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: Seminole Springs Elementary	District Name: Lake
Principal: Barbara A. Longo	Superintendent: Dr. Susan Moxley
SAC Chair: Therese Choy	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

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

Administrators

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

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Barbara A. Longo	Ms. Longo has a B.S. degree in Movement Science, Leisure Studies and a M. Ed. in Educational Leadership	2	15	2011-2012 School grade A at Seminole Springs Elementary with the implementation of new cut scores we had 67% meeting high standards in reading and 66% in math. In writing, 88% of the students met high standards and 68% met high standards in science. 69% of students made learning gains in Reading and 83% made learning gains in Math. Of the students identified in the lowest quartile, 62% made learning gains in reading and 69% in math. 2010-2011 School grade B at Seminole Springs Elementary with 86% meeting high standards in reading and 78% in math. In writing, 91% of the students met high standards and 62% met high standards in science. Of the students identified in the lowest quartile, 57% made learning gains in reading and 39% in math. 2009-2010 School grade A at Lost Lake Elementary with 86% meeting high standards in reading and 82% meeting high standards in math. In writing, 88% of the students met high standards and in science 68% percent received a level three or above. Of the students identified in the lowest quartile, 66% made learning gains in reading and 63% made learning gains in math. 2008-2009 School grade A at Lost Lake Elementary with 89% meeting high standards in reading and 84% meeting high standards in math. In writing, 90% of the students met high standards and in science 63% percent received a level three or above. Of the students identified in the lowest quartile, 74% made learning gains in reading and 68% made learning gains in math.
Assistant Principal	Marjorie Abston	BS in Elementary Education, University of Central Florida; Master of Science in Educational Leadership, Nova Southeastern; Principal Certification, State of Florida	0	15	2011-2012 Assistant Principal Treadway Elementary, School grade "A", Reading Proficiency 63%; Math Proficiency 69%; Writing Proficiency 74%; Science Proficiency 59%; Reading Gains 73%; Math Gains 83%; Reading Gains Lowest 25%--78%, Math Gains Lowest 25%--83% 2010-2011 Assistant Principal of Villages Elementary, School grade "A", made AYP with 100%, Reading Mastery 87%, Math Mastery 86%, Writing Mastery 86%,Science Mastery 67%.

					2009-2010 Assistant Principal of Villages Elementary, School Grade B Reading Mastery 84%; Math Mastery 84%; Science Mastery 51%; made AYP 100%. 2008-2009 Asst. Principal of Villages Elementary, School Grade: A; Reading Mastery: 86%; Math Mastery: 82%; Science Mastery: 66%; AYP: 97%; Students with Disabilities did not meet AYP in the areas of math or reading. 2007-2008 Asst. Principal of Villages Elementary, School Grade: A; Reading Mastery: 82%; Math Mastery: 84%; Science Mastery: 62%; AYP: 100%.

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)
Curriculum Resource Teacher	Therese Choy	Mrs. Choy has her Bachelor's degree from the University of Florida in Elementary Education and her Masters degree in Educational Leadership Mrs. Choy has endorsements in Reading and ESOL	14	6	2011-2012 School grade A with the implementation of new cut scores we had 67% meeting high standards in reading and 66% in math. In writing, 88% of the students met high standards and 68% met high standards in science. 69% of students made learning gains in Reading and 83% made learning gains in Math. Of the students identified in the lowest quartile, 62% made learning gains in reading and 69% in math. 2010-2011 School grade B with 86% meeting high standards in reading and 78% in math. In writing, 91% of the students met high standards and 62% met high standards in science. Of the students identified in the lowest quartile, 57% made learning gains in reading and 39% in math. 2009-2010 School grade A with 85% meeting high standards in reading and 85% meeting high standards in math. In writing, 85% of the students met high standards and in science 65% percent received a level three or above. Of the students identified in the lowest quartile, 54% made learning gains in reading and 63% made learning gains in math. 2008-2009 School grade A with 88% meeting high standards in reading and 87% meeting high standards in math. In writing, 90% of the students met high standards and in science 65% percent received a level three or above. Of the students identified in the lowest quartile, 74% made learning gains in reading and 74% made learning gains in math.
Literacy Coach	Lori Myers	Mrs. Myers received her Bachelor's degree in elementary education from Simpson College, IA	5	3	2011-2012 School grade A with the implementation of new cut scores we had 67% meeting high standards in reading and 66% in math. In writing, 88% of the students met high standards and 68% met high standards in science. 69% of students made

