A 83 69 89 51 69 58 69 68 07-08 B 72 69 83 33 64 70 48 67 06-07 C 67 60 59 33 52 59 50 63 **Three Points Elementary** 05-06 B 72 62 73 70 68 63 04-05 A 67 57 88 70 66 64 03-04 C 57 52 94 54 68 47 02-03 A 59 51 89 76 76 83
Assistant Principal					

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

<u>**Instructional Coaches**</u>

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)							
Literacy	Barbara Koziara	B.A. Elementary Education /Reading Endorsement	8	8	**Lake Como Elementary**							
					Yr. RM	Grade	LIII (R M)		W	Science	LG(RM)		25%
					11-12 75	B	52	58	74	49	66	79	59
					10-11 77	A	68	69	78	48	69	75	53
					09-10 67	A	77	73	67	64	77	75	63
					08-09 68	A	83	69	89	51	69	58	69
					07-08 67	B	72	69	83	33	64	70	48
					06-07 63	C	67	60	59	33	52	59	50
CRT	Linda Cordone-Cope	B.S. Elementary Education 1-8	7	7	**Lake Como Elementary**							
					Yr. RM	Grade	LIII (R M)		W	Science	LG(RM)		25%
					11-12 75	B	52	58	74	49	66	79	59
					10-11 77	A	68	69	78	48	69	75	53
					09-10 67	A	77	73	67	64	77	75	63
					08-09 68	A	83	69	89	51	69	58	69
					07-08 67	B	72	69	83	33	64	70	48
					06-07 63	C	67	60	59	33	52	59	50

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

Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. District Induction Program	Great Beginnings	First week of employment
2. School Induction Program-Mentoring, Monthly meetings and debriefing about school –wide initiatives and instructional practices. 3. On-site visits with colleagues and/or other schools are facilitated.	Barbara Koziara, Linda Cordone-Cope	On-going
4. Grade Level Mentor-Teachers new to LCE are assigned a grade level mentor. Mentor meets regularly with mentee during PLC and other forums for orientations, planning meetings.	Seasoned Teacher	On-going
5.		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
4	Teachers are taking their ESOL endorsements offered at OCPS to satisfy that endorsement.

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total number of Instructional Staff	% of first-year teachers	% of teachers with 1-5 years of experience	% of teachers with 6-14 years of experience	% of teachers with 15+ years of experience	% of teachers with Advanced Degrees	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
27	11%	22%	22%	44%	29%	100%	18%	3%	55%

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Linda Dennison	Barbara Koziara/Brenda Munoz	New Teacher	Monthly Instructional Meetings, PLC class visitations
Michael Ann Elliot	Barbara Koziara/Nina Lombardi	New Teacher	Monthly Meetings, PLC
Holly Strickland	Barbara Koziara/Brenda Munoz	New Teacher	Monthly Instructional Meetings, PLC class visitations

| Loren Cipion | Speech dept. assigned mentor/Barbara Koziara | New to district | Monthly Meetings, PLC |

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

*Coordination and Integration-***Title I Schools Only**

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

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

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) /Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. Principal: Shares the vision for the use of the data-based decision-making and ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS/RtI. An RtI flow chart is shared with school personnel and targeted interventions are monitored and documented. The principal offers adequate professional development to support the MTSS/ RtI process and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS/RtI plans and activities. School Psychologist- participates in the collection, interpretations and analysis of data; facilitates development of the intervention plan. Provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation. Assists with professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning and program evaluation. Staffing Specialist: Staffing Specialist will initiate the MTSS/ RtI process with students experiencing academic and/or behavioral difficulties. She will provide quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention of individual students. She assists teachers with technical support regarding data management and display. The staffing specialist has designed the framework for MTSS/ RtI at Lake Como Elementary. The initial RtI meeting is scheduled by the Staffing Specialist/Guidance Counselor she will act as RtI Coordinator and will work with the General Educator to initiate the MTSS/RtI process with students experiencing academic and/or behavioral difficulties. The coordinator is responsible for supporting the students, teachers and parents. She has the responsibility of brokering resources and services from multiple agencies. The resources that are made available to the student and his/her family will support the child's academic growth and his/her social, emotional and behavioral needs. General Education teacher (primary and intermediate) shares information about core instruction, collects student data, delivers Tier I instruction/intervention, collaborates with other teachers and professionals at the building level, and implements Tier 2 interventions and facilitates the integration of Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Exceptional Education Teacher: participates in the data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction and collaborates with Gen. Ed. Teachers through such activities as co-teaching. Literacy Coach/Curriculum Resource Teacher: provide guidance on the K-12 plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention plans. Ensures that interventions effectively are paired to areas of deficits and that progress monitoring is being done effectively and timely.
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? Step by step information is provided above describing the process and the professionals responsible for implementation
Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? The RtI team is comprised of three members of the School Advisory Council (SAC). The team reviewed school wide data and the needs assessment. The SAC made recommendations of materials and support that would be included in the School Improvement Plan.

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

MTSS Implementation
Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior. Baseline data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), LAS and LAB, FLKRS, Formative Assessments such as "Imagine It" benchmark and lesson assessments, Envision assessments, Write Score (3-5), Edusoft Benchmark Assessments.
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. A school wide overview is shared during Preplanning- sharing common language and defining the **Multi Tiered Support Service/Response to Intervention/Response to Instruction.** The presentation will be spearheaded by Roxanne Simpson, school psychologist and will be divided in a primary and secondary session. Dissemination of the RtI chart demonstrating the MTSS/RtI process with a brief description of the process at Lake Como Prior to the FAIR testing window all teachers will meet as a PLC and the RtI team will facilitate an overview of the FAIR, its components and its instructional implications.
Describe the plan to support MTSS. On-going progress monitoring of the MTSS/RtI process will ensure that this process is culturally embedded. Staff development will be offered to monitor effectiveness of Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions and data collection and analysis.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).   The Lake Como Literacy Leadership Team centers its efforts on promoting school-wide literacy activities. The activities that are planned and initiated by the team enhance classroom initiatives and have the purpose of expanding reading and literacy activities in the home and the community at large. A strong partnership has been forged between our team and UCF's Junior Achievement program as well as other members of the community such as Orange County Public Library System. The members of the Literacy Leadership Team are: Principal (Carmen Carrasco-Thompson), Literacy Coach (Barbara Koziara), CRT (Linda Cordone-Cope), SLD Teacher (Susan Kemper), VE Teacher (Joelle Lim), Kindergarten Teacher (Rita Eddy), First Grade Teacher (Jean Edwards), Second Grade Teacher (Nikki Starks), Third Grade Teacher (Erica Araujo), Fourth Grade Teacher (Brenda Munoz) and Fifth Grade Teacher (Rehana Kazi).
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).   The school based Literacy Leadership Team meets at least once a month to discuss literacy activities that will address areas of deficits in reading. Brainstorming sessions are held to determine what strategies best address the areas of weakness as this council will/does function as a PLC. Parent Initiatives are planned and executed throughout the year. Celebrate Literacy Week activities are planned with the whole school participating
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?   We will be expanding our Accelerated Reader program fostering school-wide implementation. There will also be a focus on using the new Success Maker Enterprise program. We are committed to continuing to celebrate Literacy Night activities and conducting parent workshops through our Literacy Council and our Parent Knowledge Academy.

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

- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**
  Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.

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

Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

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

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

High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1A: *By June 2013, 24% (28) (of the students assessed with FCAT 2.0 in reading will achieve Level 3.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *20 % (23) scored level 3.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *24% (28) will score at Level 3.*	1A.1Students new to LCE are deficient in the area of reading . Teacher fidelity using Accelerated Reader and Success Maker. Insufficient Lab space to accommodate more students during the school day.	1A.1. School-wide implementation of the AR Program. Provide training and use STAR reading assessment as a tool for progress monitoring for all students in grades K-5. Purchase Success Maker Enterprise to be used daily in grades 3-5 and provide training.	1A.1. Teacher, Literacy Coach Curriculum Resource Teacher Principal	1A.1.Monitor individual AR points earned by students. Monitor STAR reports Monitor SME student data sheet for program completion and academic growth	1A.1. Benchmark Assessment Imagine It Assessment FAIR Write Score Common Assessments STAR Assessments
	1A.2. Inability to understand complex text and use strategies that will enhance analytical skills. 1A.3.Lack of a robust set of strategies that are used during inquiry to deepen student understanding of complex text.		1A.2. Learn the shifts in English Language Arts in preparation of the Common Core State Standards. Provide on-going training on ELA Common Core Standards. Evaluate the levels of complexity of text used in grades 3-5. Enhance the library collection with rigorous text.	1A.2. Teacher, Literacy Coach Curriculum Resource Teacher Principal	1A.2. Monitor/analyze the media collection for complex text. Monitor progress with students receiving intervention in comprehension instruction. Monitor teachers by observation and exit slips after training for understanding/implementation of the shifts.	1A.2. Formative Assessments Mini Benchmarks Benchmark Assessment Imagine It Assessment FAIR	1A.2.

			1A.3.Provide teachers with staff development opportunities to enable them to differentiate instruction and provide experiences that will help students make sense of complex text and generalize skills with unfamiliar text.	1A.3.Literacy Coach
				   CRT
				   Principal
					1A.3. Monitor by observation students' use of strategies used during inquiry to understand complex text	1A.3. Formative Assessments Mini Benchmarks Benchmark Assessment Imagine It Assessment FAIR	1A.3.

1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.
 	
Reading Goal #1B:
 	
By June2012, 13%(2) will score at level 4,5 or 6
	2012 Current Level of Performance:*
	
	13% (2) of the students scored at level 4,5, or 6.
		2013 Expected Level of Performance:*
		
		13% (2) of the students will score at level 4,5 or 6.
			1B.1Students lack decoding skills and strategies to derive meaning from simple text.	1B.1. Teacher will teach skills that will enable students to improve: Decoding Fluency Comprehension	1B.1.Literacy Coach
					   CRT
					   Principal
					   Teacher
						1B.1.Monitor IEP goals periodically in the area of reading.
						Use fluency checks and comprehension checks, using decodable books.
							1B.1.Brigance IEP Fluency Checks Success Maker/K-2

		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.			2A.1. Lack of differentiation of instruction for students that are proficient. Students need additional strategies to understand and comprehend complex text.	2A.1. Provide time for teachers to use PLC as the vehicle to plan for student projects and instructional experiences that will move them to higher levels of achievement. Learn the shifts in English Language Arts in preparation of the Common Core State Standards. Provide on-going training on ELA Common Core Standards.	2A.1.Teacher CRT Literacy Coach Principal	2A.1.Monitor lesson plans and PLC notes for ideas used for proficient students. Monitor teachers by observation and exit slips after training for understanding/implementation of the shifts. Monitor by observation students' use of strategies used during inquiry to understand complex text	2A.1. Rubrics/Scales Formative Assessments Mini Benchmarks Benchmark Assessment Imagine It Assessment FAIR
Reading Goal #2A: **By June 2013, 29% (32) of the students will score at**	**2012 Current Level of Performance:*** *25% (28) of the students scored Level 4 on FCAT reading.*	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:*** *29% (32) of the students will score at Level 4.*					
	2A.2.Teachers need resources to challenge our highest achievers. 2A.3. Teacher fidelity using Accelerated Reader and Success Maker.		2A.2.Incorporate instructional experiences that incorporate the use of : -Technology -Research/Investigations -Project based learning	2A.2. Teacher CRT Literacy Coach Principal	2A.2. Monitor lesson plans and PLC notes for ideas used for proficient students.	2A.2. Rubrics/Scales Formative Assessments Mini Benchmarks Benchmark Assessment Imagine It Assessment FAIR	2A.2.
			2A.3. School-wide implementation of the AR Program. Provide training and use STAR reading assessment as a tool for progress monitoring for all students in grades K-5. Purchase Success Maker Enterprise to be used daily in grades 3-5 and provide training.	2A.3. Teacher CRT Literacy Coach Principal	2A.3. Monitor individual AR points earned by students. Monitor STAR reports Monitor SME student data sheet for program completion and academic growth	2A.3. Benchmark Assessment Imagine It Assessment FAIR Write Score Common Assessments STAR Assessments	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.			2B.1.A need to acquire low lexile high interest leveled text.	2B.1.Increase classroom libraries with chapter books of lower lexile levels.	2B.1.Media Clerk Teacher CRT	2B.1.Increased participation in AR Increase in classroom performance on common assessments and in-program assessments	AR reports STAR assessment IEP goals
Reading Goal #2B: **80% (12) of the students will score at level 7 or**	**2012 Current Level of Performance:*** *87% (14)) of the students scored at level 7 or above on FAA.*	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:*** *90% of the students will score at Level 7 or above.*					
			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. Some of the students are two to three years behind in reading. Intervention not tailored to their specific needs.	3A.1. Daily interventions specifically tailored to address the areas of deficits. The ratio will be 6:1	3A.1.Interventionist Principal CRT Literacy Coach Teacher	3A.1. Interventionist will conduct informal assessments on a regular basis. Many of the programs used have embedded assessment. Data Dialogue Chats will incorporate monitoring effectiveness of intervention.	3A.1. FAIR Assessment Edusoft for 3-5 Fluency- Read Naturally
Reading Goal #3A: By June 2013, 70% of the students will make learning gains in the reading portion of the FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *67% of the students made learning gains*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *70% of the students will make learning gains*					
	3A.2.Lack of focus on text features, lack of ability to summarize and find the main idea. Lack of ability to "prove" the answer by finding the information needed in the text. 3A.3.Students are not understanding how to increase their learning gains/not understanding the benchmarks deeply enough or able to demonstrate them in ways that show their understanding.		3A.2.Use reading and writing strategies such as SMART 7. Use of Think aloud strategies while teacher modeling is occurring.	3A.2. Principal CRT Literacy Coach Teacher	3A.2.In program assessments Mini assessments Formative Assessments Data Dialogue Chats	3A.2. FAIR Assessment Edusoft for 3-5 Imagine It Assessments Formative Assessments Mini Assessments	3A.2.
			3A.3.Teachers will create learning scales that will assist students in evaluating their progress in understanding/demonstrating their understanding of a particular benchmark or skill. The learning scales will be a clear picture of what students need to be able to do, allowing the student to rate himself/herself on their progress.	3A.3 Principal CRT Literacy Coach Teacher	3A.3. In program assessments Mini assessments Formative Assessments Data Dialogue Chats	3A.3. FAIR Assessment Edusoft for 3-5 Imagine It Assessments Formative Assessments Mini Assessments	3A.3.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3B.1. There is a wide variety of reading ability among the students.	3B.1. Daily interventions will be provided for students using instructional material that is leveled appropriately and of high interest to students.	3B.1. Teacher CRT Literacy Coach	3B.1.IEP goals will be reviewed periodically to ensure learning gains in the area of reading.	3B.1.Formative and Summative Assessments
Reading Goal #3B: *By June 2013, 88% of the students will demonstrate learning gains on the reading portion of the FAA.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *85% (11) Students demonstrated learning gains in reading.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *88% of the students will demonstrate learning gains.*					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4: *64% of the students in the lowest quartile will make learning gains by June 2013.*			4A.1. Many of the students new to our school are at least two years behind in reading level. Daily systematic interventions not specific enough to student's needs. Interventions not occurring often enough or with enough intensity to make gains.	4A.1. Provide explicit, systematic daily interventions during the school day for 40 minutes each day (3-5) and 30 minutes (K-2). Interventions specialized to meet deficits. Students will be exposed to small group and computer assisted programs on a daily basis.	4A.1.Interventionist Principal CRT Literacy Coach Teacher	4A.1. Interventionist will conduct informal assessments on a regular basis. Many of the programs used have embedded assessment. We will use Read Naturally for fluency checks. Data Dialogue Chats will incorporate monitoring effectiveness of intervention.	4A.1. FAIR Assessment Edusoft for 3-5
	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *61% of students in the lowest quartile made learning gains*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *64% of the students in the lowest quartile will make learning gains.*					
			4A.2. Lack of time spent reading and practicing strategies one on one. 4A.3.Lack of focus on text features, lack of ability to summarize and find the main idea. Lack of ability to "prove" the answer by finding the information needed in the text.	4A.2. Increase reading time with the use of reading buddies, mentors and tutors. Add in the Read to Succeed program as well as the other mentor programs currently in place.	4A.2. Guidance Counselor Teacher CRT Literacy Coach Principal Tutors/Mentors	4A.2. In program assessments Mini assessments Data Dialogue Chats will incorporate monitoring effectiveness of intervention/mentoring and tutoring.	4A.2. FAIR Assessment Edusoft for 3-5 Fluency- Read Naturally Imagine It Assessments Formative Assessments Mini Assessments	4A.2.
				4A.3.Use reading and writing strategies such as SMART 7. Use of Think aloud strategies while teacher modeling is occurring.	4A.3.Principal CRT Literacy Coach Teacher	4A.3.In program assessments Mini assessments Formative Assessments Data Dialogue Chats	4A.3.FAIR Assessment Edusoft for 3-5 Imagine It Assessments Formative Assessments Mini Assessments	4A.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** There is currently a gap between our hispanic students, white students, students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged students.	52%	57%	61%	65%	70%	74%
Reading Goal #5A: For 2012-2013, the number of students making satisfactory progress will increase by 5.							

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**			5B.1.
			White:
			Black:
			Hispanic:
			Asian:
			American Indian:
				5B.1.
				Provide intensive small group instruction specific to student deficits in the areas of:
				  a. Decoding
				  b. Fluency
				  c. Vocabulary
				  d. Comprehension
				Promote the AR program to ensure reading time is increased throughout the entire day including after school.
					5B.1. Teacher Interventionist CRT Literacy Coach	5B.1. Data Dialogue PLC Formative Assessments	5B.1. FAIR Assessment Formative Assessments Benchmark Assessment Program Embedded Assessments	

Reading Goal #5B: By June 2013 all subgroups will increase the percentage of students scoring at the proficient level by 3%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* White: 60% Black: 42% Hispanic:64% Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White:63% Black:45% Hispanic:67% Asian: American Indian:						
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.		5C.1. Students academic vocabulary is limited.	5C.1.Use Marzano's six step process for academic vocabulary acquisition.	5C.1.Teacher ESOL Paraprofessional Literacy Coach CRT Principal	5C.1.Student Writing Journals Work Samples	5C.1.FAIR CELLA Formative Assessment
Reading Goal #5C: *By June 2013 57% of the ELL students will be proficient in reading.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *48% of the ELL students are proficient.* / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *51% of the students will be proficient.*					
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.		5D.1. Students struggle with decoding and comprehension.	5D.1.ESE teachers and Gen. Ed. Teachers will work collaboratively to generalize the strategies used in small groups and ESE resource room in the gen. ed. Class.	5D.1ESE Teachers Gen. Ed Teachers Literacy Coach CRT	5D.1.Student work sampled and shared among Gen Ed. & ESE teachers	5D.1 Formative Assessment
Reading Goal #5D: *By June 2013, 47% of the students with disabilities will be proficient in the reading portion of the FCAT.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *44% of the ESE population is proficient in reading.* / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *47% of the students will be proficient in reading.*					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5E.1. Students do not have appropriate leveled text as resources at home.	5E.1.Ensure that students have opportunities to take books home.	5E.1.Teacher Media Clerk CRT Literacy Coach Principal	5E.1. Monitor check out rosters Monitor reading goals	5E.1. Summative Assessments
Reading Goal #5E: 46% of the disadvantaged students will be proficient in reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *46% of disadvantaged students are proficient in reading.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *49% of the disadvantaged students will be proficient in reading.*					
	5E.2.Little or no access to computer assisted programs in the home.		5E.2. Provide daily opportunities for students to access computerized programs in the class and throughout the school day.	5E.2.Teacher Literacy Coach Principal CRT	5E.2.A/R Printouts SuccessMaker Reports	5E.2. Summative Assessments	5E.2.
	5E.3.		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Marzano-The Art and Science of Teaching	K-5	Carmen Carrasco-Thompson	School-Wide	On-Going	Continued discussion of book during PLC's and Team Leader Meetings	Principal
Imagine It-Common Core/Reading Shifts focus using Imagine It as our core	K-5	Becky Peacock	School-Wide	Two times per year Dates TBD Completed by February 2013	Literacy Coach /Principal visit during the reading block. Coaching process, debriefing and discussion of findings during PLC's and individually.	Principal
Marzano's Six Step Vocabulary Development	K-5	Carrasco-Thompson, Koziara	Introduction: Strickland, Dennisen Review: School-Wide	Two sessions, one for review in a staff meeting and one for introduction for our new staff members. Dates TBD. Completed by December 2012.	Observation/PLC discussion	Principal
Lesson Study Observations at another school	K-5	CRT Literacy Coach	A Lesson Study team comprised of leadership team members and classroom teachers.	TBD	Observers will discuss observations in a PLC	Principal
Common Core and Reading Shifts in Instruction	K-5	Literacy Coach Principal District Instructors Black Belt	School wide	Dates TBD	Black Belt members will share about Common Core/Reading Shifts during PLC meetings and Reading Leadership Team meetings.	Principal

					Black Belt members/Literacy Coach will attend follow up meetings provided by the district to aid with implementation. 3-5 will be provided with an overview.	
		Participants				

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

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
1B.1, 3A.1, 3B.1, 4A.1, 4B.1, 5B.1	Early Reading Tutor, STARS, EIR, Read Well, Phonics for Reading, Rewards, additional Imagine It resources and consumables	School Budget	10,900.00
			Subtotal:10,900.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
1A. 1, 2A.3	SuccessMaker Enterprise program	Title 1	21,000
			Subtotal:21,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
1A.2, 1A.3, 2A.1, 2A.2	SRA Consultant-Becky Peacock	Title II	700.00
1A.1, 1A.2, 2A,2, 2A.3	Subs	Title II	700.00
			Subtotal:1,400.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
3A.2, 4A.3	Florida Ready purchased for all students	General Budget	1,300.00
1A.1, 2A.3			
			Subtotal:1,800.00
			Total:35,100.00

End of Reading Goals

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

<u>Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals</u>

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

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. <u>CELLA Goal #1:</u> *By June 2013, 63% will be proficient in listening/speaking.*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: *60% (17) students are proficient in listening/speaking.*	1.1. Students primary language is not English.	1.1.Use effective ESOL strategies to make instruction comprehensible to students. a. Realia b.Total Physical Response c. Use of Pictorial presentations.	1.1.Teacher 1.2 Paraprofessional	1.1.Close exercises 1.2 Checklist of BICS/CALPS	1.1.Formative/summative Assessments
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. <u>CELLA Goal #2:</u> *By June 2013, 39% will be proficient in reading.*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: *36% (10)of the students are proficient in reading..*	2.1. Students primary language is not English.	2.1.Increase the use of ESOL strategies to promote reading at all levels. -Use real literature Theme Listening Use of student's cultural background and experience -Fluency passages Small group instruction	2.1.Classroom teacher Paraprofessional ESOL paraprofessional CCT CRT Principal	2.1.	2.1.Formative/Summative Assessments
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3: *By June 2013, 24% of the students will be proficient in writing.*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : *21% of the students are proficient in writing.*	2.1. Inaccurate spelling patterns Lack of English vocabulary	2.1.Increase the opportunity to write in all disciplines. Provide scaffold in writing: a. Patterned b. Cloze writing c. Dialogue journal d. Response writing	2.1.Classroom Teacher ESOL Paraprofessional CCT CRT	2.1.Writing Samples/WFTB monthly prompts	2.1.Formative/Summative Assessment
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1A: By June 2013, 32% (36) of the students will score at Level 3.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *29% (33) scored at Level 3.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *32% (36) will score at Level 3.*	1A.1. Lack of conceptual knowledge which will inhibit student progress	1A.1. Expand the math block in K-5 to incorporate 60-90 minutes per week of ST Math (Mind Research/JiJi) activities in the classroom and computer lab. Encourage use of JiJi at home where accessible. Train teachers and introduce SuccessMaker 5.0 to students in grades K-5 (30-60 minutes per week) to support classroom instruction.	1A.1. Classroom Teacher CRT Principal Support Staff Lab Monitor	1A.1. Tracking of progress in JiJi Ongoing use of SuccessMaker reports Data Dialog in PLC meetings Use of Common Assessments Mini Assessments	1A.1. Benchmark Tests Envision Math tests Teacher Created Tests
			1A.2. Student lack of fluency with basic math facts.	1A.2. ST Math (JiJi) and Success Maker will be used during class and lab times to provide remediation. Envision math games/flashcards/math centers will be used to reinforce fluency of operations.	1A.2. Classroom Teacher CRT Principal Support Staff Lab Monitor	1A.2. Weekly progress monitoring of fluency SuccessMaker reports	1A.2. Benchmark Tests Envision Math tests Teacher Created Tests
			1A.3. Lack of deeper understanding of mathematics and its application across disciplines.	1A.3. Reinforce math skills across curricula, including special area classes, through dialog with classroom teachers and access for all for progress monitoring through success maker and JiJi reports. Include math in lesson plans wherever possible across all disciplines.	1A.3. Classroom Teacher CRT Principal Support Staff Lab Monitor	1A.3. Dialog between classroom teachers and all other disciplines re: student progress. Training for teachers of all disciplines re: access to information from IMS, SM and ST math	1A.3. Benchmark Tests Envision Math tests Teacher Created Tests

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

1B. **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1. Students display difficulty in the areas of numeration, basic addition and subtraction skills.	1B.1. Provide daily instructional practices that will ensure mastery of: a. Number Sense b. Basic addition facts c. Basic subtraction facts	1B.1. ESE Teacher	1B.1. Timed Drills	1B.1. Formative/Summative Assessments
Mathematics Goal #1B: *By June 2013, 34% of the students will score at level 4,5 and 6 or higher.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	31% of the students scored at level 4,5 and 6	*34% of the students will score at level 4,5 6 or higher.*					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

28

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2A: *By June 2013, 25% will score at level 4 or 5.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *22% (25) scored at Level 4 or 5.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *25% (28) will score at level 4 or 5.*	2A.1. Students have mastered the skill being taught, or master it almost immediately, and they need a challenge beyond the directed instruction in the regular classroom setting.	2A.1. Success Maker and JiJi will challenge students beyond the skills assigned to their grade level. Differentiated instruction during the math block. Daily enrichment activities, EnVision math games, center activities created to challenge capable students.	2A.1. Classroom Teacher CRT Principal Support Staff Lab Monitor	2A.1. Tracking of Progress: teacher created, SM, JiJi	2A.1. Benchmark Tests EnVision Math Tests Teacher Created Tests
	2A.2. Expansion of knowledge beyond concrete to higher levels of thinking mathematically 2A.3. Allotment of time to expose students to an extension of the curriculum offered in the envision math program		2A.2. Mind Research Challenge Activities through JiJi Challenge activities through En Vision Hands on projects that require mathematical HOTS	2A.2. Classroom Teacher CRT Principal Support Staff Lab Monitor	2A.2. Validity of projects SM and JiJi results	2A.2. Benchmark Tests EnVision Math Tests Teacher Created Tests	2A.2.
			2A.3. Afford students independent time in the classroom to use JiJi and SM math as challenge activities.	2A.3. Classroom Teacher	2A.3. Progress monitoring One on one dialog with student	2A.3. Benchmark Tests EnVision Math Tests Teacher Created Tests	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2B: *By June 2013, 59% of the students will score at level 7 or above.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *56% of the students scored at level 7 or above.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *59% of the students will score at level 7 or above.*	2B.1. Students display difficulty retaining basic math facts.	2B.1. Provide daily instructional practice that will help with long term retention of math facts.	2B.1. ESE Teacher Paraprofessional	2B.1. In program assessment	2B.1. Summative Assessments Formative Assessments
			2B.2.	2B.2. Use computer assisted math games.	2B.2. ESE Teacher Paraprofessional	2B.2. In program assessment	2B.2. Formative/Summative Assessment
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3A.1. Students are in need of instruction differentiated to meet their needs and to remediate specific areas of weakness.	3A.1. Use BOY assessments to determine levels of proficiency and student placement. Provide small group instruction during the math block to address specific needs. Use of JiJi and SM math instruction at the students' instructional level.	3A.1. Classroom Teacher Principal Lab Monitor	3A.1. Envision Math Tests common Assessments PLC's Mini Assessments	3A.1. En Vision Math Tests Edusoft Benchmark Tests Teacher Created Tests
Mathematics Goal #3A: _Enter narrative for the goal in this box._	2012 Current Level of Performance:* _Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box._	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* _Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box._					
	3A.2. Students struggling to understand math concepts and terminology. 3A.3. Students need additional remediation/reinforcement/practice outside of school.		3A.2. Math Word Wall Marzano's building Academic Vocabulary steps in all grade levels and continue the use of the student notebook. JiJi/Success Maker Hands On Activities/Centers	3A.2. Classroom Teacher Principal Lab Monitor	3A.2. Student Vocabulary Notebook Performance Reports Mini Assessments	3A.2. En Vision Math Tests Edusoft Benchmark Tests Teacher Created Tests	3A.2.
			3A.3. Send home activities for parents/guardians to use to assist students with basic math skills	3A.3. Classroom Teacher	3A.3. Planner Progress Monitoring	3A.3. En Vision Math Tests Edusoft Benchmark Tests Teacher Created Tests	3A.3.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1. Students struggle with basic math facts and long term recall.	3B.1. Introduce students to more hands-on approach with the Equals Math program.	3B.1. ESE Teacher Paraprofessional	3B.1. Fluency Checks IEP goals checklist	3B.1. Formative Assessment
Mathematics Goal #3B: _By June 2013, 53% of the students will make learning gains in the FAA math portion._	2012 Current Level of Performance:* _50% of the students made learning gains._	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* _53% of the students will make learning gains._					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4: *By June 2013, 100% of the lowest 25% will make learning gains.*			4A.1. Students are struggling with basic pre-requisites and need review/reteaching of key concepts	4A.1. Assess and identify at-risk students. Provide small group instruction. Provide parents with passwords and ID codes so children can avail themselves of computer programs outside of school.	4A.1. Classroom Teacher CRT Principal Para Professionals	4A.1. EnVision Math Tests Use of common assessments PLC Meetings Mini Assessments from Edusoft	4A.1. En Vision Math Tests Edusoft Benchmark Tests Teacher Created Tests
	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *100% of the lowest 25% made learning gains.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *100% of the lowest 25% will make learning gains.*					
	4A.2. Students need additional instruction outside of the standard math block 4A.3. Students need additional assistance outside the school day		4A.2. Provide additional time by allowing students to access JiJi and SM math in addition to their scheduled math block. Students work one on one with a para.	4A.2. Classroom Teacher Para Professional	4A.2. Mini Assessments Progress Monitoring PLC's	4A.2. En Vision Math Tests Edusoft Benchmark Tests Teacher Created Tests	4A.2.
			4A.3. Teachers provide activities for students to use at home. Teacher will provide parents with passwords and codes necessary for students to use computer based programs outside of the school setting.	4A.3. Classroom Teacher Principal CRT Computer Tech	4A.3. Mini Assessments Progress Monitoring PLC's	4A.3. En Vision Math Tests Edusoft Benchmark Tests Teacher Created Tests	4A.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** There is a gap between white students and students with disabilities	52%	57%	61%	65%	70%	74%
Mathematics Goal #5A: For 2012-2013, the number of students making satisfactory progress will increase by 5%							

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**		5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: Students struggle with applying strategies to unfamiliar settings.	5B.1.Provide small group instruction and interventions in order to assist with dispelling student misconceptions about math.	5B.1.Teacher Paraprofessional	5B.1.Fluency probes	5B.1.Formative/summative assessments	
Mathematics Goal #5B: *By June 2013, all student subgroups will increase the number of students that are proficient by 3%.*	**2012 Current Level of Performance:***						
	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*						
	White: 53% Black: 53% Hispanic: 71% Asian: American Indian:	White: 56% Black: 56% Hispanic: 74% Asian: American Indian:					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1. Students lack academic vocabulary in the area of math.	5C.1.Use of Marzano's academic vocabulary acquisition.	5C.1.Teacher Paraprofessional	5C.1.Vocabulary Journals Work Samples	5C.1.Formative/Summative Assessments
Mathematics Goal #5C: *By June 2013, 65% of the ELL students will be proficient in math.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *62% of the ELL students are proficient in math.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *65% of the ELL students will be proficient in math.*					
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1. Students struggle with generalizing math skills.	5D.1.Small group instruction will be provided to ensure students understand math concepts.	5D.1.Gen Ed. Teacher ESE Teacher Paraprofessional	5D.1.Work Samples	5D.1.Fluency Checks Formative/Summative Assessments
Mathematics Goal #5D: *By June 2013, 57% of Students With Disabilities will be proficient.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *54% of the students are proficient in math.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *57% of the students will be proficient in math.*					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1. Students are deficient in the following areas: Number sense Math facts	5E.1.Use game formatted drills to help increase proficiency with number sense and basic math facts	5E.1.Gen Ed. Teacher Paraprofessional	5E.1.Math drills	5E.1.Formative/Summative Assessments
<u>Mathematics Goal #5E:</u> *By June 2013, 57% of economically disadvantaged students will be proficient.*	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> *54% of the students are proficient.*	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> *57% of the students will be proficient.*					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**						
Mathematics Goal #5A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*							

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**		5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	
Mathematics Goal #5B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:						
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

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

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

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

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

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

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**						
Algebra 1 Goal #3A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*							

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.**		3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	
Algebra 1 Goal #3B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

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

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

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

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Geometry End-of-Course Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Geometry EOC)*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Mind Research-JiJi	K-5	Carl Robison ST Math Rep	K-5 and ESE Teachers Computer Lab Monitors	8/16/12	PLC's	CRT Principal Team Leaders
SuccessMaker 5.0 Math	K-5	SM Rep	K-5 and ESE Teachers Computer Lab Monitors	9/5/12 Leadership/Team Leaders 9/26/12 K-5 and ESE Teachers	PLC's Progress Monitoring through Observation and Reports	CRT Principal Team Leaders Computer Tech

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
<u>Mathematics Budget</u> (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
1A.1, 1A.2, 2A.1, 2A.3, 3A.1, 3A.2, 4A.2	Headphones for use with SuccessMaker Program	Facilities Rental Fund	599.00
			Subtotal: 599.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: 599.00

End of Mathematics Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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 lack knowledge of basic vocabulary terms.	1A.1. Develop a robust knowledge of vocabulary terms. Continue the use of Academic Vocabulary Notebooks (Marzano) to strengthen vocabulary knowledge/concepts.	1A.1. Classroom Teacher CRT Principal	1A.1. Unit Tests	1A.1. Formative/Summative Assessments
Science Goal #1A: By June 2013, 30% of the students will score level 3.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *26% (10) scored level 3.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *30% (12) will score level 3.*					
			1A.2. Lack of knowledge of the scientific process.	1A.2. Teachers will work experiments and hands on activities into their science instruction allowing students to experience the scientific process.	1A.2. Classroom Teacher CRT Principal	1A.2. Unit Tests	1A.2. Formative/Summative Assessments
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1B.1. Students lack knowledge about science concepts.	1B.1. Provide students with activities that will help develop a knowledge base about basic science skills.	1B.1. ESE Teacher Paraprofessional CRT Principal	1B.1.	1B.1. Formative/Summative Assessments
Science Goal #1B: *By June 2013, 57% of the students will score at level 4, 5 and 6.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *54% of the students scored level 4, 5 and 6.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *57% of the students will score level 4, 5 and 6.*					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.			2A.1. Students have difficulty recalling and understanding science concepts.	2A.1. Have students elaborate in written form about science concepts.	2A.1. Classroom Teacher Paraprofessional CRT Principal	2A.1. Rubrics/Scales	2A.1. Formative/Summative Assessments
Science Goal #2A: By June 2013, 15% of the students will score at level 4 and 5.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *11% (4) scored at level 4 and 5.*	2013Expected Level of Performance:* *15% (6) will score at level 4 and 5.*					
			2A.2 Lack of prior science vocabulary knowledge.	2A.2 Continue the use of Academic Vocabulary Notebooks (Marzano) to strengthen vocabulary knowledge/concepts.	2A.2 Classroom Teacher CRT Principal	2A.2 Unit Tests Write Score Science Assessment for 5th	2A.2 Benchmark Testing Unit Tests
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2B.1.Students have difficulty recalling and understanding science concepts.	2B.1.Have students explain science concepts.	2B.1.Classroom Teacher	2B.1. Rubrics/Scales	2B.1. Formative/Summative Assessments
Science Goal #2B: *By June 2013, 48% of the students will score at level 7 or above.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *45% scored at level 7 or above.*	2013Expected Level of Performance:* *48% will score at level 7 or above.*					
			2B.2. Students need to experience science concepts first hand.	2B.2. Have students complete a hands on experiment with assistance.	2B.2. Classrom Teacher Paraprofessional	2B.2. Rubrics/Scales	2B.2.Formative/Summative Assessments
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

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

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

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Marzano's Six Step Vocabulary Development	K-5	Carrasco-Thompson, Koziara	Introduction: Strickland, Dennisen Review: School-Wide	Two sessions, one for review in a staff meeting and one for introduction for our new staff members. Dates TBD. Completed by December 2012.	Observation/PLC discussion	Principal
Science Fusion Online Training/Summer Trainings	K-5	Nicole Fromm District Instructors	Offered School wide	Dates TBD by participant	Observation/PLC discussion	Principal

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
<u>Writing Goals</u>

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

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. <u>Writing Goal #1A:</u> *Enter na80% of the 4th graders will score at level 3 or higher on the FCAT.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *76% of the 4th graders scored at level 3.0*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *80% of the 4th graders will score 3.0 or higher.*	1A.1. Students lack writing proficiency re: conventions and structure.	1A.1. Assess all students in grades K-5 using Write From the Beginning prompts and classroom assessments. Continue to instruct using WFTB. Ensure new teachers are trained in WFTB strategies.	1A.1. Classroom Teacher CRT Principal Leadership Team Support Staff	1A.1. Monthly Writing Prompts Write Score tests in grade 4 Data Dialog PLCs Vertical Articulation	1A.1. FCAT Writing Test Monthly prompts
			1A.2. Students taking advantage of the individual feedback afforded them following the monthly cold writing prompt	1A.2. Allow release time for 4th grade teachers to confer with individual students at least 2x during the year. Encourage teachers to do this on a regular basis when providing feedback to students.	1A.2. Classroom Teacher Principal CRT	1A.1. WFTB Monthly Prompts Write Score Tests Data Dialog PLCs	1A.1. FCAT Writing Test Monthly prompts
			1A.3. Teachers following the WFTB Program with fidelity need planning time to meet vertically to discuss expectations.	1A.3. Allow teachers to meet on early Wednesdays to discuss strategies and share best practices	1A.3. Classroom Teacher Principal CRT	1A.3 Team Feedback sheet	Observation Monthly writing prompts FCAT Writing Test
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. <u>Writing Goal #1B:</u>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 100% of the students scored at level 4 or higher.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	1B.1. Students lack writing strategies/instruction in correct writing form/lack ability to look at their progress using a rubric.	1B.1. Assess all students in grades K-5 using Write From the Beginning rubrics and classroom assessments. Continue to instruct using WFTB. Make sure new teachers are trained in Thinking Maps and WFTB.	1B.1. Classroom Teacher CRT Principal Leadership team	1B.1. Monthly prompts using the WFTB rubrics, examined by classroom teachers and members of the leadership team. PLC's	1B.1. Florida Alternative Assessment Monthly prompts
			1B.2. Students lack specific/individual feedback to improve writing	1B.2. Leadership Team to give feedback as needed for writing as well as the classroom teacher on a regular basis.	1B.2. Classroom Teacher CRT Principal Leadership team	1B.2. Monthly prompts using the WFTB rubrics, examined by classroom teachers and members of the leadership team. PLC's	1B.2. Florida Alternative Assessment Monthly prompts

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

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
WFTB for new teachers	4th and VE	CRT Munoz	Strickland, Dennisen, Lim, McCormick	10/31/12	Examine Monthly Scoring PLC Meetings Written Feedback	Principal CRT

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
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
1A.1, 1B.1 1A.2	Training in WFTB and Thinking Maps as well as teachers conferring with students (sub cost)	General Budget	910.00
			Subtotal: 910.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
1A.1	Write Score Tests	General Budget	1795.00

	Subtotal:
	Total: 2705.00

End of Writing Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(required in year 2014-2015)*

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

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

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Civics Professional Development

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

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

End of Civics Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
U.S. History End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(required in year 2013-2014)*

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

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

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
U.S. History Professional Development

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

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

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

End of U.S. History Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1: By June 2013, the average daily attendance will be 98%. .	2012 Current Attendance Rate:* *97% (184)daily attendance.* 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) *98 students with 10 or more absences.* 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) *46 students with 10 or more tardies.*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* *98% average daily attendance.* 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) *88 students with 10 or more absences.* 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) *36 students with 10 or more tardies.*	1.1. Students that live further than the two mile radius miss their designated pick up times which impacts their school day.	1.1. Keep parents abreast of routing and scheduling changes. Continue to send Connect Orange messages to inform parents of student absences and tardies. RtI meetings for students that are habitually tardy or absent.	1.1. Principal Teacher Guidance Counselor Social Worker	1.1. Monthly data meetings Teacher reports	1.1. SMS Reports EDW Report
			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
Attendance Professional Development

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

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Attendance Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1: By June 2013 the suspension rate will be reduced from 12% to 10%	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions	1.1. Students making poor choices and not adhering to the school wide guidelines for success.	1.1. Teachers teaching and monitoring appropriate behaviors. Using lessons from the BLT handbook.	1.1. Teachers Principal School Leadership Team	1.1. Monitor number of suspensions monthly.	1.1. EDW Reports In house report
	21	*16*					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					
	23	*18*					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	46	*41*					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Suspension Professional Development

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

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

End of Suspension Goals

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: The drop out rate will be reduced to 18%.	2012 Current Dropout Rate:* *20%* 2012 Current Graduation Rate:* *80%*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:* *18%* 2013 Expected Graduation Rate:* *82%*	1.1. Daily systematic interventions not specific enough to student's needs. Interventions not occurring often enough or with enough intensity to make gains.	1.1. Offer extended learning opportunities within the school day, such as daily intervention in the areas of need.	1.1 Interventionist Principal CRT Literacy Coach Teacher	1.1Interventionist will conduct informal assessments on a regular basis. Many of the programs used have embedded assessment. Data Dialogue Chats will incorporate monitoring effectiveness of intervention.	1.1FAIR Assessment Edusoft for 3-5 Fluency- Read Naturally Imagine It Assessments Formative Assessments Mini Assessments
			1.2. Students have difficulty completing homework, studying for tests and show a lack of self-esteem.	1.2. Small group guidance for at-risk students that address: -study habits -homework -enhancing self-esteem	1.2. Principal Teachers Guidance Counselor	1.2. Teacher will have a record of homework completed and student grades on tests will reflect progress. Student reflections of how well they think they are performing and general well-being will be discussed with our Guidance Counselor in small group interaction.	1.2. 1FAIR Assessment Edusoft for 3-5 Fluency- Read Naturally Imagine It Assessments Formative Assessments Mini Assessments Attendance records
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: By June 2013 there will be a 5% increase in parental participation.	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:* *48% parent involvement*	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:* *53% parental involvement.*	1.1. More parental participation is needed to ensure student success	1.1. Providing a number of high interest activities that correlate with reading, math and writing.	1.1. Principal CRT Literacy Coach PKA	1.1. Analyze % of students/parents who attended each event. Utilize surveys for parents who attended.	1.1. Met goal of parent participation for each event. FAIR assessment Benchmark Assessments Imagine It and Envision Assessments Monthly Writing Prompts
			1.2. The distance of Lake Como from the communities it serves is a factor that can hinder parent participation.	1.2. Providing school buses to enable parents/students to come to the school for school events when possible.	1.2. Principal CRT Literacy Coach PKA	1.2. Analyze % of students/parents who attended each event. Utilize surveys for parents who attended. Analyze who utilized the transportation we provided for them.	1.2. Met goal of parent participation for each event. FAIR assessment Benchmark Assessments Imagine It and Envision Assessments Monthly Writing Prompts
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Parent Involvement Budget

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
		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
1.1,1.2	Literacy Nights, Curriculum Nights	Target Grant	1,500.00
		General Budget	1,500.00
		Subtotal:	
		Total: 3000.00	

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
<u>Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Goal(s)</u>

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
<u>STEM Goal #1:</u> *By June 2013 all students in grades K-5 will participate with STEM through problem based learning in a variety of contents.*	1.1. Lack of general knowledge about STEM.	1.1. Provide opportunities for teachers to develop a working knowledge of STEM.	1.1. School Math & Science Liaison Principal	1.1. School-wide STEM project menu	1.1. Exhibition of projects and project menu
	1.2.Finding time to incorporate STEM activities within the school day.	1.2.Use PLC as a vehicle for teachers to enhance knowledge about STEM and develop a calendar of activities.	1.2.Math & Science Liaison Principal	1.2.Staff Survey	1.2. Staff Survey
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity					
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.					
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
District PDS	K-5		School-wide	On-going		Principal

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

CTE Professional Development

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

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

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Additional Goal Additional Goal #1: Decrease disproportionate classification in special education Additional Goal #1: Decrease disproportionate classification in special education	2012 Current Level :* 2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :* 2013 Expected Level :*	1.1.Many students come with a deficit in the academic areas of two or three years below grade level.	1.1.Provide tiered intervention in areas of weakness on a daily basis for at-risk students.	1.1MTSS/RtI team Teacher	1.1.Data collection and analysis	1.1. Benchmark assessments Imagine It assessments Teacher Created Tests FAIR Write Score Tests
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Additional Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
RtI Overview	K-5	Roxanne Simpson	K-5	August 2012		RtI Team
FAIR Overview	K-5	" "	K-5	" "		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Additional Goal(s) Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget 35,100.00	
	Total:
CELLA Budget	
	Total:
Mathematics Budget	
	Total:
Science Budget	
	Total:
Writing Budget $2,705.00	
	Total:
Civics Budget	
	Total:
U.S. History Budget	
	Total:
Attendance Budget	
	Total:
Suspension Budget	
	Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget	
	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget $3,000.00	
	Total:
STEM Budget	
	Total:
CTE Budget	
	Total:
Additional Goals	
	Total:
Grand Total: **$43,805.00**	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
<u>Differentiated Accountability</u>

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
☐Priority	☒Focus	☐Prevent

Are you reward school? ☐Yes   ☒No
(A reward school is any school that has improved their letter grade from the previous year or any A graded school.)

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

☒ Yes   ☐ No

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

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
Monthly meetings will be held. Data will be shared during meetings specifically to look at trends in all academic areas, discipline and overall school safety. Goals will be monitored and adjusted accordingly.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount