FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Yankeetown School	District Name: Levy
Principal: Suzette Pelton	Superintendent: Robert Hastings
SAC Chair: Rhonda Calderone	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

Administrators

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Suzette Pelton	B.S., Mathematics Education M.Ed, Educational Leadership	0	4	In the past 10 years I have served as an Assistant Principal and the last two years I served as STEM Coordinator for the School Board of Levy County.
Assistant Principal	N/A				

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

Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Melba Lovely	Reading Endorsed Early Childhood Education BAE Elementary Education 1-6	30	8	2011-2012 Reading Coach School Grade B AYP unknown High Standards: Reading 52% Math 44% Science 69% Writing 79% Learning Gains: Reading 68% Math 61% Lowest Quartile: Reading 36% Math 32% 2010-2011 Reading Coach School Grade A AYP 87% High Standards: Reading 75% Math 58% Writing 94% Science 72% Learning Gains: Reading 60% Math 57% Lowest Quartile: Reading 60% Math 60% 2009-2010 Reading Coach School Grade A AYP 79% High Standards: Reading 78% Math 58% Writing 83% Science 79% Learning Gains: Reading 60% Math 65% Lowest Quartile: Reading 50% Math 63% 2008-2009 Reading Coach School Grade B AYP 87% High Standards: Reading 77% Math 57% Writing 92% Science 46% Learning Gains: Reading 64% Math 53% Lowest Quartile: Reading 62% Math 53% 2007-2008 Reading Coach School Grade A AYP 95% High Standards: Reading 74% Math 67% Writing 89% Science 57% Learning Gains: Reading 67% Math 69% Lowest Quartile: Reading 74% Math 69% 2006-2007 Reading Coach School Grade A AYP 97% High Standards: Reading 72% Math 70% Writing 89% Science 58% Learning Gains: Reading 71% Math 74% Lowest Quartile: Reading 74% Math 67% 2005-2006 Reading Coach School Grade B AYP 95% High Standards: Reading 67% Math 64% Writing 86% Learning Gains: Reading 60% Math 71% Lowest Quartile: Reading 53% 2004-2005 Reading Coach School Grade B AYP 97% High Standards: Reading 67% Math 63% Writing 79% Learning Gains: Reading 65% Math 64% Lowest Quartile: Reading 56%

RtI	Gayle Gatton	Elementary, K-6 and Media Specialist	9	8	2010-2011 RtI Coach School Grade A AYP 87% High Standards: Reading 75% Math 58% Writing 94% Science 72% Learning Gains: Reading 60% Math 57% Lowest Quartile: Reading 60% Math 60% 2009-2010 RtI Coach School Grade A AYP 79% High Standards: Reading 78% Math 58% Writing 83% Science 79% Learning Gains: Reading 60% Math 65% Lowest Quartile RtI Coach School Grade B AYP 87% High Standards: Reading 77% Math 57% Writing 92% Science 46% Learning Gains: Reading 64% Math 53% Lowest Quartile: Reading 62% Math 53% 2007-2008 RtI Coach School Grade A AYP 95% High Standards: Reading 74% Math 67% Writing 89% Science 57% Learning Gains: Reading 67% Math 69% Lowest Quartile: Reading 74% Math 69% 2006-2007 RtI Coach School Grade A AYP 97% High Standards: Reading 72% Math 70% Writing 89% Science 58% Learning Gains: Reading 71% Math 74% Lowest Quartile: Reading 74% Math 67% 2005-2006 RtI Coach School Grade B AYP 95% High Standards: Reading 67% Math 64% Writing 86% Learning Gains: Reading 60% Math 71% Lowest Quartile: RtI Coach School Grade B AYP 97% High Standards: Reading 67% Math 63% Writing 79% Learning Gains: Reading 65% Math 64% Lowest Quartile: Reading 56%

Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Select highly qualified applicants from our electronic pool of teachers. Search online for highly qualified teachers seeking employment.	Suzette Pelton	August 2012
2. Classroom visits and regular meetings with new teachers.	Suzette Pelton	May 2013
3. New teachers are assigned a clinically trained, veteran teacher mentor.	Suzette Pelton	September 2012

4. On-site professional development opportunities.	Suzette Pelton Melba Lovely	May 2013

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

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
Chester Pacana, Spanish	Mr. Pacana has taken his Spanish certification exam and is waiting for the results.

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
16	6.25% (1)	6.25% (1)	25% (4)	62.5% (10)	12.5% (2)	93.8% (15)	18.75% (3)	6.25% (1)	12.5% (2)

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
Melody Carson	Tracy Jenner	Grade level teacher who has shown effective instructional strategies and top performance on state testing.	Observations, conferencing, professional development, opportunities to observe colleagues
Melba Lovely	Gayle Gatton	Their teaching assignments are similar. They both have student and non-student contact time in their daily schedules.	Observations, conferencing, professional development, opportunities to observe colleagues

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 1 funds are used to benefit all students and subgroups. The Comprehensive Needs Assessment is used to determine our needs and develop a budget for the upcoming year. A portion of this money is used to address the professional development needs of the faculty.
Title I, Part C- Migrant Migrant services are administered through Alachua County.
Title I, Part D N/A
Title II District funds are used to purchase technology equipment that supports classroom instruction. This money is also used to provide professional development for teachers and administrators.
Title III Services are provided by the district to support English Language Learners in the classroom setting.
Title X- Homeless The district provides resources for students identifies as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) N/A
Violence Prevention Programs The school and district work together to educate parents and students on bullying. The emphasis is on creating an awareness of the no bullying policy and on improving the overall school climate.
Nutrition Programs The district provides a Wellness Plan that guides the development of the school Wellness Plan.
Housing Programs N/A
Head Start N/A
Adult Education N/A
Career and Technical Education Students in middle school are pulled for career education and high school planning prior to promotion from middle school.
Job Training N/A

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

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. Charles Dillon, Guidance Counselor Melba Lovely, Reading Coach Gayle Gatton, RtI Coordinator Candy Prescott, Middle School Teacher and PBS Coach Suzette Pelton, Principal
Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts? The Problem Solving Leadership Team meets as needed when Summary of Concerns forms are presented and every 6 weeks with the teachers to progress monitor students in the RtI process.
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 Leadership Team met with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and principal to help develop the SIP. The team provided data on: Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets; academic and social/emotional areas that needed to be addressed (focus of PBS); helped set clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, Relationship); facilitated the development of a systemic approach to teaching (Essential Questions, Teaching Strategies, Extending,, Refining, and Summarizing). The RtI Problem Solving process is used to evaluate the needs of our students to help us determine the areas in our school that are in need of improvement.
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), Levy Interim Assessments, and STAR. Progress Monitoring: Content area mini assessments, reviewing data on Performance Matters Midyear: Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Content Area Mini Assessments, Levy Interim Assessments End of Year: FAIR, FCAT, Levy Interim Assessments, Content Area Mini Assessments (End of Year Grades) Frequency of Data Review: Monthly Performance Matters is used to review FCAT and Levy Interim Assessment Data
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. Professional development will be provided on early release days. The RtI team will evaluate additional professional development needs during weekly Lead Team meetings. One on one training will be provided by the Reading Coach, the RtI teacher, and district office personnel as needed.
Describe the plan to support MTSS. The RtI team met to develop a school-wide schedule for analyzing assessment data, giving teachers time to plan for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, implementing the interventions, reassessing students, evaluating the impact of interventions, and modifying the interventions or moving students from one tier to another based on individual student needs. This cycle will continue throughout the school year.