		and Master's degree in educational leadership from Stetson University, FL. Mrs. Myers has endorsements in Reading, Early Childhood, ESOL, and Exceptional Student Education			learning gains in Reading and 83% made learning gains in Math. Of the students identified in the lowest quartile, 62% made learning gains in reading and 69% in math.
					2010-2011 School grade B with 86% meeting high standards in reading and 78% in math. In writing, 91% of the students met high standards and 62% met high standards in science. Of the students identified in the lowest quartile, 57% made learning gains in reading and 39% in math.
					2009-2010 School grade A with 85% meeting high standards in reading and 85% meeting high standards in math. In writing, 85% of the students met high standards and in science 65% percent received a level three or above. Of the students identified in the lowest quartile, 54% made learning gains in reading and 63% made learning gains in math.
					2008-2009 School grade A with 88% meeting high standards in reading and 87% meeting high standards in math. In writing, 90% of the students met high standards and in science 65% percent received a level three or above. Of the students identified in the lowest quartile, 74% made learning gains in reading and 74% made learning gains in math.

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. Screening and interview with special consideration to recommendations and references	Administration, Curriculum Specialist, Literacy Coach	On-going
2. Select teacher candidates that are highly qualified under the guidelines outlined by the Florida Department of Education	Administration, Curriculum Specialist, Literacy Coach	On-going
3. Facilitate collaboration between new teachers to campus and highly performing mentors	Administration, Curriculum Specialist, Literacy Coach	On-going

4.		

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
0% teaching out of field 24% (11) teachers receiving less than Effective *This data is before VAM has been calculated in	NA

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
46	6.5% (3)	21.7% (10)	41.3% (19)	30.4% (14)	32.6% (15)	76.1% (35)	10.9% (5)	6.5% (3)	84.8% (39)

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
Tammy Wathen	Amanda Gibson	Grade Level Chairperson. Mentor also a successful first grade teacher and is familiar with the curriculum.	The mentor and mentee will meet monthly during grade level meetings to discuss evidence validated teaching strategies. Grade level teams will also conduct planning meetings to promote consistent policies across the grade level. Instructional Coach will visit

			monthly.
Bonnie Leon	Kristi Purvis	Grade level chairperson, team partner Mentor and mentee are proven successful fourth grade teachers, familiar with curriculum. Mentee is new to the Seminole Springs' campus.	The mentor and mentee will meet monthly during grade level meetings to discuss evidence validated teaching strategies. Grade level teams will also conduct planning meetings to promote consistent policies across the grade level. Instructional Coach will visit monthly.
Shannon Locke	Caroline Dunn	Grade level chairperson, team partner Mentor and mentee are proven successful teachers, familiar with curriculum. Mentee is new to the grade level.	The mentor and mentee will meet monthly during grade level meetings to discuss evidence validated teaching strategies. Grade level teams will also conduct planning meetings to promote consistent policies across the grade level. Instructional Coach will visit monthly.

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

Additional Requirements

*Coordination and Integration-*Title I Schools Only

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

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

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

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

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. **Administrators** – As leaders of the RTI team the school administration provide models for informed data based decision making. The administration is responsible for the fidelity of RTI implementation at the school site. **Curriculum Resource Teacher/Literacy Coach** – Researches existing literature on academic interventions to be implemented with students exhibiting specific need. Provide professional development to promote the implementation of evidence based instructional strategies in the classroom. Assist with the collection of progress monitoring data and assessment. **Classroom Teacher** – The classroom teacher is primarily responsible for the delivery of tier one, two and tree interventions and data collection. **Guidance Counselor** – The guidance counselor plays an integral role in the collection and documentation of student data as well as data analysis and interpretation. Researches existing literature on behavior interventions to be implemented with students exhibiting specific need. She also maintains student RTI records and schedules follow-up meetings to discuss student progress with the team. **School Psychologist** – Provides professional development and contributes to the development of academic and behavioral interventions and other data based decisions. **ESE School Specialist** – Provides assistance in decision making when students reach tier three of RTI.
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 Response to Intervention Team meets each week to review student data and identify students in need of academic or behavioral interventions. Working cooperatively, the Team will plan instructional strategies, determine the effectiveness of interventions, and create a system for continued monitoring of student progress.
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 Team met with the School Advisory Council to review school wide academic data as well as data relating to behavior. Jointly, the team outlined the plan and set goals.
MTSS Implementation
Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.

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

The Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. Professional development will be provided by district and school staff on site. The RTI team will also determine professional development needs during weekly RTI meetings.
Describe the plan to support MTSS. Determine school-wide learning and development areas in need of improvement. Identify barriers which have or could prohibit school from meeting improvement goals. Distribute and assign resources to implement plans. Monitor fidelity and effectiveness of core and Tier 2 instruction.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Administration, Literacy Coach, 3 ESE Teachers, 4 Classroom Teachers
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). Meetings are held once a month to discuss data, literacy instruction, and reading events throughout the year. The team will also assess the effectiveness of the programs initiated. Meetings are held once a month to discuss data, literacy instruction, and reading events throughout the year. The team will also assess the effectiveness of the programs initiated.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? Professional development of instructional shifts for transitioning to Common Core standards, family literacy events, and grant writing to fund classroom libraries.

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.

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

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

Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

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

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

High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.			1A.1. Economically Disadvantaged students Attendance Time constraints during day	1A.1 RtI ESOL support Team collaboration Tutoring Flexible P/T conferences Teacher/Data Talks Media Nights Intervention Groups Lesson Study/Model lessons	1A.1. School Leadership Team RtI Team Classroom Teacher	1A.1. Grades Benchmark Evaluations FAIR RtI data Classroom Walkthroughs Lesson Plans	1A.1. Formative and summative assessments Classroom walkthrough data
Reading Goal #1A: Based on the 2012 school grade report, 27% met proficiency standards. The goal for 2013 Reading FCAT for at least 30% of students to score a level 3.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **27% (84)**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *30% (93)*					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Reading Goal #1B:	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 in reading.			2A.1. Economically Disadvantaged students Attendance Time constraints during day	2A.1. RtI ESOL support Team collaboration Tutoring Flexible P/T conferences Teacher/Data Talks Media Nights Intervention Groups Lesson Study/Model lessons Enrichment opportunities	2A.1. School Leadership Team RtI Team Classroom Teacher	2A.1 Grades Benchmark Evaluations FAIR RtI data Classroom Walkthroughs Lesson Plans.	2A.1. Formative and summative assessments Classroom walkthrough data
Reading Goal #2A: Based on 2012 Reading FCAT 39% scored level 4 or 5. The goal for 2013 Reading FCAT is for 42% of students to score a level 4 or 5.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 39% (121)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 42% (131)					
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Reading Goal #2B: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3A.1. Economically Disadvantaged students Attendance Time constraints during day	3A.1. RtI ESOL support Team collaboration Tutoring Flexible P/T conferences Teacher/Data Talks Media Nights Intervention Groups Lesson Study/Model lessons Enrichment opportunities	3A.1. School Leadership Team RtI Team Classroom Teacher	3A.1. Grades Benchmark Evaluations FAIR RtI data Classroom Walkthroughs Lesson Plans.	3A.1. Formative and summative assessments Classroom walkthrough data
Reading Goal #3A: According to 2012 school grade data 69% (214) of students tested made learning gains in reading. The goal for 2013 is to have 72% make learning gains.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 69% (214)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 72%					
			3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Reading 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

17

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4A.1. Economically Disadvantaged students Attendance Time constraints during day	4A.1. RtI ESOL support Team collaboration Tutoring Flexible P/T conferences Teacher/Data Talks Media Nights Intervention Groups Lesson Study/Model lessons Enrichment opportunities	4A.1. School Leadership Team RtI Team Classroom Teacher	4A.1. Grades Benchmark Evaluations FAIR RtI data Classroom Walkthroughs Lesson Plans.	4A.1. Formative and summative assessments Classroom walkthrough data
Reading Goal #4A: 2012 School grade data shows that 62% of lowest quartile made learning gains in reading. The goal for 2013 reading is to have 69% of lowest quartile make learning gains (in guideline with the district goals).	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 62%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 69%					
			4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.
Reading Goal #4B: *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.

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 69%	During the 2011-12 school year, 67% of students tested were proficient in Reading. The Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) was 72%.	74%	77%	79%	82%	85%
Reading Goal #5A: At Seminole Springs Elementary 69% of tested population were meeting proficiency in reading on the 2011 FCAT. The goal is to increase that percentage to 85% by 2017.							

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5B.1. White: Attendance Time constraints during school day	5B.1. RtI ESOL support Team collaboration Tutoring Flexible P/T conferences Teacher/Data Talks Media/Homework Nights Intervention Groups Lesson Study/Model lessons.	5B.1. School Leadership Team RtI Team Classroom Teacher	5B.1 Data Meetings to review classroom grades, benchmark evaluations, FAIR, and RtI data. Classroom Walkthroughs and lesson plan checks will also be used..	5B.1. Classroom Reading Grades FAIR FCAT Reading Benchmark Reading Tests Classroom walkthroughs	
Reading Goal #5B: The goal is to have 74% of the white subgroup be proficient in reading as indicated on the 2013 FCAT. The goal for the Hispanic subgroup is to be 65%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White:69% Black:57% Hispanic: 50% Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White:71% Black: Hispanic:56% Asian: American Indian:	Black: Hispanic: Attendance Time constraints during school day Limited home support Asian: American Indian::					
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5C.1. Attendance Time constraints during school day	5C.1. RtI ESOL support Team collaboration Tutoring Flexible P/T conferences Teacher/Data Talks Media/Homework Nights Intervention Groups Lesson Study/Model lessons.	5C.1. School Leadership Team RtI Team Classroom Teacher	5C.1. Data Meetings to review classroom grades, benchmark evaluations, FAIR, and RtI data. Classroom Walkthroughs and lesson plan checks will also be used..	5C.1. Classroom Reading Grades FAIR FCAT Reading Benchmark Reading Tests Classroom walkthroughs
Reading Goal #5C: The reading goal for our English Language Learners is to have 44% proficient as indicated on the 2013 FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 25% meeting proficiency.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 44%					
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5D.1. Attendance Time constraints during school day	5D.1. RtI Team collaboration Tutoring Flexible P/T conferences Teacher/Data Talks Media/Homework Nights Intervention Groups Lesson Study/Model lessons.	5D.1. School Leadership Team RtI Team Classroom Teacher	5D.1. Data Meetings to review classroom grades, benchmark evaluations, FAIR, and RtI data. Classroom Walkthroughs and lesson plan checks will also be used..	5D.1. Classroom Reading Grades FAIR FCAT Reading Benchmark Reading Tests Classroom walkthroughs
Reading Goal #5D: The goal for Students with Disabilities (SWD) if for 39% to be proficient (Level 3 or above) in reading as indicated by the 2013 FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 70% not meeting reading proficiency (level 3 and above)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 39%.					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

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. Attendance Time constraints during school day	5E.1. RtI Team collaboration Tutoring Flexible P/T conferences Teacher/Data Talks Media/Homework Nights Intervention Groups Lesson Study/Model lessons.	5E.1. School Leadership Team RtI Team Classroom Teacher	5E.1. Data Meetings to review classroom grades, benchmark evaluations, FAIR, and RtI data. Classroom Walkthroughs and lesson plan checks will also be used..	5E.1. Classroom Reading Grades FAIR FCAT Reading Benchmark Reading Tests Classroom walkthroughs
Reading Goal #5E: The goal for Economically Disadvantaged Students is to have 61% proficient (Level 3 or above) in reading as indicated by the 2013 FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance :* 55%	2013 Expected Level of Performance :* 61%					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Thinking Maps	K-5	Teaching and Learning Dept.	School Wide	August 15 Follow up determined by Teaching/Learning Dept	Follow up determined by Teaching/Learning Dept. Monitoring completed during walkthroughs and sharing	Administration
Kagan Structures	K-5	Trained staff	School Wide	August 15 Follow up determined by Teaching/Learning Dept	Monthly sharing during Faculty meetings, Classroom observations	Administration
Lesson Study	K-5	Literacy Coach & CRT	School Wide by grade level	November bi-monthly during grade level planning times	Bi-monthly meetings, classroom observations	Peers, Literacy Coach, Administration

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
Kagan Structures	Posters, ancillary materials	Discretionary funds	$100
Thinking Maps	Laminated Posters,	Discretionary funds	$50
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Lesson Study	Handouts	Discretionary funds	$100
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Media Night/Homework Help	Staff	Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)	$1,800
Grade Level Data Meetings	Half day substitute teachers	Discretionary funds	**$1,500**
			Subtotal:
			Total: $3,550

End of Reading Goals

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

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1: The following data was obtained through the 2012 administration of the CELLA test. Among kindergarten students 29% (2) were proficient in listening and speaking, 44% (4) in first grade, 83% (5) in second grade, 8% (1) in third grade, and 100% (1) in fourth grade. There were no ELL students tested in 5th grade.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: k-29% 1-44% 2_83% 3-8% 4-100%	1.1. Time constraints during the school day. Limited background knowledge and vocabulary Communication barriers between home and school	1.1. RtI ESOL support Team collaboration Tutoring Flexible P/T conferences Teacher/Data Talks Media/Homework Nights Intervention Groups Lesson Study/Model lessons Phone messages in second language Utilization of Transact and Rosetta Stone Software.	1.1. School Leadership Team RtI Team Classroom Teacher ESOL Contact	1.1. Grades Benchmark Evaluations FAIR RtI data Classroom Walkthroughs Lesson Plans	1.1. Formative and summative assessments. Results on 2013 CELLA Progress in Rosetta Stone
		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. CELLA Goal #2: The following data	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:	2.1. Time constraints during the school day. Limited background knowledge and vocabulary	2.1. RtI ESOL support Team collaboration Tutoring	2.1. School Leadership Team RtI Team Classroom Teacher ESOL Contact	2.1. Grades Benchmark Evaluations FAIR RtI data	2.1. Formative and summative assessments. Results on 2013 CELLA

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

was obtained through the 2012 administration of the CELLA test. Among kindergarten students 0% (0) were proficient in reading, 0% (0) in first grade, 67% (4) in second grade, 17% (2) in third grade, and 0% (0) in fourth grade. There were no ELL students tested in 5th grade.	k-0& 1-0% 2-67% 3-17% 4-0%.	Communication barriers between home and school	Flexible P/T conferences Teacher/Data Talks Media/Homework Nights Intervention Groups Lesson Study/Model lessons Phone messages in second language Utilization of Transact and Rosetta Stone Software.		Classroom Walkthroughs Lesson Plans	Progress in Rosetta Stone
		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: The following data was obtained through the 2012 administration of the CELLA test. Among kindergarten students 0% (0) were proficient in writing, 22% (2) in first grade, 50% (3) in second grade, 0% (0) in third grade, and 0% (0) in fourth grade. There were no ELL students tested in 5th grade.	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u> k-0% 1-22% 2-50% 3-0% 4-0%	2.1. Time constraints during the school day. Limited background knowledge and vocabulary Communication barriers between home and school	2.1. RtI ESOL support Team collaboration Tutoring Flexible P/T conferences Teacher/Data Talks Media/Homework Nights Intervention Groups Lesson Study/Model lessons Phone messages in second language Utilization of Transact and Rosetta Stone Software.	2.1. School Leadership Team RtI Team Classroom Teacher ESOL Contact	2.1. Grades Benchmark Evaluations FAIR RtI data Classroom Walkthroughs Lesson Plans	2.1. Formative and summative assessments. Results on 2013 CELLA administration. Progress in Rosetta Stone
		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. Economically Disadvantaged students Attendance Time constraints during day	1A.1. Data Chats Tutoring Task Cards Thinking Maps Kagan Lesson Study Math Camp	1A.1. Formative and summative assessments Classroom walkthrough data	1A.1. Grades Benchmark Evaluations RtI data Classroom Walkthroughs Lesson Plans	1A.1. Data Meetings to review classroom grades, benchmark evaluations, and RtI data. Classroom Walkthroughs and lesson plan checks will also be used.
Mathematics Goal #1A: According 2012 School Grade Report, 25% met proficiency level. The goal for the 2013 FCAT 2.0 is for 28% of students to score a level 3.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 25%(78)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 28%					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Mathematics Goal #1B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1. Economically Disadvantaged students Attendance Time constraints during day	2A.1. Envision higher order projects Participation in STEM Bowl and other enrichment opportunities Data Chats Tutoring Task Cards Thinking Maps Kagan Lesson Study Math Camp	2A.1. School Leadership Team RtI Team Classroom Teacher	2A.1. Grades Benchmark Evaluations RtI data Classroom Walkthroughs Lesson Plans	2A.1. Data Meetings to review classroom grades, benchmark evaluations, and RtI data. Classroom Walkthroughs and lesson plan checks will also be used.
Mathematics Goal #2A: On the 2012 FCAT 2.0 41% (128)achieved above proficiency. The goal is to increase this level to 44%	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	41% (128)	44%					
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Mathematics Goal #2B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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. Mathematics Goal #3A: According to 2012 FCAT 2.0, 83% made learning gains. The goal for 2013 FCAT 2.0 is to have 84% of students make learning gains.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 83%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 84%	3A.1. Economically Disadvantaged students Attendance Time constraints during day	3A.1. Envision higher order projects Participation in STEM Bowl and other enrichment opportunities Data Chats Tutoring Task Cards Thinking Maps Kagan Lesson Study Math Camp	3A.1. School Leadership Team RtI Team Classroom Teacher	3A.1. Grades Benchmark Evaluations RtI data Classroom Walkthroughs Lesson Plans	3A.1. Data Meetings to review classroom grades, benchmark evaluations, and RtI data. Classroom Walkthroughs and lesson plan checks will also be used.
			3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Mathematics Goal #3B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1. Economically Disadvantaged students Attendance Time constraints during day	4A.1. Data Chats Tutoring Task Cards Thinking Maps Kagan Lesson Study Math Camp	4A.1. School Leadership Team RtI Team Classroom Teacher	4A.1. Grades Benchmark Evaluations RtI data Classroom Walkthroughs Lesson Plans	4A.1. Data Meetings to review classroom grades, benchmark evaluations, and RtI data. Classroom Walkthroughs and lesson plan checks will also be used.
Mathematics Goal #4A: According to 2012 FCAT 2.0 data, 69% of lowest quartile made learning gains. The goal for 2013 is for 72% of lowest quartile to make learning gains.	2012 Current Level of Performance :* 69% (215)	2013 Expected Level of Performance :* 72%					
			4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.
Mathematics Goal #4B: *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	During the 2011-12 school year, 66% of students tested were proficient in math. The Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) was 65%.	68%	72%	75%	78%	81%
Mathematics Goal #5A: At Seminole Springs Elementary 62% of tested population were meeting proficiency in math on the 2011 FCAT. The goal is to increase that percentage to 81% by 2017.							

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: Attendance Time constraints during school day Black: Hispanic: Attendance Time constraints during school day Limited home support Language barriers Asian: American Indian::	5B.1. RtI ESOL support Team collaboration Tutoring Flexible P/T conferences Teacher/Data Talks Media/Homework Nights Intervention Groups Lesson Study/Model lessons.	5B.1. School Leadership Team RtI Team Classroom Teacher	5B.1. Data Meetings to review classroom grades, benchmark evaluations, and RtI data. Classroom Walkthroughs and lesson plan checks will also be used..	5B.1. Classroom Math Grades FCAT Math Benchmark Math Tests Classroom walkthroughs	
Mathematics Goal #5B: The goal is to have 68% of the white subgroup be proficient in math as indicated on the 2013 FCAT. The goal for the Hispanic subgroup is to be 56%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Percent not meeting satisfactory progress White:31% Black:43% Hispanic: 50 Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White:71% Black: Hispanic:56% Asian: American Indian					

		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1. Time constraints during school day Limited home support	5C.1. RtI ESOL support Team collaboration Tutoring Flexible P/T conferences Teacher/Data Talks Media/Homework Nights Intervention Groups Lesson Study/Model lessons.	5C.1. School Leadership Team RtI Team Classroom Teacher	5C.1. Data Meetings to review classroom grades, benchmark evaluations, and RtI data. Classroom Walkthroughs and lesson plan checks will also be used..	5C.1. Classroom Math Grades FCAT Math Benchmark Math Tests Classroom walkthroughs
Mathematics Goal #5C: The math goal for our English Language Learners is to have 41% proficient as indicated on the 2013 FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance :* Percent not meeting satisfactory progress 71%	2013 Expected Level of Performance :* 41%					
			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. Attendance Time constraints during school day Limited home support	5D.1. RtI ESE support Team collaboration Tutoring Flexible P/T conferences Teacher/Data Talks Media/Homework Nights Intervention Groups Lesson Study/Model lessons.	5D.1. School Leadership Team RtI Team Classroom Teacher	5D.1. Data Meetings to review classroom grades, benchmark evaluations, and RtI data. Classroom Walkthroughs and lesson plan checks will also be used..	5D.1. Classroom Math Grades FCAT Math Benchmark Math Tests Classroom walkthroughs
Mathematics Goal #5D: The math goal for our Students with Disabilities is to have 48% proficient as indicated on the 2013 FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance :* Percent not meeting satisfactory progress 62%	2013 Expected Level of Performance :* 48%					
.			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1. Attendance Time constraints during school day Limited home support	5E.1. RtI ESOL support ESE support Team collaboration Tutoring Flexible P/T conferences Teacher/Data Talks Media/Homework Nights Intervention Groups Lesson Study/Model lessons.	5E.1. School Leadership Team RtI Team Classroom Teacher	5E.1. Data Meetings to review classroom grades, benchmark evaluations, and RtI data. Classroom Walkthroughs and lesson plan checks will also be used..	5E.1. Classroom Math Grades FCAT Math Benchmark Math Tests Classroom walkthroughs
Mathematics Goal #5E: The math goal for our economically disadvantaged students is to have 56% proficient as indicated on the 2013 FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance: *					
	Percent not making satisfactory progress 45%	56% making satisfactory progress.					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.
Mathematics Goal #5E: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

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

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

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

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		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
Thinking Maps	K-5	Teaching and Learning Dept.	School Wide	August 15 Follow up determined by Teaching/Learning Dept	Follow up determined by Teaching/Learning Dept. Monitoring completed during walkthroughs and sharing	Administration
Lesson Study	K-5	Trained staff	School Wide	August 15 Follow up determined by Teaching/Learning Dept	Monthly sharing during Faculty meetings, Classroom observations	Administration
Kagan/Cooperative Learning	K-5	Literacy Coach & CRT	School Wide by grade level	November bi-monthly during grade level planning times	Bi-monthly meetings, classroom observations	Peers, Curriculum Resource, Administration

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
Thinking Maps			
Kagan Structures			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
STAR Math	Progress Monitoring	SAI	$2,000
FASTT Math	Skill Practice Program	SAI	$2,000
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: $4,000

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1A: Based on 2012 FCAT science data, 44% (45) achieved a level 3. The goal for 2013 FCAT science is for 47% of the students to score a level 3.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 44% (45)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 47%	1A.1. Economically Disadvantaged students Attendance Time constraints during day	1A.1. Science Day Science Fair Classroom and virtual labs Field trips Benchmark assessments STEM Bowl participation	1A.1. School Leadership Team RtI Team Classroom Teacher	1A.1. Grades Benchmark Evaluations RtI data Classroom Walkthroughs Lesson Plans	1A.1. Formative and summative assessments Classroom walkthrough data
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.			2A.1. Economically Disadvantaged students Attendance Time constraints during day	2A.1. STEM Bowl participation Envision Project Based Learning	2A.1. School Leadership Team RtI Team Classroom Teacher	**2A.1.** Grades Benchmark Evaluations RtI data Classroom Walkthroughs Lesson Plans	**2A.1.** Formative and summative assessments Classroom walkthrough data
Science Goal #2A: Based on the 2012 FCAT assessment 22% (23) students achieved above proficiency. The goal for 2013 is for 25% of the students to achieve above proficiency	2012 Current Level of Performance :* 22% (23)	2013Expected Level of Performance :* 25%					
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Science Goal #2B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

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

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

Science Professional Development

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject t, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Science Day	5th grade	5th grade team leader	5th grade team	January 2013	Monitoring completed during walkthroughs and sharing	Administration 5th grade team leader 5th grade team

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.

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
Science Day	Olando Science Center in-school field trip	Students/internal budget	$600
			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

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

			Subtotal:
			Total: $600

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. Lack of background knowledge Time restraints	1A.1. Writing Camp DBQ School Wide Writing Prompts Thinking Maps Kagan Structures	1A.1. Administration RTI team Classroom teachers	1A.1. Scores on monthly writing assessments DBQ	1A.1. Monthly writing assessments and rubrics
Writing Goal #1A: According to the 2012 FCAT Writes 88% (85) scored a level 3 or higher Our goal for 2013 FCAT Writes is for 91% to score at or above proficiency.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 88% (85)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 91%					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Writing Goal #1B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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
Anchor set review	4th grade	Literacy Coach and Curriculum Resource Teacher	4th grade	October 2012	Monthly writing prompts will be scored and reviewed by all grade level teams.	Administration Leadership team Classroom teachers
Thinking Maps	All Grades	Literacy Coach and Curriculum Resource Teacher	School Wide	On-going	Monthly PLC's provided on site Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Leadership team Classroom teachers
Kagan Structures	All Grades	Literacy Coach and Curriculum Resource Teacher	School Wide	On-going	Monthly PLC's provided on site Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Leadership team Classroom teachers

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Writing Camp	Stduents and teachers attend writing reteat at the Central Florida Bible Camp. Writing centers are utilized to reinforce writing skills.	Students and PTO	$1700
DBQ	Document Based Questions- Students use documents to outline and compose original essays.	Discretionary budget	$200
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: **$1,900**

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

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

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

Civics Professional Development

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

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Civics Goals

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						
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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

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]).

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			1.1. Personal transportation is an issue due to poor economical status.	1.1 Increase personal contact with families to increase daily attendance.	1.1. Administration and social worker.	1.1. Data analysis using information from Student Services and FIDO	1.1. Quarterly attendance data from Student Services.
Attendance Goal #1: During the 2011-2012 school year 7.18% of our students had 20 or more absences. We improved by 3% from the previous year with 10%. Our ADA was 96% which was a 1% improvement from the previous year. Our goal for 2013 will be an ADA of 97%.	2012 Current Attendance Rate:* The average ADA for 2011-2012 was 96%	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* 97%					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) 138	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) 100					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) 71	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) 35					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.

		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Attendance Professional Development

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

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Set up incentive plan for regular attendance	Certificates, cash cards, random drawings	Internal budget	$1,500
			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: $1,500

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

End of Attendance Goals

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension			1.1. Inconsistent classroom discipline plan Lack of area to hold in school suspension session and consistent personnel to supervise. LEAPS lessons	1.1 Create a grade level discipline plan Use grade level area to assign in-school suspensions vs. front office.	1.1. Administration Selected classroom teacher will house the student with supervision by administration	1.1. Administration will keep log of student's progress during in-school time Keep log of behaviors resulting in suspension out-of-school and find solutions to repeating the behaviors	1.1. Student Referral Quarterly Discipline Report from AS400 Student Referral Quarterly Discipline Report from AS400
Suspension Goal #1: The number of students suspended will decrease by 25%.	2012 Total Number of In – School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions					
	29	15					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					
	13	10					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	13	10					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	13	10					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			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
Strategies to avoid suspensions	K-5	Assistant Principal	School-wide	Once every nine weeks	AP, ESE Specialist, Guidance Counselor	Assistant Principal
PBS initiative	K-5	Guidance Counselor	School-wide	First Thursday of month before school.	PBS committee	Guidance Councelor

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
Meet with ESE Specialist and Guidance Counselor quarterly	Report from AS400/FIDO	N/A	-0-
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:

	Total:

End of Suspension Goals

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Dropout Rate:* *Enter numerical data for dropout rate in this box.*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:* *Enter numerical data for expected dropout rate in this box.*	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:* *Enter numerical data for graduation rate in this box.*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:* *Enter numerical data for expected graduation rate in this box.*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

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)).

<table>
<tr>
<th colspan="3">Parent Involvement Goal(s)</th>
<th colspan="5">Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement</th>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="3">Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:</td>
<td>Anticipated Barrier</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td>
<td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td>
<td>Evaluation Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="3">1. Parent Involvement</td>
<td rowspan="2">1.1.
Language, childcare and transportation Informational meetings such as Common Core Readiness and FCAT</td>
<td rowspan="2">1.1
Open media nights, phone system, flexible conference times, and report card nights.</td>
<td rowspan="2">1.1.
Literacy Coach, administration, CRT, media specialist and classroom teachers.</td>
<td rowspan="2">1.1.
Collect participation data and survey families.</td>
<td rowspan="2">1.1.
Parental sign in sheets, and survey results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td rowspan="2">Parent Involvement Goal #1:
Previous year 90% of parents participated in school activities including, but not limited to conferences special events, and recognition ceremonies.</td>
<td>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</td>
<td>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="3"></td>
<td>1.2.</td>
<td>1.2.</td>
<td>1.2.</td>
<td>1.2.</td>
<td>1.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="3"></td>
<td>1.3.</td>
<td>1.3.</td>
<td>1.3.</td>
<td>1.3.</td>
<td>1.3.</td>
</tr>
</table>

Parent Involvement Professional Development

<table>
<tr>
<th colspan="7">Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.</th>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus</td>
<td>Grade Level/Subject</td>
<td>PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader</td>
<td>PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)</td>
<td>Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)</td>
<td>Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring</td>
<td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td>
</tr>
</table>

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

Parent Involvement Budget

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			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: Based on the 2012 FCAT data, the following content focus areas are in need of improvement. Physical Science Life Science Geometry and Measurement	1.1. Economically Disadvantaged students Attendance Time constraints during day Language barriers Communication barriers	1.1. Seminole Springs Elementary School is a STEM school, and 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students participate in county wide STEM Bowl Science Day Science Fair Classroom and virtual labs Field trips Benchmark assessments	1.1. School Leadership Team RtI Team Classroom Teacher	1.1. Grades Benchmark Evaluations RtI data Classroom Walkthroughs Lesson Plans Participation in STEM Bowl practice	1.1. Formative and summative assessments Classroom walkthrough data
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

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

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

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

CTE Professional Development

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

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

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Additional Goal			1.1. Student and teacher understanding of the definition of bullying Language Cultural differences	1.1. Second Step LEAPS Training PBS	1.1. Classroom teachers - Guidance counselors - Administration - PBS Team	1.1. Discipline referrals - PBS Tier 2 intervention tracking	1.1. 2011-2012 Discipline Referral Data - Tier 2 interventions data
Additional Goal #1: The number of bullying incidents for 2011--2011 was 0% Our goal is to develop an awareness of bullying and prevention to eliminate all bullying related incidents.	2012 Current Level :* 0%	2013 Expected Level :* 0%					
			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
Technology: teachers will improve mastery and integration of educational technology to increase student achievement.	k-5	Administration Technology contact	School wide	ongoing	Classroom walkthrough, lesson plan checks	administrators

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

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	**$3,550**
	Total:
CELLA Budget	
	Total:
Mathematics Budget	**$4,000**
	Total:
Science Budget	**$600**
	Total:
Writing Budget	**$1,900**
	Total:
Civics Budget	
	Total:
U.S. History Budget	
	Total:
Attendance Budget	**$1,500**
	Total:
Suspension Budget	
	Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget	
	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	
	Total:
STEM Budget	
	Total:
CTE Budget	
	Total:
Additional Goals	
	Total: 10,950
	Grand Total: 11,550

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.
The School Advisory Council will meet monthly to discuss current academic trends and recommend educational decisions based on information disseminated to the voting membership.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Academic support for goals as listed in the School Improvement Plan	$2,000

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