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

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Natalie Steinberg, Middle School Language Arts Teacher Candy Prescott, Administrative Assistant, Middle School Intensive Reading Teacher Gayle Gatton, Media Specialist, RtI Coach Melody Carson, Curriculum Facilitator, First Grade Teacher Melba Lovely, Reading Coach Rhonda Calderone, ESE Specialist Chuck Dillon, Guidance Counselor Suzette Pelton, Principal
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The LLT meets weekly as the Leadership Team. Literacy issues are identified based on student needs and performance. School wide data is used to guide decisions about professional development.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? The LLT will focus on increasing student achievement. The LLT will discuss and analyze the effectiveness of the targeted initiatives; RtI, FCIM, professional development and implementation of highly effective cross curricular reading and writing strategies. The LLT will also continue to improve, implement, and monitor our PBS plan. By restructuring our Family Literacy Nights, the LLT will also focus on strengthening community and parental involvement and promoting and improving communication between school, parent, and community.

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.

Yankeetown school has a Voluntary Pre-K Program for the 2012-2013 school year. This program is designed to serve students that qualify based on the state prescribed criteria. The curriculum includes the literacy based Opening the World of Learning Program and the Waterford Early Learning Program. Speech and Language services are provided for students who qualify. Transition from Pre-K to Kindergarten will be accomplished by the Pre-K students attending Kindergarten classes at the end of the school year. Kindergarten will host an open house at the beginning of the year and the students will be scheduled for a staggered start for the 2013-2014 school year.

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?

According to the local and district School Improvement Plans and our Individual Professional Development plans, all teachers must demonstrate through explicit instruction the use of highly effective, cross curricular reading strategies. Yankeetown School has identified and implemented strategies to address student comprehension across all subject areas. These strategies include but are not limited to Dr. Max Thompson's highly effective methods and strategies, Team Read strategies, the use of complex text, and Reciprocal Teaching. These strategies are research-based and will help produce a cohesive approach for our instruction.

It will be the responsibility of the Principal to monitor the use of these strategies in the classroom. It will be the responsibility of the Reading Coach and Lead Team to model these strategies and provide professional development for teachers in need of working on these strategies.

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

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

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

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.			1A.1. Lack of teacher understanding of rigor and grade level expectations.	1A.1. Using the Lesson Study model, develop lessons with questions that incorporate all levels of text complexity. Teachers have 4 sub days (funded through Title 1) to analyze data and/or observe other classrooms.	1A.1. Administrator Reading Coach Lead Team	1A.1. Review of lesson study cycle, lesson plans, and assessments.	1A.1. 75% of our teachers will have completed at least one lesson study cycle focusing on rigor and grade level expectations.
Reading Goal #1A: *Increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency in reading by 10%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *52.4% [65]*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *62.4%*					
			1A.2. Time restraints to review individual student reading data.	1A.2. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need. Continue and implement PD on CCSS for all teachers. PD on cross curricular reading and writing for all teachers. Identifying resources aligned to CCSS. Use Study Island to accelerate students' mastery of skills.	1A.2. Principal Reading Coach Guidance Counselor Curriculum Coach Curriculum Facilitator	1A.2. Review meeting templates/notes. Collect list of students discussed at meetings.	1A.2. At least 95% of students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year. Evaluation of PD by teachers.
			1A.3. Inadequate time to review and revise Progress Monitoring Tool for level 1 and level 2 students.	1A.3. Identifying level 1, level 2, and low level 3 students and scheduling them into Fast ForWord, Read 180, or Advanced Reading. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need.	1A.3. Lead Team	1A.3. Review meeting templates/notes. Lead Team will monitor the Progress Monitoring process throughout the year.	1A.3. At least 95% of the level 1, level 2, and low level 3 students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.			1B.1. none	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Reading Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

Maintain 100% of students scoring level 4 or above on the Florida Alternate Assessment	*100% [1]*	*100%*					
			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 teacher understanding of rigor and grade level expectations.	2A.1. Using the Lesson Study model, develop lessons with questions that incorporate all levels of text complexity. Teachers have 4 sub days (funded through Title 1) to analyze data and/or observe other classrooms.	2A.1. Administrator Reading Coach Lead Team	2A.1. Review of lesson study cycle, lesson plans, and assessments.	2A.1. 75% of our teachers will have completed at least one lesson study cycle focusing on rigor and grade level expectations.
Reading Goal #2A: *Increase the percentage of students scoring at or above Level 4 by 10%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *26.6% [33]*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *36.6%*					
			2A.2. Limited differentiation for our level 4 and level 5 students	2A.2. Utilize instructional time to offer a supplemental intervention for level 3, level 4, and level 5 students focused on the reading benchmarks using FCAT Explorer and Study Island.	2A.2. Lead Team	2A.2. Review the number of students participating in the program. FCAT Explorer and Study Island data will be reviewed.	2A.2. At least 75% of the level 4 and level 5 students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year.
			2A.3. Limited supplemental instructional resources for our level 4 and level 5 students.	2A.3. Increase the number of books containing complex text in the media center.	2A.3. Reading Coach Media Specialist	2A.3. Increase circulation of our books with complex text.	2A.3. Increase in the number of books with complex text checked out by students.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.			2B.1. none	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Reading Goal #2B: *Maintain 100% of students scoring level 7 or above on the Florida Alternate Assessment*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *100% [1]*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *100%*					
			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. Lack of teacher understanding of rigor and grade level expectations.	3A.1. Using the Lesson Study model, develop lessons with questions that incorporate all levels of text complexity. Teachers have 4 sub days (funded through Title 1) to analyze data and/or observe other classrooms.	3A.1. Administrator Reading Coach Lead Team	3A.1. Review of lesson study cycle, lesson plans, and assessments.	3A.1. 75% of our teachers will have completed at least one lesson study cycle focusing on rigor and grade level expectations.
Reading Goal #3A: *Increase the percentage of students making learning gains in reading by 5%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 67.8% [59]	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 72.8%					
			3A.2. Time restraints to review individual student reading data.	3A.2. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need. Continue and implement PD on CCSS for all teachers. PD on cross curricular reading and writing for all teachers. Identifying resources aligned to CCSS. Use Study Island to accelerate students' mastery of skills.	3A.2. Principal Reading Coach Guidance Counselor Curriculum Coach Curriculum Facilitator	3A.2. Review meeting templates/notes. Collect list of students discussed at meetings.	3A.2. At least 95% of students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year. Evaluation of PD by teachers.
			3A.3. Inadequate time to review and revise Progress Monitoring Tool for level 1 and level 2 students.	3A.3. Identifying level 1, level 2, and low level 3 students and scheduling them into Fast ForWord, Read 180, or Advanced Reading. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need.	3A.3. Lead Team	3A.3. Review meeting templates/notes. Lead Team will monitor the Progress Monitoring process throughout the year.	3A.3. At least 95% of the level 1, level 2, and low level 3 students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3B.1. none	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Reading Goal #3B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.

		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4A.1. Time restraints to review individual student reading data.	4A.1. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need. Continue and implement PD on CCSS for all teachers. PD on cross curricular reading and writing for all teachers. Identifying resources aligned to CCSS. Use Study Island to accelerate students' mastery of skills.	4A.1. Principal Reading Coach Guidance Counselor Curriculum Coach Curriculum Facilitator	4A.1. Review meeting templates/notes. Collect list of students discussed at meetings.	4A.1. At least 95% of students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year. Evaluation of PD by teachers.
Reading Goal #4A: *Increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading by 5%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *36.4% [8]*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *41.4%*					
			4A.2. Inadequate time to review and revise Progress Monitoring Tool for level 1 and level 2 students.	4A.2. Identifying level 1, level 2, and low level 3 students and scheduling them into Fast ForWord, Read 180, or Advanced Reading. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need.	4A.2. Lead Team	4A.2. Review meeting templates/notes. Lead Team will monitor the Progress Monitoring process throughout the year.	4A.2. At least 95% of the level 1, level 2, and low level 3 students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year.
			4A.3. Poor attendance	4A.3. Communicate tardy and attendance policies with families and encourage increased attendance, which will have a positive effect on both academics and behavior.	4A.3. Administrator Classroom Teacher	4A.3. Teacher and Guidance Counselor will track students' attendance record.	4A.3. School wide attendance records
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.
Reading Goal #4B:	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.*					
			4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.
			4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.

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

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**	**Current: 59%**	**Target: 63%**	**Target: 66%**	**Target: 70%**	**Target: 74%**	**Target: 79%**

Reading Goal #5A:

White students making A MO in reading will increase to 63%.

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.** Reading Goal #5B: *White students making A MO in reading will increase to 63%.*	**2012 Current Level of Performance:*** *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* White: 59% Black: N/A Hispanic: N/A Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A / **2013 Expected Level of Performance:*** *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: 63% Black: N/A Hispanic: N/A Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A	5B.1. White: Lack of teacher understanding of rigor and grade level expectations. Black: N/A Hispanic: N/A Asian: N/a American Indian: N/A	5B.1. Using the Lesson Study model, develop lessons with questions that incorporate all levels of text complexity. Teachers have 4 sub days (funded through Title 1) to analyze data and/or observe other classrooms.	5B.1 Administrator Reading Coach Lead Team.	5B.1. Review of lesson study cycle, lesson plans, and assessments.	5B.1. 75% of our teachers will have completed at least one lesson study cycle focusing on rigor and grade level expectations.	
		5B.2. Time restraints to review individual student reading data.	5B.2. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need. Continue and implement PD on CCSS for all teachers. PD on cross curricular reading and writing for all teachers. Identifying resources aligned to CCSS. Use Study Island to accelerate students' mastery of skills.	5B.2. Principal Reading Coach Guidance Counselor Curriculum Coach Curriculum Facilitator	5B.2. Review meeting templates/notes. Collect list of students discussed at meetings	5B.2. At least 95% of students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year. Evaluation of PD by teachers.	

		5B.3. Inadequate time to review and revise Progress Monitoring Tool for level 1 and level 2 students.	5B.3. Identifying level 1, level 2, and low level 3 students and scheduling them into Fast ForWord, Read 180, or Advanced Reading. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need.	5B.3. Lead Team	5B.3. Review meeting templates/notes. Lead Team will monitor the Progress Monitoring process throughout the year.	5B.3. At least 95% of the level 1, level 2, and low level 3 students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year.

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. Lack of teacher understanding of rigor and grade level expectations.	5C.1. Using the Lesson Study model, develop lessons with questions that incorporate all levels of text complexity. Teachers have 4 sub days (funded through Title 1) to analyze data and/or observe other classrooms.	5C.1. Administrator Reading Coach Lead Team	5C.1. Review of lesson study cycle, lesson plans, and assessments.	5C.1. 75% of our teachers will have completed at least one lesson study cycle focusing on rigor and grade level expectations.
Reading Goal #5C: *Maintain 100% of ELL students making learning gains in reading.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *100% [1]*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *100%*					
			5C.2. Time restraints to review individual student reading data.	5C.2. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need. Continue and implement PD on CCSS for all teachers. PD on cross curricular reading and writing for all teachers. Identifying resources aligned to CCSS. Use Study Island to accelerate students' mastery of skills.	5C.2. Principal Reading Coach Guidance Counselor Curriculum Coach Curriculum Facilitator	5C.2. Review meeting templates/notes. Collect list of students discussed at meetings.	5C.2. At least 95% of students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year. Evaluation of PD by teachers.
			5C.3. Inadequate time to review and revise Progress Monitoring Tool for level 1 and level 2 students.	5C.3. Identifying level 1, level 2, and low level 3 students and scheduling them into Fast ForWord, Read 180, or Advanced Reading. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need.	5C.3. Lead Team	5C.3. Review meeting templates/notes. Lead Team will monitor the Progress Monitoring process throughout the year.	5C.3. At least 95% of the level 1, level 2, and low level 3 students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year.
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. Lack of teacher understanding of rigor and grade level expectations.	5D.1. Using the Lesson Study model, develop lessons with questions that incorporate all levels of text complexity. Teachers have 4 sub days (funded through Title 1) to analyze data and/or observe other classrooms.	5D.1. Administrator Reading Coach Lead Team	5D.1. Review of lesson study cycle, lesson plans, and assessments.	5D.1. 75% of our teachers will have completed at least one lesson study cycle focusing on rigor and grade level expectations.
Reading Goal #5D: *Increase the percent of SWD making learning gains in reading by 10%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *41.7% [5]*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *51.7%*					

		5D.2. Time restraints to review individual student reading data.	5D.2. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need. Continue and implement PD on CCSS for all teachers. PD on cross curricular reading and writing for all teachers. Identifying resources aligned to CCSS. Use Study Island to accelerate students' mastery of skills.	5D.2. Principal Reading Coach Guidance Counselor Curriculum Coach Curriculum Facilitator	5D.2. Review meeting templates/notes. Collect list of students discussed at meetings.	5D.2. At least 95% of students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year. Evaluation of PD by teachers.
		5D.3. Inadequate time to review and revise Progress Monitoring Tool for level 1 and level 2 students.	5D.3. Identifying level 1, level 2, and low level 3 students and scheduling them into Fast ForWord, Read 180, or Advanced Reading. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need.	5D.3. Lead Team	5D.3. Review meeting templates/notes. Lead Team will monitor the Progress Monitoring process throughout the year.	5D.3. At least 95% of the level 1, level 2, and low level 3 students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year.

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. Lack of teacher understanding of rigor and grade level expectations.	5E.1. Using the Lesson Study model, develop lessons with questions that incorporate all levels of text complexity. Teachers have 4 sub days (funded through Title 1) to analyze data and/or observe other classrooms.	5E.1. Administrator Reading Coach Lead Team	5E.1. Review of lesson study cycle, lesson plans, and assessments.	5E.1. 75% of our teachers will have completed at least one lesson study cycle focusing on rigor and grade level expectations.

Reading Goal #5E:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*
Increase the percent of ED students making learning gains in reading by 5%.	*65.7% [44]*	*70.7%*

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	5E.2. Time restraints to review individual student reading data.	5E.2. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need. Continue and implement PD on CCSS for all teachers. PD on cross curricular reading and writing for all teachers. Identifying resources aligned to CCSS. Use Study Island to accelerate students' mastery of skills.	5E.2. Principal Reading Coach Guidance Counselor Curriculum Coach Curriculum Facilitator	5E.2. Review meeting templates/notes. Collect list of students discussed at meetings.	5E.2. At least 95% of students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year. Evaluation of PD by teachers.
	5E.3. Poor attendance	5E.3. Communicate tardy and attendance policies with families and encourage increased attendance, which will have a positive effect on both academics and behavior.	5E.3. Administrator Classroom Teacher	5E.3. Teacher and Guidance Counselor will track students' attendance record.	5E.3. School wide attendance records

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

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
CCSS Training	K-8/Reading	Natalie Steinberg Denise Dillon Candy Prescott Melba Lovely Suzette Peton	School-Wide	Ongoing	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk Throughs	Suzette Pelton
Lesson Study	K-8/Reading	Melba Lovely Suzette Pelton	School-Wide	Early Release Days	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk Throughs	Suzette Pelton
Cross Curricular Reading and Writing	K-8 All Content Areas	Natalie Steinberg Denise Dillon Candy Prescott Melba Lovely Suzette Peton	School-Wide	December 2012	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk Throughs	Suzette Pelton
Use of Complex Text	K-8	Natalie Steinberg Denise Dillon Candy Prescott Melba Lovely Suzette Peton	School-Wide	Ongoing	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk Throughs	Suzette Pelton

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
Core Instruction	Read 180	Title 1	$1,750.00
Core Instruction	Reading Workbooks/McPlaid	Textbook Allocation	$1,000.00
Core Instruction	Reading Books, 2nd Grade	Internal Funds	$ 225.75
			Subtotal: $2,975.75
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Progress Monitoring	Math Facts in a Flash/STAR Reading	Title 1	$ 309.00
Comprehension Strategies	Accelerated Reader	Title 1	$1,604.00
			Subtotal: $1,913.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Cross Curricular Reading and Writing Strategies	Consultant	Title 1	$1,300.00
			Subtotal: $1,300.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: $6,188.75

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.		1.1. None. We do not have any ELL students enrolled at this time.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
<u>CELLA Goal #1:</u> *Increase the number of students scoring proficient in listening/speaking by 50%*	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</u> *0% [1]*					
		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.		2.1. None. We do not have any ELL students enrolled at this time.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
<u>CELLA Goal #2:</u> *Increase the number of students scoring proficient in reading by 50%.*	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:</u> *0% [1]*					
		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: *Increase the number of students scoring proficient in writing by 50%.*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : 0% [1]	2.1. None. We do not have any ELL students enrolled at this time.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
		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.			1A.1. Lack of teacher understanding of rigor and grade level expectations.	1A.1. Using the Lesson Study model, develop lessons with questions that incorporate all levels of complexity. Teachers have 4 sub days (funded through Title 1) to analyze data and/or observe other classrooms.	1A.1. Administrator Lead Team	1A.1. Review of lesson study cycle, lesson plans, and assessments.	1A.1. 75% of our teachers will have completed at least one lesson study cycle focusing on rigor and grade level expectations.
Mathematics Goal #1A: *Increase the percentage of students scoring proficient in mathematics by 10%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *43.1% [25]*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *53.1%*					
			1A.2. Time restraints to review individual student reading data.	1A.2. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need. Continue and implement PD on CCSS for all teachers. PD on cross curricular reading and writing for all teachers. Identifying resources aligned to CCSS. Use Study Island to accelerate students' mastery of skills.	1A.2. Lead Team	1A.2. Review meeting templates/notes. Collect list of students discussed at meetings.	1A.2. At least 95% of students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year. Evaluation of PD by teachers.
			1A.3. Inadequate time to review and revise Progress Monitoring Tool for level 1 and level 2 students.	1A.3. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need.	1A.3. Lead Team	1A.3. Review meeting templates/notes. Lead Team will monitor the Progress Monitoring process throughout the year.	1A.3. At least 95% of the level 1, level 2, and low level 3 students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Mathematics Goal #1B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
			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. Lack of teacher understanding of rigor and grade level expectations.	2A.1. Using the Lesson Study model, develop lessons with questions that incorporate all levels of complexity. Teachers have 4 sub days (funded through Title 1) to analyze data and/or observe other classrooms.	2A.1. Administrator Lead Team	2A.1. Review of lesson study cycle, lesson plans, and assessments.	2A.1. 75% of our teachers will have completed at least one lesson study cycle focusing on rigor and grade level expectations.
Mathematics Goal #2A: *Increase the percentage of students scoring at or above Level 4 in mathematics by 10%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *19% [11]*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *29%*					
			2A.2. Limited differentiation for our level 4 and level 5 students	2A.2. Utilize instructional time to offer a supplemental intervention for level 3, level 4, and level 5 students focused on the mathematics benchmarks using FCAT Explorer and Study Island.	2A.2. Lead Team	2A.2. Review the number of students participating in the program. FCAT Explorer and Study Island data will be reviewed.	2A.2. At least 75% of the level 4 and level 5 students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year.
			2A.3. Limited supplemental instructional resources for our level 4 and level 5 students.	2A.3. Utilize instructional time to offer a supplemental intervention for level 3, level 4, and level 5 students focused on the mathematics benchmarks using FCAT Explorer and Study Island.	2A.3. Lead Team	2A.3. Review the number of students participating in the program. FCAT Explorer and Study Island data will be reviewed.	2A.3. At least 75% of the level 4 and level 5 students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Mathematics Goal #2B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3A.1. Lack of teacher understanding of rigor and grade level expectations.	3A.1. Using the Lesson Study model, develop lessons with questions that incorporate all levels of complexity. Teachers have 4 sub days (funded through Title 1) to analyze data and/or observe other classrooms.	3A.1. Administrator Reading Coach Lead Team	3A.1. Review of lesson study cycle, lesson plans, and assessments.	3A.1. 75% of our teachers will have completed at least one lesson study cycle focusing on rigor and grade level expectations.
Mathematics Goal #3A: *Increase the percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics by 5%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *65.5% [19]*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *70.5%*					
			3A.2. Time restraints to review individual student reading data.	3A.2. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need. Continue and implement PD on CCSS for all teachers. PD on cross curricular reading and writing for all teachers. Identifying resources aligned to CCSS. Use Study Island to accelerate students' mastery of skills.	3A.2. Lead Team	3A.2. Review meeting templates/notes. Collect list of students discussed at meetings.	3A.2. At least 95% of students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year. Evaluation of PD by teachers.
			3A.3. Inadequate time to review and revise Progress Monitoring Tool for level 1 and level 2 students.	3A.3. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need.	3A.3. Lead Team	3A.3. Review meeting templates/notes. Lead Team will monitor the Progress Monitoring process throughout the year.	3A.3. At least 95% of the level 1, level 2, and low level 3 students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Mathematics Goal #3B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *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
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1. Time restraints to review individual student mathematics data.	4A.1. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need. Continue and implement PD on CCSS for all teachers. PD on cross curricular reading and writing for all teachers. Identifying resources aligned to CCSS. Use Study Island to accelerate students' mastery of skills.	4A.1. Lead Team	4A.1. Review meeting templates/notes. Collect list of students discussed at meetings.	4A.1. At least 95% of students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year. Evaluation of PD by teachers.
Mathematics Goal #4A: *Increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics by 10%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *25% [2]*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *35%*					
			4A.2. Inadequate time to review and revise Progress Monitoring Tool for level 1 and level 2 students.	4A.2. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need.	4A.2. Lead Team	4A.2. Review meeting templates/notes. Lead Team will monitor the Progress Monitoring process throughout the year.	4A.2. At least 95% of the level 1, level 2, and low level 3 students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year.
			4A.3. Inability of students to decipher word problems	4A.3. Explicit instruction and gradual release instructional strategies	4A.3. RtI Teacher Lead Team	4A.3. CWTs, Lesson Plans	4A.3. LIAs, FCAT
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.
Mathematics Goal #4B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *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.*					
			4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.
			4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**	Current: 43%	Target: 48%	Target: 54%	Target: 59%	Target: 64%	Target: 69%
Mathematics Goal #5A: *The percent of white students making AMO in mathematics will increase to 48%.*							

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**		5B.1. White: Lack of teacher understanding of rigor and grade level expectations. Black: N/A Hispanic: N/A Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A	5B.1. Using the Lesson Study model, develop lessons with questions that incorporate all levels of complexity. Teachers have 4 sub days (funded through Title 1) to analyze data and/or observe other classrooms.	5B.1. Administrator Reading Coach Lead Team	5B.1. Review of lesson study cycle, lesson plans, and assessments.	5B.1. 75% of our teachers will have completed at least one lesson study cycle focusing on rigor and grade level expectations.	
Mathematics Goal #5B: *The percent of white students making AMO in mathematics will increase to 48%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* White:43% Black: N/A Hispanic: N/A Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White:48% Black: N/A Hispanic: N/A Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A						
		5B.2. Time restraints to review individual student reading data.	5B.2. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need. Continue and implement PD on CCSS for all teachers. PD on cross curricular reading and writing for all teachers. Identifying resources aligned to CCSS. Use Study Island to accelerate students' mastery of skills.	5B.2. Lead Team	5B.2. Review meeting templates/notes. Collect list of students discussed at meetings.	5B.2. At least 95% of students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year. Evaluation of PD by teachers.	

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

		5B.3. Inadequate time to review and revise Progress Monitoring Tool for level 1 and level 2 students	5B.3. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need.	5B.3. Lead Team	5B.3. Review meeting templates/notes. Lead Team will monitor the Progress Monitoring process throughout the year.	5B.3. At least 95% of the level 1, level 2, and low level 3 students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
Mathematics Goal #5C: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected 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. Lack of teacher understanding of rigor and grade level expectations.	5D.1. Using the Lesson Study model, develop lessons with questions that incorporate all levels of complexity. Teachers have 4 sub days (funded through Title 1) to analyze data and/or observe other classrooms.	5D.1. Administrator Reading Coach Lead Team	5D.1. Review of lesson study cycle, lesson plans, and assessments.	5D.1. 75% of our teachers will have completed at least one lesson study cycle focusing on rigor and grade level expectations.
Mathematics Goal #5D: *Increase the percentage of SWD making learning gains in mathematics by 5%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *42.9% [5]*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *47.9%*					
			5D.2. Time restraints to review individual student reading data.	5D.2. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need. Continue and implement PD on CCSS for all teachers. PD on cross curricular reading and writing for all teachers. Identifying resources aligned to CCSS. Use Study Island to accelerate students' mastery of skills.	5D.2. Lead Team	5D.2. Review meeting templates/notes. Collect list of students discussed at meetings.	5D.2. At least 95% of students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year. Evaluation of PD by teachers.
			5D.3. Inadequate time to review and revise Progress Monitoring Tool	5D.3. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and	5D.3. Lead Team	5D.3. Review meeting templates/notes. Lead Team will monitor the	5D.3. At least 95% of the level 1, level 2, and low level 3 students will

		for level 1 and level 2 students	implement strategies to address areas of need.		Progress Monitoring process throughout the year.	be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year.

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. Lack of teacher understanding of rigor and grade level expectations.	5E.1. Using the Lesson Study model, develop lessons with questions that incorporate all levels of complexity. Teachers have 4 sub days (funded through Title 1) to analyze data and/or observe other classrooms.	5E.1. Administrator Reading Coach Lead Team	5E.1. Review of lesson study cycle, lesson plans, and assessments.	5E.1. 75% of our teachers will have completed at least one lesson study cycle focusing on rigor and grade level expectations.
Mathematics Goal #5E: *Increase the percentage of ED students making learning gains in mahtematics by 5%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *62.5% [15]*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *67.5%*					
			5E.2. Time restraints to review individual student reading data.	5E.2. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need. Continue and implement PD on CCSS for all teachers. PD on cross curricular reading and writing for all teachers. Identifying resources aligned to CCSS. Use Study Island to accelerate students' mastery of skills.	5E.2. Lead Team	5E.2. Review meeting templates/notes. Collect list of students discussed at meetings.	5E.2. At least 95% of students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year. Evaluation of PD by teachers.
			5E.3. Inadequate time to review and revise Progress Monitoring Tool for level 1 and level 2 students	5E.3. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need.	5E.3. Lead Team	5E.3. Review meeting templates/notes. Lead Team will monitor the Progress Monitoring process throughout the year.	5E.3. At least 95% of students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year. Evaluation of PD by teachers.

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. Lack of teacher understanding of rigor and grade level expectations.	1A.1. Using the Lesson Study model, develop lessons with questions that incorporate all levels of complexity. Teachers have 4 sub days (funded through Title 1) to analyze data and/or observe other classrooms.	1A.1. Administrator Lead Team	1A.1. Review of lesson study cycle, lesson plans, and assessments.	1A.1. 75% of our teachers will have completed at least one lesson study cycle focusing on rigor and grade level expectations.
Mathematics Goal #1A: *Increase the percentage of students scoring Level 3 or above in mathematics by 10%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *45.6% [31]*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *55.6%*					
			1A.2. Time restraints to review individual student reading data.	1A.2. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need. Continue and implement PD on CCSS for all teachers. PD on cross curricular reading and writing for all teachers. Identifying resources aligned to CCSS. Use Study Island to accelerate students' mastery of skills.	1A.2. Lead Team	1A.2. Review meeting templates/notes. Collect list of students discussed at meetings.	1A.2. At least 95% of students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year. Evaluation of PD by teachers.
			1A.3. Inadequate time to review and revise Progress Monitoring Tool for level 1 and level 2 students.	1A.3. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need.	1A.3. Lead Team	1A.3. Review meeting templates/notes. Lead Team will monitor the Progress Monitoring process throughout the year.	1A.3. At least 95% of the level 1, level 2, and low level 3 students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1. none	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Mathematics Goal #1B: *Maintain 100% of students scoring level 4 or above on the Florida Alternate Assessment*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *100% [1]*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *100%*					
			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. Lack of teacher understanding of rigor and grade level expectations.	2A.1. Using the Lesson Study model, develop lessons with questions that incorporate all levels of complexity. Teachers have 4 sub days (funded through Title 1) to analyze data and/or observe other classrooms.	2A.1. Administrator Lead Team	2A.1. Review of lesson study cycle, lesson plans, and assessments.	2A.1. 75% of our teachers will have completed at least one lesson study cycle focusing on rigor and grade level expectations.
Mathematics Goal #2A: *Increase the percentage of students scoring at or above Level 4 in mathematics by 5%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *17.6% [12]*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *22.6%*					
			2A.2. Limited differentiation for our level 4 and level 5 students	2A.2. Utilize instructional time to offer a supplemental intervention for level 3, level 4, and level 5 students focused on the mathematics benchmarks using FCAT Explorer and Study Island.	2A.2. Lead Team	2A.2. Review the number of students participating in the program. FCAT Explorer and Study Island data will be reviewed.	2A.2. At least 75% of the level 4 and level 5 students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year.
			2A.3. Limited supplemental instructional resources for our level 4 and level 5 students.	2A.3. Utilize instructional time to offer a supplemental intervention for level 3, level 4, and level 5 students focused on the mathematics benchmarks using FCAT Explorer and Study Island.	2A.3. Lead Team	2A.3. Review the number of students participating in the program. FCAT Explorer and Study Island data will be reviewed.	2A.3. At least 75% of the level 4 and level 5 students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1. none	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Mathematics Goal #2B: *Maintain 100% of students scoring level 7 or above on the Florida Alternate Assessment*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *100% [1]*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *100%*					
			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. Lack of teacher understanding of rigor and grade level expectations.	3A.1. Using the Lesson Study model, develop lessons with questions that incorporate all levels of complexity. Teachers have 4 sub days (funded through Title 1) to analyze data and/or observe other classrooms.	3A.1. Administrator Lead Team	3A.1. Review of lesson study cycle, lesson plans, and assessments.	3A.1. 75% of our teachers will have completed at least one lesson study cycle focusing on rigor and grade level expectations.
Mathematics Goal #3A: *Increase the percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics by 10%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *53.7% [29]*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *63.7%*					
			3A.2. Time restraints to review individual student reading data.	3A.2. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need. Continue and implement PD on CCSS for all teachers. PD on cross curricular reading and writing for all teachers. Identifying resources aligned to CCSS. Use Study Island to accelerate students' mastery of skills.	3A.2. Lead Team	3A.2. Review meeting templates/notes. Collect list of students discussed at meetings.	3A.2. At least 95% of students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year. Evaluation of PD by teachers.
			3A.3. Inadequate time to review and revise Progress Monitoring Tool for level 1 and level 2 students.	3A.3. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need.	3A.3. Lead Team	3A.3. Review meeting templates/notes. Lead Team will monitor the Progress Monitoring process throughout the year.	3A.3. At least 95% of the level 1, level 2, and low level 3 students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year.
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.

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1. Time restraints to review individual student reading data.	4A.1. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need. Continue and implement PD on CCSS for all teachers. PD on cross curricular reading and writing for all teachers. Identifying resources aligned to CCSS. Use Study Island to accelerate students' mastery of skills.	4A.1. Lead Team	4A.1. Review meeting templates/notes. Collect list of students discussed at meetings.	4A.1. At least 95% of students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year. Evaluation of PD by teachers.
Mathematics Goal #4A: *Increase the percentage of students in the lowest quartile making learning gains in mathematics by 10%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *35.7% [5]*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *45.7%*					
			4A.2. Inadequate time to review and revise Progress Monitoring Tool for level 1 and level 2 students.	4A.2. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need.	4A.2. Lead Team	4A.2. Review meeting templates/notes. Lead Team will monitor the Progress Monitoring process throughout the year.	4A.2. At least 95% of the level 1, level 2, and low level 3 students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year.
			4A.3. Inability of students to decipher word problems	4A.3. Explicit instruction and gradual release instructional strategies	4A.3. RtI Teacher Lead Team	4A.3. CWTs, Lesson Plans	4A.3. LIAs, FCAT
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.
Mathematics Goal #4B: *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.*					
			4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.
			4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.

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

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**	Current: 43%	Target: 48%	Target: 54%	Target: 59%	Target: 64%	Target: 69%

Mathematics Goal #5A:

The percent of white students making AMO in mathematics will increase to 48%.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.** Mathematics Goal #5B: *The percent of white students making AMO in mathematics will increase to 48%.*	5B.1. White: Lack of teacher understanding of rigor and grade level expectations. Black: N/A Hispanic: N/A Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A	5B.1. Using the Lesson Study model, develop lessons with questions that incorporate all levels of complexity. Teachers have 4 sub days (funded through Title 1) to analyze data and/or observe other classrooms.	5B.1. Administrator Reading Coach Lead Team	5B.1. Review of lesson study cycle, lesson plans, and assessments.	5B.1. 75% of our teachers will have completed at least one lesson study cycle focusing on rigor and grade level expectations.	

	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White:43% Black:N/A Hispanic: N/A Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White:48% Black: N/A Hispanic: N/A Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A				

| | 5B.2.
Time restraints to review individual student reading data. | 5B.2.
Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need.
Continue and implement PD on CCSS for all teachers.
PD on cross curricular reading and writing for all teachers.
Identifying resources aligned to CCSS.
Use Study Island to accelerate | 5B.2.
Lead Team | 5B.2.
Review meeting templates/notes. Collect list of students discussed at meetings. | 5B.2.
At least 95% of students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year.
Evaluation of PD by teachers. | |

		students' mastery of skills.			
		5B.3. Inadequate time to review and revise Progress Monitoring Tool for level 1 and level 2 students.	5B.3. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need.	5B.3. Lead Team	5B.3. Review meeting templates/notes. Lead Team will monitor the Progress Monitoring process throughout the year.	5B.3. At least 95% of the level 1, level 2, and low level 3 students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year.

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. Lack of teacher understanding of rigor and grade level expectations.	5C.1. Using the Lesson Study model, develop lessons with questions that incorporate all levels of complexity. Teachers have 4 sub days (funded through Title 1) to analyze data and/or observe other classrooms.	5C.1. Administrator Lead Team	5C.1. Review of lesson study cycle, lesson plans, and assessments.	5C.1. 75% of our teachers will have completed at least one lesson study cycle focusing on rigor and grade level expectations.
Mathematics Goal #5C: *Increase the percent of ELL students making learning gains in mathematics to 50%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *0% [0]*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *50%*					
			5C.2. Time restraints to review individual student reading data.	5C.2. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need. Continue and implement PD on CCSS for all teachers. PD on cross curricular reading and writing for all teachers. Identifying resources aligned to CCSS. Use Study Island to accelerate students' mastery of skills.	5C.2. Lead Team	5C.2. Review meeting templates/notes. Collect list of students discussed at meetings.	5C.2. At least 95% of students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year. Evaluation of PD by teachers.
			5C.3. Inadequate time to review and revise Progress Monitoring Tool for level 1 and level 2 students.	5C.3. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need.	5C.3. Lead Team	5C.3. Review meeting templates/notes. Lead Team will monitor the Progress Monitoring process throughout the year.	5C.3. At least 95% of the level 1, level 2, and low level 3 students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year.
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. Time restraints to review individual student reading data.	5D.1. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need. Continue and implement PD on CCSS for all teachers. PD on cross curricular reading and writing for all teachers. Identifying resources aligned to CCSS. Use Study Island to accelerate students' mastery of skills.	5D.1. Lead Team	5D.1. Review meeting templates/notes. Collect list of students discussed at meetings.	5D.1. At least 95% of students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year. Evaluation of PD by teachers.
Mathematics Goal #5D: *Increase the percentage of SWD making learning gains in mathematics by 10%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *50% [2]*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *60%*					

		5D.2. Inadequate time to review and revise Progress Monitoring Tool for level 1 and level 2 students.	5D.2. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need.	5D.2. Lead Team	5D.2. Review meeting templates/notes. Lead Team will monitor the Progress Monitoring process throughout the year.	5D.2. At least 95% of the level 1, level 2, and low level 3 students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year.
		5D.3. Inability of students to decipher word problems	5D.3. Explicit instruction and gradual release instructional strategies	5D.3. RtI Teacher Lead Team	5D.3. CWTs, Lesson Plans	5D.3. LIAs, FCAT

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1. Lack of teacher understanding of rigor and grade level expectations.	5E.1. Using the Lesson Study model, develop lessons with questions that incorporate all levels of complexity. Teachers have 4 sub days (funded through Title 1) to analyze data and/or observe other classrooms.	5E.1. Administrator Lead Team	5E.1. Review of lesson study cycle, lesson plans, and assessments.	5E.1. 75% of our teachers will have completed at least one lesson study cycle focusing on rigor and grade level expectations.
Mathematics Goal #5E: *Increase the percentage of ED students making learning gains in mathematics by 10%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *47.5% [19]*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 57.5%					
			5E.2. Time restraints to review individual student reading data.	5E.2. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need. Continue and implement PD on CCSS for all teachers. PD on cross curricular reading and writing for all teachers. Identifying resources aligned to CCSS. Use Study Island to accelerate students' mastery of skills.	5E.2. Lead Team	5E.2. Review meeting templates/notes. Collect list of students discussed at meetings.	5E.2. At least 95% of students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year. Evaluation of PD by teachers.
			5E.3. Inadequate time to review and revise Progress Monitoring Tool for level 1 and level 2 students.	5E.3. Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need.	5E.3. Lead Team	5E.3. Review meeting templates/notes. Lead Team will monitor the Progress Monitoring process throughout the year.	5E.3. At least 95% of the level 1, level 2, and low level 3 students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year.

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

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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. All Algebra students are taking the course online.	1.1. Provide support multiple times during the week.	1.1. Principal	1.1. CWTs	1.1. LIAs, EOC
Algebra 1 Goal #1: *Increase the percentage of students scoring Level 3 or above on the Algebra 1 EOC to 100%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *90.9% [10]*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *100%*					
			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. All Algebra students are taking the course online.	2.1. Provide support multiple times during the week.	2.1. Principal	2.1. CWTs	2.1. LIAs, EOC
Algebra Goal #2: *Increase the percentage of students scoring Level 4 or above on the Algebra 1 EOC by 10%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *18.2% [2]*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *28.2%*					
			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: *N/A*	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: *N/A*	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. All Algebra students are taking the course online.	3E.1. Provide support multiple times during the week.	3E.1. Principal	3E.1. CWTs	3E.1. LIAs, EOC
Algebra 1 Goal #3E: *Increase the percentage of students scoring Level 3 or above on the Algebra 1 EOC to 100%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *??*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *100%*					
			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.

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

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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
CCSS Training	K-8/Mathematics	Denise Dillon Suzette Peton	School-Wide	Ongoing	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk Throughs	Suzette Pelton
Lesson Study	K-8/Mathematics	Melba Lovely Suzette Pelton	School-Wide	Early Release Days	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk Throughs	Suzette Pelton
Cross Curricular Reading and Writing	K-8 All Content Areas	Natalie Steinberg Denise Dillon Candy Prescott Melba Lovely Suzette Peton	School-Wide	December 2012	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk Throughs	Suzette Pelton

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

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Core Instruction	Math Textbooks	Textbook Allocation	$210.00
			Subtotal: $210.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Cross Curricular Reading and Writing	Consultant	Title 1	Documented in Reading Budget
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: $210.00

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

<table>
<tr><th colspan="2">Elementary and Middle Science Goals</th><th colspan="5">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="2">1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.</td>
<td>1A.1.
Lack of teacher understanding of rigor and grade level expectations.</td>
<td>1A.1.
Using the Lesson Study model, develop lessons with questions that incorporate all levels of complexity. Teachers have 4 sub days (funded through Title 1) to analyze data and/or observe other classrooms.</td>
<td>1A.1.
Administrator
Lead Team</td>
<td>1A.1.
Review of lesson study cycle, lesson plans, and assessments.</td>
<td>1A.1.
75% of our teachers will have completed at least one lesson study cycle focusing on rigor and grade level expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Goal #1A:

Increase the percentage of students scoring Level 3 or above in science by 10%.</td>
<td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*
5th: 40% [6]
8th: 87.5% [21]

2013 Expected Level of Performance:*
5th: 50%
8th: 97.5%</td>
<td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="2"></td>
<td>1A.2.
Inadequate time to review and revise Progress Monitoring Tool for level 1 and level 2 students.</td>
<td>1A.2.
Schedule monthly data meetings to review individual student data and implement strategies to address areas of need.</td>
<td>1A.2.
Lead Team</td>
<td>1A.2.
Review meeting templates/notes. Lead Team will monitor the Progress Monitoring process throughout the year.</td>
<td>1A.2.
At least 95% of the level 1, level 2, and low level 3 students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="2"></td>
<td>1A.3.
Fidelity of implementation</td>
<td>1A.3.
Teachers will use reading strategies to help students understand the meaning of higher order questions.</td>
<td>1A.3.
Lead Team, Teachers</td>
<td>1A.3.
CWTs, Lesson Plans</td>
<td>1A.3.
FCAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="2">1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.</td>
<td>1B.1.
none</td>
<td>1B.1.</td>
<td>1B.1.</td>
<td>1B.1.</td>
<td>1B.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Goal #1B:

Maintain 100% of students scoring level 7 or above on the Florida Alternate Assessment</td>
<td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*
100% [1]

2013 Expected Level of Performance:*
100%</td>
<td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="2"></td>
<td>1B.2.</td>
<td>1B.2.</td>
<td>1B.2.</td>
<td>1B.2.</td>
<td>1B.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="2"></td>
<td>1B.3.</td>
<td>1B.3.</td>
<td>1B.3.</td>
<td>1B.3.</td>
<td>1B.3.</td>
</tr>
</table>

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. Lack of teacher understanding of rigor and grade level expectations.	2A.1. Using the Lesson Study model, develop lessons with questions that incorporate all levels of complexity. Teachers have 4 sub days (funded through Title 1) to analyze data and/or observe other classrooms.	2A.1. Administrator Lead Team	2A.1. Review of lesson study cycle, lesson plans, and assessments.	2A.1. 75% of our teachers will have completed at least one lesson study cycle focusing on rigor and grade level expectations.
Science Goal #2A: *Increase the percentage of students scoring Level 4 or above in science by 10%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *5th: 13.3% [2]* *8th: 16.7% [4]*	2013Expected Level of Performance:* *5th: 23.3%* *8th: 26.7%*					
			2A.2. Limited supplemental instructional resources for our level 4 and level 5 students.	2A.2. Utilize instructional time to offer a supplemental intervention for level 3, level 4, and level 5 students focused on the mathematics benchmarks using FCAT Explorer and Study Island.	2A.2. Lead Team	2A.2. Review the number of students participating in the program. FCAT Explorer and Study Island data will be reviewed.	2A.2. At least 75% of the level 4 and level 5 students will be discussed in data meetings by the end of the year.
			2A.3. Fidelity of implementation	2A.3. Teachers will use reading strategies to help students understand the meaning of higher order questions.	2A.3. Lead Team, Teachers	2A.3. CWTs, Lesson Plans	2A.3. FCAT
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2B.1. none	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Science Goal #2B: *Maintain 100% of students scoring level 7 or above on the Florida Alternate Assessment*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *100% [1]*	2013Expected Level of Performance:* *100%*					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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.*	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 Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

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

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

Biology 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
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.
<u>Biology 1 Goal #1:</u> *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> *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.
<u>Biology 1 Goal #2:</u> *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> *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

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

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

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
CCSS Training	K-8/Science	Denise Dillon Suzette Peton	School-Wide	Ongoing	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk Throughs	Suzette Pelton
Lesson Study	K-8/Science	Melba Lovely Suzette Pelton	School-Wide	Early Release Days	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk Throughs	Suzette Pelton
Cross Curricular Reading and Writing	K-8 All Content Areas	Natalie Steinberg Denise Dillon Candy Prescott Melba Lovely Suzette Peton	School-Wide	December 2012	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk Throughs	Suzette Pelton

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
Core Instruction	Science Textbooks	Textbook Allocation	$203.00
			Subtotal: $203.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

	Subtotal:
	Total: $203.00

End of Science Goals

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

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.			1A.1. Writing scores have dropped due to new state rubric	1A.1. Awareness and implementation of new scoring rubric and explicit instruction in grammar.	1A.1. Teachers, Lead Team	1A.1. Write Score!, Springboard assessments	1A.1. 80% of our students will score proficient on Write Score! and FCAT Writes!
Writing Goal #1A: *Increase the percentage of students scoring Level 3 or above in writing by 10%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 4th: 82.4% [14] 8th: 77.3% [17]	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 4th: 92.4% 8th: 87.3%					
			1A.2. Lack of teacher understanding of rigor and grade level expectations.	1A.2. Using the Lesson Study model, develop writing activities to be scored using the new rubric. Teachers have 4 sub days (funded through Title 1) to analyze data and/or observe other classrooms.	1A.2. Administrator Lead Team	1A.2. Review of lesson study cycle, lesson plans, and assessments.	1A.2. 75% of our teachers will have completed at least one lesson study cycle focusing on rigor and grade level expectations.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.			1B.1. none	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Writing Goal #1B: *Maintain 100% of students scoring level 4 or above on the Florida Alternate Assessment*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 100% [1]	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 100%					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

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

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
CCSS Training	K-8/Mathematics	Denise Dillon Suzette Peton	School-Wide	Ongoing	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk Throughs	Suzette Pelton
Lesson Study	K-8/Mathematics	Melba Lovely Suzette Pelton	School-Wide	Early Release Days	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk Throughs	Suzette Pelton
Cross Curricular Reading and Writing	K-8 All Content Areas	Natalie Steinberg Denise Dillon Candy Prescott Melba Lovely Suzette Peton	School-Wide	December 2012	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk Throughs	Suzette Pelton

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
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

	Subtotal:
	Total:

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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

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

Attendance Goal #1:

Increase attendance rate by 3% and reduce excessive tardies and absences.</td>
<td>1.1.
Enforcement of district tardy and absence policy.</td>
<td>1.1.
Principal and Guidance Counselor will conduct Child Study Team (CST) Meetings for students with excessive absences. A phone call home will be made for each absence after the CST meeting.</td>
<td>1.1.
Attendance Clerk
Guidance Counselor
Principal</td>
<td>1.1.
Attendance records will be reviewed weekly by the Lead Team to identify students with attendance issues. Records will be reviewed for accuracy and corrections will be made based on teacher/student/parent input. Students with historical data that indicates a record of excessive absenteeism will be more closely monitored.</td>
<td>1.1.
End of year attendance data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*

95%

2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)

86

2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)

19</td>
<td>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*

98%

2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)

80

2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)

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

Attendance Professional Development

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

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

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

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

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

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: *Decrease the number of ISS and OSS by 50%*	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions *106* 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School *106* 2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions *64* 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School *64*	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions *53* 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School *53* 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions *32* 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School *32*	1.1. Learned behaviors of low socio-economic students are those of survival in the environment outside the school, not in the school.	1.1. When a student receives a second school discipline report, they will be assigned to the RtI process to learn acceptable school behaviors. They will be taught that the behaviors that help them outside the school are not effective in the school.	1.1. RtI teacher Guidance Counselor	1.1. Monthly monitoring of effectiveness of the newly learned behaviors.	1.1. End of school discipline report
			1.2. New discipline policies	1.2. Educate teachers, students, and parents of new policies, procedures, and consequences.	1.2. Principal Administrative Assistant Guidance Counselor Teachers	1.2. Monthly monitoring of referrals	1.2. End of school discipline report
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

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
Discipline Procedures	PreK-8	Principal Admin Asst	School-wide	ongoing	Analyze discipline reports and provide support based on school-wide and individual teacher trends.	Principal

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

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

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: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.* **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:* *Enter numerical data for current level of parent involvement in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of parent involvement 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.

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
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: *Increase the percentage of students scoring at or above Level 4 in mathematics and science by 10%.*	1.1. Lack of teacher understanding of rigor and grade level expectations.	1.1. Using the Lesson Study model, develop lessons with questions that incorporate all levels of complexity.	1.1. Administrator Lead Team	1.1. Review of lesson study cycle, lesson plans, and assessments.	1.1. 75% of our teachers will have completed at least one lesson study cycle focusing on rigor and grade level expectations.
	1.2. Gaps in students' knowledge and skills related to NGSSS and CCSS	1.2. Continue and implement PD on CCSS for all teachers. PD on cross curricular reading and writing for all teachers. Identifying resources aligned to CCSS.	1.2. RtI Teacher Lead Team	1.2. CWTs, Lesson Plans	1.2. LIAs, FCAT
	1.3. Student Engagement	1.3. Use of high interest, complex text and highly effective instructional strategies.	1.3. RtI Teacher Lead Team	1.3. CWTs, Lesson Plans	1.3. FCAT

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
CCSS Training	K-8/Mathematics	Denise Dillon Suzette Peton	School-Wide	Ongoing	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk Throughs	Suzette Pelton
Lesson Study	K-8/Mathematics	Melba Lovely Suzette Pelton	School-Wide	Early Release Days	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk Throughs	Suzette Pelton
Cross Curricular Reading and Writing	K-8 All Content Areas	Natalie Steinberg Denise Dillon Candy Prescott Melba Lovely	School-Wide	December 2012	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk Throughs	Suzette Pelton

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

		Suzette Peton				

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

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

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			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Additional Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level :* *Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.*	2013 Expected Level :* *Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box.*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Additional Goals Professional Development

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

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

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	
	Total: $6,188.75
CELLA Budget	
	Total:
Mathematics Budget	
	Total: $210.00
Science Budget	
	Total: $203.00
Writing Budget	
	Total:
Civics Budget	
	Total:
U.S. History Budget	
	Total:
Attendance Budget	
	Total:
Suspension Budget	
	Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget	
	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	
	Total:
STEM Budget	
	Total:
CTE Budget	
	Total:
Additional Goals	
	Total:
	Grand Total: $6,421.75

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

Differentiated Accountability

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
☐Priority	☐Focus	☐Prevent

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

☒ Yes   ☐ No

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

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
Monthly SAC meetings (at least 8 meetings per year) Discussion of SAC by-laws Collaboration on SIP Discuss and vote on dissemination of SAC monies Review and approve the parental Involvement Plans Review and approve Principal/Teacher/Parent/Student Compacts School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

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

All (SAC) members will:
- Make decisions by consensus for the good of the entire school, when addressing school-wide issues
- Assist in the preparation and evaluation of the SIP
- Perform functions as prescribed by regulations
- Allocate time for educational issues
- Work directly with the School Improvement Coordinator
- Allocate funds

Parents of SAC will:
- Provide feedback
- Understand and continue in the ongoing discussion of the SAC Basics and By-Laws

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount